PROGRAM REVIEW
PACIFIC RECREATION SERVICES AND FACILITIES

INTRODUCTION/PROCESS

On January 29, 2009, Dr. Elizabeth Griego, Vice-President for Student Life, convened a committee to review Pacific Recreation services and facilities. The committee membership consisted of the following persons:

    Peg Ciccolella, Professor of Sport Sciences & Committee Chair
    Mike Dalgety, Assistant Director of Athletics
    Janet Dial, Senior Development Officer
    Daron Fugett, Associate Bursar
    Darrin Kitchen, Assistant Professor of Sport Sciences
    Haroon Singh, Graduate Student, Department of Sport Sciences

The charge of the committee was to identify and summarize issues relevant to the current status and future direction of Pacific Recreation programs and facilities. Additionally, the committee was asked to offer recommendations and observations incidental to its review. In the past 18 months, Pacific Recreation has made significant progress under its current administration in the development of its program. Much of the Self-Study Report for Pacific Recreation Services and Facilities (Self-Study) considers newly initiated or revamped policies and procedures. Nonetheless, our charge was to review the “snapshot” of the program as it exists today and to offer recommendations relevant to continued improvement. With that understanding, we proceeded with our review.

The committee was provided the Self-Study and standards from the Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS) as an initial basis for the review. The committee also reviewed the University’s explicit commitments to values, aspirations, and integrated/dynamic planning as articulated in Pacific Rising. Following a review of these documents, the committee relied upon physical inspections of the Baum Fitness Center (BFC) and interviews/meetings with Elizabeth Griego, Vice President for Student Life; Dan Shipp, Assistant Vice President for Student Life; and Wendy Stratton, Director of Pacific Recreation Programs and Facilities (“Pacific Recreation administrators”). Additionally, various staff members employed at the BFC were interviewed.
The committee appreciated the comprehensive review in the Self-Study, authored by Wendy Stratton. This document offers a thorough analysis of 13 distinct aspects of Pacific Recreation programs and facilities. It served as a roadmap upon which the committee heavily relied throughout the review process. The committee decided to analyze each part by dividing responsibility among its members who worked in teams.

When the review committee was convened, Vice President Griego invited consideration of any and all issues that might be relevant to Pacific Recreation. The committee decided on both a transparent and ongoing process. It met weekly as a group to discuss progress specifically on the reviews of Parts 1-13 and on other issues that may have surfaced incidental to these reviews. These were open meetings and typically attended by some or all of the Pacific Recreation administrators. Throughout the process, numerous drafts inviting comments and revisions were shared with committee members and Pacific Recreation administrators. The committee was committed to a final report that would faithfully and deliberately meet its charge.

The remainder of this document offers comments and recommendations that resulted from the committee’s review. Major issues and a conclusion are reported below. Attached to the document are individual reviews of Parts 1-13 of the Self-Study that also include committee recommendations.

SUMMARY OF MAJOR ISSUES

The review committee identified five major issues that merit special consideration. These are (1) University planning, (2) the relationship of Pacific Recreation to other entities, (3) facility needs, (4) financial support for professional support and software for membership management, and (5) the use of CAS standards.

1. UNIVERSITY PLANNING

Problems associated with University planning are central to most of the issues and recommendations emerging as a result of this review. In spite of an institutional commitment to integrated master planning (see Pacific Rising), decisions relevant to Pacific Recreation have been made, at times, without its input. This program’s efforts on behalf of our University are unnecessarily complicated when this occurs. Specific issues/recommendations flowing directly from failures to engage in integrated master planning are discussed throughout this report.
Recommendation: The committee urges University master planning consistent with our commitment as articulated in Pacific Rising to support ongoing improvements in education and service by “better integrating University planning”. (See Pacific Rising, Commitments and Strategic Directions, #18; and Integrated and Dynamic Planning). Specifically, the committee recommends meaningful collaboration with Pacific Recreation when other campus entities consider issues that may have an impact on any aspect of its program. This may occur simply by adding a Pacific Recreation staff representative to the discussion.

2. THE RELATIONSHIP OF PACIFIC RECREATION TO OTHER ENTITIES

DEPARTMENT OF SPORT SCIENCES

The relationship of Pacific Recreation to the Department of Sport Sciences is specifically addressed in the Self-Study in both a general and specific context. The specific context addresses the use of graduate assistantships funded by the Department of Sport Sciences and essentially requests an agreement between the two entities that is understood and supported by their respective administrations (see “Professional Support”, p. 6). The general context requests consideration of a relationship and implies that a more formal agreement is necessary.

The relationship between Pacific Recreation and the Department of Sport Sciences includes a history of shared physical space, graduate assistantships provided to Pacific Recreation by the Department of Sport Sciences, overlapping backgrounds and expertise relevant to wellness, and common areas of professional interest. Over the years, students, faculty, and staff have benefited from this association. However, in the absence of integrated planning, we have never formally explored the potential benefits associated with the collaboration of these two programs. Collaboration serves the future interests of Pacific in both an academic and service context and is consistent with our values and aspirations as expressed in Pacific Rising. For example, integrated curricular and co-curricular efforts between these two entities could be a significant contribution to this institution’s commitment to “Whole Person Education”. (See Pacific Rising, Core Values)

It is in the interests of the University and both programs to continue mutually cooperative efforts. This should not simply result from a sense of historical collegiality; rather it should result from planned consideration and decided administrative support. This requires incorporation of the relationship into University planning and a functional proximity of one entity to the other. The relocation of the Department of Sport Sciences to the periphery of the campus (Classroom Building) would seriously compromise its working relationship with Pacific Recreation. Consideration of the
impact caused by displacement of Sport Sciences on Pacific Recreation should precede any decision to relocate that Department without its consent.

Recommendation: The committee recommends that the University develop a long range plan that provides structure and resources for the mutually cooperative efforts of these entities in the context of wellness related issues as well as “Whole Person Education” opportunities for students and the greater Pacific community as a whole. This planning should precede any decision to relocate the Department of Sport Sciences.

HUMAN RESOURCES

Incidental to this review, the committee learned that from January 2008 to May 2008, Human Resources implemented a campus wellness initiative designed explicitly to reduce the cost of health care premiums for the University. The value of reducing health care premiums is simply undisputable. However, it was surprising to learn that Human Resources independently and unilaterally planned, funded, and implemented this initiative without the involvement of other sectors of the University with expertise and/or resources relevant to wellness.

This was a disappointing revelation since Pacific Recreation, in collaboration with the Department of Sport Sciences, is uniquely positioned to provide leadership regarding wellness. For example, there is compelling evidence that regular participation in moderate exercise alone results in a reduction of the major health risk factors facing our population. At the planning stage, Pacific Recreation and the Department of Sport Sciences both could have offered recommendations that may have contributed to a successful program and avoided the problems associated with this initiative.

The Self-Study recommends University support for faculty/staff members at the BFC. Since it is now clear that funding exists for campus wellness and assuming a logical connection between fitness and the reduction of insurance claims, it is important for the University to consider a way to reasonably support employee memberships.

Recommendation: Failure to consider the possible role of Pacific Recreation in the 2008 wellness initiative is disturbing and the committee recommends a more integrated approach to future planning of wellness related issues.
INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETICS

The relationship between Pacific Recreation and Athletics is evident from shared programming and space. Both programs offer competitive athletic opportunities, e.g., intercollegiate and club sports; nutritional counseling; personnel and facilities for physical training; and plans to share space in a new gymnasium. However, the relationship of these entities in formal University planning is lacking in spite of their overlapping interests, efforts, and resources.

Recommendation: The committee recommends that Pacific formally integrate the relationship of Pacific Recreation and Intercollegiate Athletics into its formal planning.

3. FACILITY NEEDS

The Self-Study proposes funding to renovate the Rubber Room to increase its usability and to increase its value in programming. Later in the Self-Study, however, it is suggested that the Rubber Room be converted into the new entrance to Baun. During a conversation between Mr. Shipp and Ms. Stratton the committee's concern over this “seeming” internal inconsistency was assuaged when they explained that the Self-Study was looking at both short-term and long-term needs i.e. the short-term want to renovate the Rubber Room to boost programming availability while in the long-term it would be ideal to have a door that faces into the new central area and the University Center.

Along with renovations to the Rubber Room, the Self-Study outlines a proposal for the addition of an aquatic facility to Baun Fitness Center. The proposed facility, as described in the Self-Study would predominantly be a large leisure pool accompanied by a smaller fitness pool with lap lanes. Randomly conducted interviews of student, alumni and emeriti at Baun Fitness Center produced an overwhelmingly favorable response to the addition of an aquatic facility. Members expressed issues with hours of operation, competitive environment and overall inconvenient location of the University’s only aquatic facility, Kjeldsen Pool. Farther, the addition of an aquatic facility would greatly expand Pacific Recreation’s programming options, specifically in regards to populations with special needs. Finally, a new centrally located facility would likely benefit the Department of Sports Science’s ability to offer instructional courses and to conduct research.

Incidental to its review, the committee also learned that an aquatic facility associated with yet to be built student residence halls was proposed in the University’s master plan. The greater Pacific Community would not benefit from the development of such a facility, as it would cater primarily to residents of that specific hall and probably not be built to accommodate use by the community as a whole.
The issue of a Pacific Recreation operated aquatic facility and the seeming internal inconsistency surrounding the Rubber Room points to a larger issue, (i.e. a systemic lack of funding and a lack of long term vision). The Self-Study mentions a lack of facilities and a general need for space, the “wanted” addition of a pool, the potential of a children’s clinic and a new position to more adequately serve the student population. Pacific Recreation clearly lacks the staffing, support and resources necessary to accomplish most, if not all of these goals.

**Recommendation:** The committee strongly suggests that, because these are mid-to-long term goals that possess intrinsic value for the program and Pacific, they need to be addressed by the division of Student Life in a strategic way that is in conjunction with the University’s master plan. The committee also recommends the relocation of the aquatic facility from the student Residence Halls to Baun Fitness Center in its master plan.

4. PROFESSIONAL SUPPORT AND SOFTWARE FOR MEMBERSHIP MANAGEMENT

**PROFESSIONAL SUPPORT**

The Self-Study reflects Pacific Recreation’s growing commitment to expand opportunities for the Pacific community. Usage of BFC by the Pacific community, enrollment of students in intramural activities, and overall participation in Pacific Outdoor Connection has been steadily rising. This growth has resulted in the need for additional employment positions within Pacific Recreation. It makes sense that as an entity continues to grow there is a need for more employees. With the variety of experiences offered by Pacific Recreation facility maintenance, facility operations, and community relations are widespread. Current structure will not suffice as the program grows, yet staff remains constant. An additional full- time position responsible for supervising facility operations is worth considering.

**Recommendation:** Pacific Recreation should have additional staff in order to meet their current growth. The committee recommends three ways to meet this need: (a) a full time position supervising facility operations, outdoor education, and leadership programming; (b) additional graduate assistantships could be granted through the graduate school; and (c) a blended option of ‘a’ and ‘b’.
SPORT SCIENCES DEPARTMENT

The Department of Sport Sciences has a history of sponsoring a total of three waivers for graduate students who work in the Pacific Recreation program. These waivers were funded by the graduate program and were supplemented by stipends paid by the Pacific Recreation budget. In recent years, an audit resulted in a reduction of the number of assistantships available to the Department of Sport Sciences. Apparently, there was a failure to document the awards from the graduate school and this created uncertainty about the obligation of Sport Sciences to Pacific Recreation. There is little question that graduate assistantships are an economic, academic, and experiential benefit to students. Additionally, Pacific Recreation depends upon the assistantships in order to offer quality wellness related program and services without severe economic consequence to its budget. Finally, it is simply more economical to use lower costing graduate assistantships instead of employing full-time staff members and paying for their salaries and benefits.

Recommendation: Pacific Recreation should be awarded an appropriate number of assistantships from the graduate school that is channeled through the Department of Sport Sciences. This should be appropriately documented in order to avoid further misunderstandings and/or ambiguity.

SOFTWARE FOR MEMBERSHIP MANAGEMENT

Currently, Baun Fitness Center does not have a membership management system. Access to the facility is governed by the PacificCard office, and not accessible to student staff on duty. The system, as it stands now, is inefficient and a poor use of resources resulting in confusion on behalf of the cardholders, staff members, and useless expenditures training staff on how to follow protocol once a member’s card denies access into the facility. The facility is in need of a system that allows all Pacific Recreation staff to identity members and resolve related conflicts in a timely more efficient manner.

With a new system if a member were denied access upon swiping their card staff can identify the reason for denial, thus allowing for better customer service on behalf of the staff and a more positive experience for the card holder. A new membership management system could inform the card holder of why access is being denied and give a clear understanding to all parties the manner in which the ‘problem’ needs to be resolved. The efficiency of such a system would also remove Pacific Recreation administrators from having to deal directly with all access issues, which is the
current practice due to student staff’s inability to identify problems with the membership cards. This creates a strain on the use of time for administrators and is an ineffective use of resources.

Currently, general information regarding membership expiration, payment type, associated members, and services utilized are not readily accessible without having to physically search through membership files. In addition, the current system makes it more difficult to identify approved guests causing problems for staff to maintain a safe and secure facility. A new membership system would significantly reduce the possibilities of someone accessing the facility who does not have clearance.

The estimated cost for a new membership maintenance system is $50,000. This includes purchase and installation. The system would be compatible with the current University ID card system. Yearly maintenance and licensing fees will cost $2,700, as quoted by the software management company. Pacific Recreation administration indicated this yearly cost will be reasonable to manage within their current budget.

**Recommendation:** The committee recommends Pacific supports Pacific Recreation’s suggestion to upgrade their current membership system with a more updated, customer friendly, resource-efficient system. The committee also recommends that Pacific Recreation apply for a variety of University grants in order to help secure funding for the upgraded management software system.

5. **THE USE OF CAS STANDARDS**

At the outset of the review process, the CAS standards were a concern and the committee asked for clarification regarding their proper role. The committee was concerned that the explicitly quoted CAS standards introducing each of the 13 parts of the Self-Study represented mandates that, in some instances, were unduly burdensome to Pacific Recreation. In a response to this concern, the committee was given clear direction from Vice President Griego (memo available upon request) on the appropriate use of the standards. That is, CAS standards are statements of good practice and not “standards” as the term can be strictly construed. It was acknowledged that while CAS standards set a high bar, we should be mindful that Pacific is not under the authority of CAS. Further, Pacific Recreation is best served by interpreting the “spirit” as opposed to the “letter” of CAS, and by using its words as “way-pointers”, not “gatekeepers”. In response to this clarification, the review committee decided that where the Self-Study is silent on a CAS standard, then the review committee would also be silent regarding any omission to comport with quoted standards. But where the Self-
Study speaks to a standard, then the committee’s review would reflect the “guiding only” role of CAS. This approach was adopted following agreement to it from Pacific Recreation administrators.

Recommendation: The review committee recommends that future Pacific references to CAS define our relationship with CAS and our level of commitment to its standards. We offer this recommendation in order to avoid any risk to the University associated with the appearance of an adoption of promises or terms that do not truly reflect our intent.

CONCLUSION

In spite of its numerous recommendations, the review committee acknowledges the great strides taken by Pacific Recreation in the past months and believes that its programs contribute in a most positive manner to this University. The committee further believes that Pacific Recreation has the potential to serve as a “centerpiece” for aspirations and commitments articulated in Pacific Rising, specifically in the context of integrated curricular and co-curricular programming on “Whole Person Education”. This requires a decided administrative commitment to implement “integrated and dynamic planning”. The benefit could allow Pacific Recreation to achieve “distinction” consistent with the ideals expressed in Pacific Rising and recognition beyond the boundaries of this University.

Respectfully submitted to Vice President Elizabeth Griego, Assistant Vice President Dan Shipp, and Director Wendy Stratton. March 4, 2009

Peg Cicolella, Professor of Sport Sciences & Committee Chair

Mike Dalgetty, Assistant Director of Athletics

Janet Dial, Senior Development Officer

Damon Fugett, Associate Bursar

Darrin Kitchen, Assistant Professor of Sport Sciences

Haroon Singh, Graduate Student, Department of Sport Sciences
EVALUATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PARTS 1-13 OF THE SELF-STUDY

PART 1: MISSION

1. Reviewed by: Damon Fugett, University of the Pacific Associate Bursar.

2. Process of Review: This section was reviewed through a comparison between CAS, Pacific Recreation standards and Pacific Recreation "intent" as was expressed in its mission statement.

3. Consistency of Part 1 with CAS Standards: CAS and Pacific Recreation standards differ because CAS standards are well defined and clearly delineated as a mission with supporting goal and value statements. While Pacific Recreation’s mission lacks the definition and development as described in the CAS standards, their “catchy”, succinct statement of “maximum potential” and the presented goals show that Pacific Recreation is “in line” with the intent expressed in the CAS standards and is very much in line with Pacific’s mission to be “student centered”.

4. Comments of Recommendations from the Self-Study: N/A. No recommendations were offered.

5. Additional Comments: Mission statements should convey desired meaning and intent to both internal and external constituents. Pacific Recreation should expand upon the concept of “maximum potential” to more clearly define its relevance in general and in particular, its role in affecting decisions made by administrators and employees. Employees and other internal constituents should be able to look to their mission statement to receive direction when they have questions about how to respond to new questions and situations. A concise, clear statement of broad goals and departmental values can help to guide all Pacific Recreation shareholders so there is less potential for a “disconnect” between statement intent and action.

   Pacific Recreation should define or further clarify the use of the terms (1) "student", (2) "member" and (3) “Pacific community”. Frequently in the Self-Study, these terms seem to be used interchangeably. In other situations there are indications that these terms are in fact different populations. Clearly defining these populations will remove the potential for ambiguity.

   Finally, Pacific Recreation should clarify why yearly goals are selected, their importance and how they relate to the overall mission of the department. For instance, why was the decision made to prioritize increases in overall participation (by 10%) and participation in Pacific Lacrosse and Tiger Rugby? While these goals appear noble, what in particular is it about these programs that justifies the allocation of budget and constrained departmental resources?
6. Review Committee Recommendations: The committee suggests that Pacific Recreation more clearly define the use of the terms (1) “student”, (2) “member”, and (3) “Pacific community”. Also, it is suggested that Pacific Recreation examine their mission statement to determine that it conveys what was intended and whether it meets the needs of the program.

PART 2: PROGRAM

1. Reviewed by: Mike Dalgety, Assistant Director of Athletics for Internal Affairs; Darrin Kitchen, Assistant Professor of Sport Sciences; and Haroon Singh, Graduate Student.

2. Process of Review: Part 2 was reviewed followed by individual and group discussions with Wendy Stratton, Director; Bryan Lenz, Assistant Director of Sports and Competitions; Alex Caspero, Coordinator of Group Exercise/Personal Training; and Jessica Roesemann, Facilities Coordinator.

3. Consistency of Part 2 with CAS Standards: The information contained in the Self-Study (p. 5) is consistent with CAS Standards as those standards are explained in the summary of this review (see p. 1 of this report).

4. Comments on Recommendations from the Self-Study: The Committee recommends that the logic/rationale in the Self-Study’s proposed Rubber Room renovation be clarified. Part 7 of the Self-Study (see p. 52) presents a recommendation to change the location of the entrance to BFC, which would thus impact the present location of the Rubber Room. Further clarification would be beneficial to justify the renovation of the Rubber Room prior to the proposed change of the BFC entrance.

The recommendation for the institution to subsidize Faculty/Staff memberships, as an employee benefit should be further substantiated. While the intent is admirable, the projected revenue of $262,400 from Faculty/Staff memberships as part of a benefit package is unrealistic. This section needs more thorough examination with the committee chairperson and the person/group involved with the Human Resources portion of the Self-Study.

The recommendation to purchase and install a member management software system is aligned with the ever-changing world of technology and could have a far-reaching impact within Pacific Recreation. In addition to managing guest access to BFC and enhancing a safe and secure facility, the recommended software system could augment the scheduling and the oversight of the RecSports program. While still playing a role in institutional health and wellness initiatives for faculty and staff.
The Self-Study recommended institutional funding for a variety of positions related to the Club Sports program. In addition to the inclusion of a proposed boathouse facility as part of future campus fundraising initiatives. The Committee acknowledges that recognized institutional priorities ideally should be funded in an appropriate manner. With that said, if the institution identifies a priority to enhance Club Sports programming for reasons such as student recruitment, the Self-Study’s recommendations merit consideration.

5. Additional Comments: Pacific Recreation provides a variety of experiences for students, staff, and the rest of the Pacific community in regards to holistic development. CAS Standards suggest identifying relevant student learning and desirable outcomes. The conducted surveys included in the Appendices document some of these desirable outcomes and a more in-depth analysis could be included. Perhaps a more qualitative approach combined with the current quantitative approach would solicit such data. Quite possibly, interviews with students, staff, and the Pacific community may lend rich data to help in future planning and discussions of outcomes.

Therefore, it would seem necessary to document (with artifacts) how these outcomes are met. For example: In what ways could Pacific Recreation determine social responsibility and meaningful interpersonal relationships? These are two outcomes critical to the adherence and/or adoption of lifetime physical activity and in addition, align with the mission statement.

Pacific Recreation has continued to appeal to the developmental and demographic profiles of the student population. This evidenced in its attempts with the Tiger X program and the purchasing of new equipment to meet the needs of students with various physical disabilities.

A more concentrated effort on reaching students via user-friendly emails is recommended for future surveys. The Self-Study mentioned a possible explanation for the high percentage of freshmen and short-term users is that the survey was distributed via Pacific email, whereas personal email accounts may be more widely used for students who live off-campus. This in turn may give a more comprehensive representation of the overall experiences from Pacific students.

There seems to be some level of inconsistency in the use of the terms “Pacific community” and “local community” regarding the Pacific Recreation’s programming. The Program’s mission (see Self-Study, p.1) is limited to the Pacific community. Likewise, the CAS standards for Part 2 (see Self-Study, p.5) are limited to a reflection of the needs and interests of “students, faculty, staff, and other members of the campus community.” Parts 2 (see p.5) and 3 (see p.33) of the Self-Study in addition to the follow-up discussions, however, relate some program offerings to local community involvement. Pacific Recreation does engage in facility rentals to community groups. Some of the
club sports programs solicit community involvement in their programs. Also, with the Director’s specialty in therapeutic recreation and adapted physical education, there are plans for a gross motor skills clinic for children with disabilities to serve the local community. These elements of local community involvement and programming may be a valuable aspect of the Pacific Recreation. The Committee recommends that the mission and goals of Pacific Recreation consistently reflect the full scope of its vision.

The Self-Study in addition to the follow-up discussions indicates that Pacific Recreation has made significant positive progress in terms of management, membership, and programming in recent years. The Committee acknowledges these improvements. The Pacific Recreation’s leadership team is undeniably committed to further improvement, as evidenced by this Self-Study and the associated discussions. Further substantiation and inquiry into a number of the Self-Study’s recommendations can help to set a course for continued improvement.

| 6. Review Committee Recommendations: (1) In addition to the quantitative surveys, the committee recommends a qualitative approach be applied to the collection of data. Interviews with students, staff, and the Pacific community may lend rich data to help in future planning and discussions of outcomes. (2) A more concentrated effort on reaching students via user-friendly emails is recommended for future surveys. The Self-Study mentioned a possible explanation for the high percentage of freshmen and short-term users is that the survey was distributed via Pacific email, whereas personal email accounts may be more widely used for students who live off-campus. This may give a more comprehensive representation of the overall experiences from Pacific students. And (3) that the mission and goals of Pacific Recreation consistently reflect the full scope of its vision. |

PART 3: LEADERSHIP

1. Reviewed by: Mike Dalgety, Assistant Director of Athletics for Internal Affairs
2. Process of Review: Part 3 was reviewed followed by a group discussion with Wendy Stratton, Director; Bryan Lenz, Assistant Director of Sports and Competitions; Alex Caspero, Coordinator of Group Exercise/Personal Training; and Jessica Roesemann, Facilities Coordinator.
3. Consistency of Part 3 with CAS Standards: The information contained in the Self-Study (p.33) is consistent with CAS Standards as those standards are explained in the summary of this review (see p.1 of this report).
4. Comments on Recommendations from the Self-Study: N/A. No recommendations were offered.

5. Additional Comments: The Self-Study and group discussion provided a clear and consistent picture of the Pacific Recreation’s leadership structure, practices, and vision. The Pacific Recreation’s overarching vision and goals are reflective of the expressed mission of the program (see Self-Study p.1) as well as that of the Division of Student Life. The Pacific Recreation’s leadership team has developed a culture of collaboration in targeting specific objectives to meet the program’s goals. This culture of collaboration extends throughout the program as student employees are encouraged to become engaged participants in the leadership process. The Pacific Recreation leadership team provides student employees with numerous opportunities for leadership development while setting clear expectations for students to serve the program’s greater mission. There is little question that the leadership team desires to continuously improve its programs and services, as evidenced through this review as well as a genuine interest to meet the needs of the Pacific community.

6. Review Committee Recommendations: None

PART 4: ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

1. Reviewed by: Darrin Kitchen, Assistant Professor of Sport Sciences.

2. Process of Review: This section was reviewed using the CAS Standards as a guiding-agent for Pacific Recreation.

3. Consistency of Part 4 with CAS Standards: The information contained in the Self-Study (p.37) is consistent with CAS Standards. Specifically, current and accessible policies and procedures, written performance expectations for all employees, and service delivery expectations (as outlined in the handbook).

4. Comments on Recommendations from the Self-Study: N/A. No recommendations were offered.

5. Additional Comments: The Self-Study demonstrates Pacific Recreation’s intent to structure and manage effectively to achieve its stated purpose of quality staff experience + quality guest experiences + quality business practices = Success. The recruitment and selection of staff members, communication from administrators to staff, Team Pacific’s use of an advisory committee for decision-making and conflict resolution, and the evaluation of staff through the Job Performance Assessment (JPA) and incentive programs aligns with CAS Standards.
It is recommended that Pacific Recreation include the handbook and JPA in the appendices of the Self-Study. In addition, the JPA would benefit by having each category be specific to that which is conveyed in the handbook.

Finally, Pacific Recreation should include an organizational chart outlining not only a hierarchy of administrators to staff, but also the various branches within the umbrella of Pacific Recreation. These should include: BFC, RecSports, Pacific Outdoor Connection, and Club Sports because staff is spread throughout the organization. This will align with CAS Standards.

6. Review Committee Recommendations: (1) Pacific Recreation include the handbook and JPA in the Appendices of the Self-Study. In addition, the JPA would benefit by having each category be specific to that which is conveyed in the handbook; and (2) Pacific Recreation should include an organizational chart outlining not only a hierarchy of administrators to staff, but also the various branches within the umbrella of Pacific Recreation.

PART 5: HUMAN RESOURCES

1. Reviewed by: Janet Schellhase Dial, Director of External Relations, Eberhardt School of Business

2. Process of Review: The Self-Study (p.40) was examined as it related to the CAS standards put forth by the Office of Student Life at University of the Pacific. Dr. Peg Ciccolella and Janet Dial visited a representative of Human Resources to determine some of the complexities that exist with the staffing and salary levels of this division.

3. Consistency of Part 5 with CAS Standards: The standards put forward are consistent with the CAS standards.

4. Comments on Recommendations from Self-Study: The first recommendation to work on furthering the relationship with the Department of Sports Sciences is reasonable, prudent, and aligned with the mission of the division. These two units could and should complement each other by providing a real world teaching and learning environment to Graduate Assistants while lending state of the art and recently acquired knowledge from the Department of Sport Sciences to the Division of Student Life. The recommendation to create a full-time professional position for supervising facility operations and leadership programming seems prudent. See Major Issues (p.4 of this report) for further comments on the use of full-time versus graduate assistant positions. The committee supports the addition of staff given that the current staff size is inappropriate for the size of the population that is served by Pacific Recreation. There does not seem to be any room in the
current budget allocations for these human resources changes or additions. If, however, there is funding, then to whom the position reports is in question; the committee suggests that this position report to the Director. The recommendation to fund a head coach position for Men’s Club Lacrosse does not seem to align with the CAS standards, and may have a limited impact to “accomplish the mission and goals of the division”. This position seems limited in its reach to the general population from both the student and University community since the lacrosse club for men would have a limited number of members. The salary for a full-time coach at $15,000 seems low the addition of benefits is unaddressed. The final recommendation to have Human Resources perform a supplemental survey of comparable institutions to ensure that professional staff salaries meet the industry standards seems reasonable, yet the four institutions that were first used to compare our salary structure poses questions. Why were these institutions selected, and with the exception of Santa Clara, all of these schools are out of state and may carry very different university profiles. Some questions to consider when examining comparable institutions include size of endowment, alumni support, graduate programs, location of campus, student fee structure, etc. On the issue of a Wellness Initiative, it seems that, again, the Human Resources Department, Pacific Recreation, and the Department of Sport Sciences, Department of Psychology and the School of Pharmacy and Health Sciences have the knowledge and expertise to administer such a program that would be cost efficient, more relevant to the “local” population, and well-received among campus constituents.  
5. Additional Comments: Upon reviewing the human resources standards, there appears to be a lack of continuing and professional development opportunities for our recreation staff. There may also be room for the program to improve the professional competence and skills of all staff members. Finally, the committee believes that two Self-Study questions must be answered; that is, “What is the strategic plan for staffing the program?” and “In what ways are staff members’ qualifications insured and their performance judged?”

6. Review Committee Recommendations: The committee recommends that the staffing needs of Pacific Recreation be met as they are outlined in the Self-Study. The Human Resources needs will also be enhanced with the addition of a software management program.

PART 6: FINANCIAL RESOURCES
1. Reviewed by: Janet Schellhase Dial
2. Process of Review: The review process included comparing the Self-Study (p.49) with the CAS standards; the budget for the department was also considered and the fund raising that was
completed for the FY '08 was also included in the review.

3. Consistency of Part 1 with CAS Standards: The financial resource standards are consistent with Part 1 (Self-Study p.1) of the CAS standards presented by the division.

4. Comments on Recommendations from Self-Study: There are no recommendations put forth in this section of the document.

5. Additional Comments: Some of the questions that arise are the amount of student fees put toward the division and where this puts Pacific Recreation programs compared to similar/peer institutions. Does the $5.00 adequately support the mission of the recreation program, and where, exactly, is the $10.00 directed? Better accounting of these dollars, and if they adequately fund the function and mission of this program, may be in order. What would be a reasonable or adequate budget amount? How does Pacific “stack up” compared to our peer institutions? Finally, the questions, “what is the funding strategy for the program?” and “what evidence exists to confirm fiscal responsibility and cost-effectiveness?” posed in the CAS document may be useful to answer. A more detailed budget account would be prudent in order to better assess the appropriate financial resources necessary to carryout the programming of Pacific Recreation.

6. Review Committee Recommendations: The committee recommends that Pacific Recreation put forth a detailed budget that aligns the programming goals with a specific dollar amount which is necessary to support Pacific Recreation. There should be a line item associated with each goal and specific program so as to better understand the budget implication for the entire division.

PART 7: FACILITIES, TECHNOLOGY, AND EQUIPMENT

1. Reviewed by: Harnoor Singh, Graduate Student Sport Sciences

2. Process of Review: Part 7 was reviewed, followed by discussions with Bryan Lenz, Assistant Director of Sports and Competitions and Alex Caspero, Coordinator of Group Exercise/Personal Training, 2 BFC Employees and multiple University of the Pacific students.

3. Consistency of Part 7 with CAS Standards: The information contained in the Self-Study (p.52) is consistent with CAS Standards as those standards are explained in the summary of this review (see Major Issues p.5 of this report).

4. Comments on Recommendations from the Self-Study: Recommendation to renovate the Rubber Room must be consistent with future plans to change the BFC entrance as presented in Section 3 (see Major Issues, p.5 of this report).
5. **Additional Comments:** Student interviews produced an overwhelmingly positive attitude towards equipment, maintenance and overall appearance of BFC.

Members of BFC, including alumni and emeriti expressed an interest in the addition of an aquatic facility to BFC. Those who reported less than two visits per semester expressed issues with hours of operation, competitive environment and overall inconvenient location with the current Kjeldsen Swim Facility.

Recommendations regarding renovation of the Rubber Room were inconsistent with other sections in the Self-Study (see Major Issues page 5 of this report), and should be addressed. Part 2 of the Self-Study presents a recommendation to renovate the Rubber Room that contradicts a recommendation in Section 7 (see Self-Study p.52) to change the location of the entrance to BFC.

6. **Review Committee Recommendations:** The committee recommends that Pacific Recreation’s need to remodel the rubber room be met. Although, moving the entrance of Baun Fitness Center should also be considered in the University’s Master Plan, renovations to the rubber room are necessary to increase programming and participation in the interim. The committee also recommends the relocation of the aquatic facility from the student Residence Halls to Baun Fitness Center in its Master Plan.

---

**PART 8: LEGAL RESPONSIBILITIES**

1. **Reviewed by:** Peg Ciccolella, Professor of Sport Sciences

2. **Process of Review:** Following a review of Part 8 (see Self-Study p.55), issues relevant to CAS standards as articulated in the report were discussed with Wendy Stratton and Dan Shipp.

3. **Consistency of Part 1 with CAS Standards:** The information contained in the Self-Study is consistent with CAS Standards.

4. **Comments on Recommendations from the Self-Study:** N/A. No recommendations were offered.

5. **Additional Comments:** The program appears to meet commitments central to its most important legal responsibilities, (i.e., maintaining the “highest standards of safety”). The Self-Study focuses on its commitment to the maintenance of the facility and the protection of its users. This is accomplished through staff training and regular maintenance of equipment. Further, the report documents supervision of travel procedures and the administration of sensitive data. It was reported by the program Director that all legal documents, e.g., waivers of liability, are reviewed and approved by Risk Management as a prerequisite to use by the program.
The Self-Study mentions but does not document “policies related to Pacific recreation” and staff training. This begs clarification. If policies or training manuals exist, they should be cited, made available upon request, or attached in the appendix in future reports.

Pacific Recreation offers “magnet” programs designed, in part, to attract undergraduate males to Pacific in an effort to remedy gender based disparities in enrollment. It also offers many “coeducational” programs. Title IX encompasses intercollegiate sports, club sports, and intramural (PacRec) programs. While the NCAA with regard to its compliance with Title IX reviews Pacific, we should be mindful that this review only addresses compliance as defined by the NCAA and with regard to intercollegiate athletics. We should be mindful of our legal obligations regarding gender equity and the role that Pacific Recreation may have in identifying our compliance in institutional reports.

6. Review Committee Recommendations: (1) “Policies” referenced in the Self-Study should be cited by name and readily available to staff in a centralized manner; (2) a summary of staff “training” should be memorialized and similarly made available; and (3) internally or externally generated reports regarding compliance with Title IX should include a review of Pacific Recreation programs. This will likely involve participation with intercollegiate athletics.

PART 9: EQUITY AND ACCESS

1. Reviewed by: Peg Ciccolella, Professor of Sport Sciences

2. Process of Review: Following a review of Part 9 (see Self-Study p.57), issues relevant to CAS standards as articulated in the report were discussed with Wendy Stratton and Dan Shipp.

3. Consistency of Part 9 with CAS Standards: The information contained in the Self-Study is consistent with CAS Standards.

4. Comments on Recommendations from the Self-Study: N/A. No recommendations were offered.

5. Additional Comments: There is little doubt that BFC makes every effort to be accessible to all who want to avail themselves of its facilities and services. Allocation of resources to accommodate disability is considered in selection of equipment and the permanent structures associated with the building, e.g., entrance, locker rooms, etc. Input from the Pacific community was solicited and resulted in an alteration of operating hours. This reflects an administrative policy and practice that is both aware of and responsive to its constituencies. Conversations with Wendy Stratton and Dan
Shipp reflect a clear intent to continue efforts not just to serve already existing members but also to identify “groups” not currently using the facility and that could benefit from participation in regular exercise. This is consistent with the expressed mission of the program (see Self-Study Part 1, p.1) and demonstrates a commitment to address unmet needs and remedy problems associated with any reluctance to use BFC.

6. Review Committee Recommendations: None

PART 10: CAMPUS AND EXTERNAL RELATIONS

1. Reviewed by: Janet Schellhase Dial

2. Process of Review: The review process included comparing the Self-Study (p.60) with the CAS standards.

3. Consistency of Part 10 with CAS Standards: The Self-Study was consistent with the mission and the CAS Standards.

4. Comments on Recommendations from Self-Study: There were no recommendations in the section, but there could be some additional information provided to make this section more useful to the program. For example, more collaboration with the Department of Sport Sciences seems a logical and prudent way to improve and expand the recreation opportunities at Pacific. There may also be other local venues by which the recreation program could be more visible. The REI connection is excellent, and there may be other stores such as Fleet Feet, Performance Bicycles, and Sundance Sports that would welcome a university partnership. This would provide additional resources and exposure to Pacific.

5. Additional Comments: There may be additional fundraising and outreach efforts available to this division with the collaboration of the Advancement Division of the University. Alumni may be key constituents for fund raising, and also a great target audience for memberships.

6. Review Committee Recommendations: The committee recommends that Pacific Recreation review its outreach efforts to the community. There may be specific partnerships with area businesses and local recreational programs that would enhance the program’s visibility in the community. This will also enhance the opportunities for fundraising for Pacific Recreation.
PART 11: DIVERSITY

1. Reviewed by: Damon Faggett, University of the Pacific Associate Bursar.

2. Process of Review: Part 11 (see Self-Study p.62) and Appendix K was reviewed and followed by discussions with two Pacific Recreation employees, four BFC employees (two of them Personal trainers) and a number of University employees.

3. Consistency of Part 11 with CAS Standards: The information expressed in the Self-Study negotiates the appropriate balance of being very consistent with CAS standards, while not losing focus on Pacific’s mission to be “student centered”.

4. Comments of Recommendations from the Self-Study: N/A. No recommendations were offered.

5. Additional Comments: Comments expressed by students, Pacific Recreation Staff and University employees were all uniform in their praise of Pacific Recreation in general and BFC in particular as “open”, “fair” and “welcoming” environments.

The sheer plethora of offered programs, program times and varying commitment and intensity levels clearly demonstrates Pacific Recreation’s intent and commitment to offer “something for everyone”.

There is little evidence in this section of the study about Pacific Recreation’s intent to “actively” engage faculty, staff, emeriti (e.g. Osher or “like” groups) or “elder” populations. The one consistent qualification (about BFC) expressed by University employees was that there were some personal “reservations” and feelings of “awkwardness” about not really knowing what they were doing in the gym and that they did not know where/how “to get started”. This is not to suggest that Pacific Recreation is excluding these populations only that Pacific Recreation should seek ways to involve and engage the entire Pacific community including programming targeted specifically toward these populations.

6. Review Committee Recommendations: Pacific Recreation should seek to find new or additional ways to involve and engage the entire Pacific community in its programs and services.
PART 12: ETHICS

1. **Reviewed by:** Damon Fugett, University of the Pacific Associate Bursar.

2. **Process of Review:** Part 12 (see Self-Study p.64), Appendices D, F and L were reviewed and followed by discussions with two Pacific Recreation employees, six BFC employees and online research of Pacific Recreation’s website.

3. **Consistency of Part 11 with CAS Standards:** The information expressed in the Self-Study is “consistent” with CAS standards as those standards are explained in the summary of this review (see p.1) and in conjunction with Pacific Recreation’s internal decision to use NIRSA (National Intramural-Recreation Sports Association) standards in preference to CAS standards. NIRSA standards are “equal” to and in some cases exceed CAS standards in that they specifically detail how staff and student employees should act/interact with other employees, the public and Pacific Recreation’s participants.

   There are, however, two points of discrepancy between CAS and Pacific Recreation’s (NIRSA) standards that are discussed in “additional comments”.

4. **Comments of Recommendations from the Self-Study:** N/A. No recommendations were offered.

5. **Additional Comments:** As explained in the Self-Study, as expressed by student’s surveyed, and information provided online and in the included appendices, Pacific Recreation is making an “active” commitment to operate in an ethical manner. The one notable and disconcerting exception is that all BFC student employees surveyed responded that they have received no information about how to anonymously (or otherwise) report co-workers who they believe are acting unethically. If a system for reporting exists, it should be better articulated to student employees. If a system for Self-Study does not exist, then one should be created that gives student employees and avenue to report their concerns.

   Pacific Recreation should also consider the creation of a central statement on departmental ethics, with statements specific to Staff and student employees, if and when they diverge from one-another. Currently, there is strong redundancy between the “Leadership” and “student employee” statements. A single unified statement saying “this is what we all do” would make a stronger statement of commitment from the department.

   There are two points in which the NIRSA/Pacific Recreation’s statements diverge from the CAS standards significantly. While this review has generally remained silent when the Self-Study
was silent in regards to a particular standard, these two standards represent incredibly important issues that should be either addressed explicitly or cited more thoroughly.

First, the CAS standards make specific mention of having policies for the release of information. It is essential for departments to have “set” and well-defined policies in place for dealing with requests from outside agencies. Requests from agencies like the police or government agencies (i.e. the FBI) should be well documented and the appropriate forms, badge numbers and the information released must be carefully recorded and filed for future reference.

Further, it is also incumbent on Pacific Recreation to specifically state how it deals with Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) regulations, within the context of the existing University framework and to determine if it is subject to the “new” governmental “Red Flag Rules”. Regardless of whether or not Pacific Recreation is subject to the Red Flag Rules regulations, a system should be in place to assist in identifying potential identity, or access of information threats.

Second, CAS standards very clearly state that student employees should “perform their duties within the limits of their training . . .” and then stipulates that “individuals in need of further clarification must be referred to persons possessing appropriate qualifications.”

All surveyed students stated categorically that no specific training or direction had been offered with regards to where to “draw the line” as to what they may or may not tell a member in regards to personal training. Students also reported that no training had been provided that might assist them in identifying even basic improper use of the equipment in the gym and to whom they might report potential concerns. These two issues seem to run contrary to the programs most important legal responsibility, (i.e. “maintaining the highest standards of safety”).

| 6. Review Committee Recommendations: The committee emphatically suggests that Pacific Recreation review their policies to determine that they are in compliance with FERPA regulations and to ensure that appropriate release of information and identity protection standards are in place. It is also suggested that Pacific Recreation review the training their student employees receive to reinforce that they are trained properly. Finally, if a system is not in place for employees to appropriately and anonymously report their concerns one needs to be created. If such a system is in place, the procedures for its use should be reinforced to student employees. |

---

23
PART 13: ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION

1. Reviewed by: Damon Fugett, University of the Pacific Associate Bursar.

2. Process of Review: Part 13 (see Self-Study p.67) and the JPA were reviewed and followed by a discussion with the program review committee.

3. Consistency of Part 13 with CAS Standards: The information expressed in the Self-Study appears as though Pacific Recreation is very consistent with CAS standards with regards to actually doing evaluations. It is impossible to verify this, since no evaluation methodologies or statistical data is provided in the study or in the appendices to corroborate information suggested in this part of the Self-Study.

4. Comments of Recommendations from the Self-Study: N/A. No recommendations were offered.

5. Additional Comments: Due to some lack of information about evaluation methodologies, comments and “found” data, Part 13’s comments will flow from the order of their presentation in the Self-Study.

   “Program Evaluation”: Text asserts that survey’s are regularly collected and used in conjunction with “focus group discussions with team captains”. No information is given about percentage of survey feedback, participation rates, questions asked, reasoning, etc. The lack of assessment and evaluation methodology makes examination or review of this section difficult.

   “University and Departmental Goal Evaluation”: Due to the large number of issues in this single section a “main example” is provided below for general reference. After that, specific points and questions are presented in the bulleted section.

   Main Example: Text states “each year the department is required to develop two goals and related objectives…” Why is Pacific Recreation required to develop two goals? Why are there only two goals? Why were “Diversity” and “Leadership” selected for 2007-08? It should be stated specifically how the “Tiger X Bingo challenge” fit into and fulfilled the goal of Diversity. If it is a case to be examined where is information about participation and statistical information gotten from the surveys? The statement “after contemplating the possible reasons for the results,” infers that the base logic is necessarily spurious. The assertion that “perhaps students were not comfortable with diversifying their exercise portfolio or purposely stepping outside their comfort level,” is an assumption only. These types of logical assertions must be supported by survey results and direct feedback in order for them to possess value. Valuable and real information will allow programming to become better through the establishment and benchmarking of goals.
Perhaps the greatest misstep of this section is that this type of logic assumes “participant error” and does not look at potential “program error” (i.e. that the participants simply did not like or were unable to make the times of the offered programming, and were therefore, simply unwilling or unable to complete the challenge as it is currently designed).

Here is a brief list of main issues with each of the following headings:

a. “Leadership”: This description sounds like work. A lack of commitment could be addressed through direct compensation (i.e. salary or course credit) or indirect compensation (i.e. little incentives along the way or job offer once the course is successfully completed).

b. “Pacific Outdoor Connection”: This lacks clarity and development and leaves this part “fuzzy” at best. Pacific Outdoor Connection isn’t a goal or an objective. Increasing participation in Pacific Outdoor Connection is a goal. Getting students to do and learn the things associated with this trip are objectives. Also, it seems difficult to believe that one of the Pacific Recreation’s two main yearly goals can be satisfied by a single (daily/weekend/week-long) trip. Greater imagination and substance needs to be put into thinking about particular ways in which this “goal” can be realized and its relevance in general.

c. “Tiger Rugby”: Basic information is missing from this section. What is different about the commitment to Tiger Rugby this year as compared to last year? What (additional) resources are being committed? Why Rugby? What is the strategy for the recruitment of players in general, female players in particular? What are the numbers or percentage of students campus wide who participate? Most importantly, what are the desired outcomes? Goal evaluation can not be properly completed without benchmarking progress.

d. “Student Evaluation”: There is a concern that the JPA is not an effective evaluation tool and leaves far too much to interpretation and subjectivity. It groups rated and highly subjective qualities in inappropriate ways. For example: number two “Pride in Quality”:

- “Takes pride in the quality of their work.” How do you successfully rate pride, even the perceived pride someone takes in what they do? It is another person’s personal feeling; you simply do not and can not know it because you do not have direct access to it. Instead, consider rating the quality of their work on its own merits. Then if it is perceived that the student appears to take pride in their work, it can be added to their review as a positive compliment/example.
“Demonstrates initiative.” Probably better grouped in number five “Task & Performance” area because it relates to “how” they do their job.

“Has a positive attitude.” This is redundant and should be included in number one “Look the part, Play the Part”.

“Completes all tasks and responsibilities during their shift.” This clearly needs to be reclassified in to the #5 “Task & Performance” area.

Similar strange criteria, often conflicting and redundant pairings across rated sections make this evaluation tool highly subjective and an ineffective feedback mechanism.

Finally, there is strong concern about the use and reliance on a 2.5 GPA. There are simply too many complications attached to this seemingly subjective number. Also, what is entailed in “corrective action”? If corrective action is simply the reduction of hours, as stated in the manual, then this logically will have a disproportional effect on first generation, minority and learning disabled students. Further, hour reduction is not an effective strategy for students who rely on those funds to pay education and other expenses or for casual employees who work to socialize. A casual employee will simply socialize in the time off. A student in need of money must get a second or different job. Reducing students’ hours may also negatively affect their ability to use/access Federal Work Study that was awarded to them as part of their financial aid awards. Pacific Recreation should consider that a “good” student is one who is successfully completing requirements toward graduation and is in good academic standing with their school.

6. **Review Committee Recommendations:** Logical missteps, conclusionary logic, lack/clarity of information provided and lack of reported benchmarking as shown in the “main example” characterize this entire section as it is currently stated. The above “main example” should provide a road map for how to re-envision this section so that it can be used as a helpful tool that benefits the program as it moves forward.

The committee recognizes that given how strong the rest of the report has been it is very likely that Pacific Recreation is in possession of most of the information and data that was not presented in this section and fervently recommends that this section be more thoroughly written in future renditions because solid assessment and evaluation is crucial to program growth and development. The committee also recommends that the JPA be overhauled and reconfigured to increase its effectiveness as an evaluation tool. Finally, the committee suggests Pacific Recreation re-evaluate its use of a 2.5 GPA as basis of disciplinary actions.