

Program Review 2011  
Cross Cultural Centers  
California State University, Los Angeles

Report from External Reviewers

Dr. Winnie Moore LaNier  
Campus Life Coordinator and Professor  
Student Development Office  
Cosumnes River College  
Past President, California Council of Cultural Centers in Higher Education

Leela MadhavaRau  
Special Advisor to the President and Associate Dean of Campus Diversity and Inclusion  
University of Redlands  
Current President, California Council of Cultural Centers in Higher Education

## **PREFACE**

First, we would like to applaud all involved in this effort, especially the Cross Cultural Centers Director for being the impetus to ensure the evaluation of the center. While your campus is only the second California State University campus to conduct a formal evaluation of its cultural center, the process helps to expand standards and present models useful for developing program reviews throughout the system. It is a distinguished pleasure to be a part of this review process and your early commitment to the process is commendable.

Secondly, allow us to thank everyone who was involved in scheduling and conducting each of our encounters. In all cases, the agenda was followed in a timely manner and each occasion presented us with in depth opportunities to have our questions addressed. The experience was a role model of professionalism and friendliness.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The work presented in this report is part of a systematic effort by the University to enhance its effectiveness, quality, and delivery of their academic programs. This is the second comprehensive evaluation and assessment of the Cross-Cultural Center (CCC) at CSU Los Angeles since its inception as a combined entity in 1997.

The report addressed thirteen critical components of the CCC operations based on the proposed Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS) functional area standards and guidelines and other models and research documents. Our primary source of data to evaluate the CCC was collected during the scheduled group interviews with students, staff, faculty, administrators, and community members, as well as documents supplied by the CCC including archival data.

### Presentation of Evaluation Results

The Mission, Program, Leadership, Financial Resources, and Assessment and Evaluation are five of the thirteen components used to evaluate the CCC that are emphasized in this section of the report. What we learned in evaluating these various components of the CCC is that the center has impressively established itself as a solid and reputable program unit.

### Mission

The CCC's mission statement is clearly stated and is congruent with the University's mission. No mission statement should remain a stagnant document and should be reviewed on an annual basis, most likely at the same time as annual reports are produced and strategic planning undertaken.

### Programs

The CCC provides exceptional programs and has a clearly defined set of Student Learning Outcomes (SLO's) for the department as a whole. We did not, however, see evidence that each program is tied to specific SLO's. We recommend that this is an exercise undertaken for each event and program. Given the thought already put into developing the SLO's, this should not prove onerous.

### Leadership

A clear strength for the CCC is its current director. He is described by all we interviewed in overwhelmingly positive terms and it is clear that his expertise, leadership skills, ability to work with all constituent groups and provide clear student development opportunities is prized by those with whom he interacts. The job description for the Director (as provided to us) is one that requires an extraordinary individual to be able to fulfill the myriad duties and responsibilities while carrying the required qualifications. From our knowledge of the leadership of cultural centers across California, it is clear that the current incumbent would be difficult to replace should he decide to leave, given that his level of expertise will be difficult to duplicate.

### Financial and Human Resources

Funding for the CCC, which is shared between CSULA and the University-Student Union, appears to be adequate to accomplish their mission and goals. We recommend that there is transparency in reporting budget funding. This would make collaborative efforts more productive.

We feel that the CCC is well-run in terms of Human Resources. We do recommend that the re-configuration of responsibilities which led to the elimination of the Assistant Director position be re-evaluated in a year in order to ensure that the CCC continue to provide outstanding service to the campus. To expand its staff abilities, we encourage the use of graduate assistants and interns. Such assistants provide peer role models and give valuable pre-professional experience.

#### Assessment and Evaluation

We commend the CCC for implementing regular assessment and evaluation of its programs and services. A review of the instruments revealed the need for content adjustment that assesses a correlation to the CCC's learning outcomes. The necessity of the correlations between programmatic and services assessment to student learning outcomes is critical to documenting the centers' contribution student learning. It would be helpful for the CCC to utilize innovative methods to achieve effective assessment.

#### Overall Conclusions and Recommendations

The CCC has several notable strengths including its intentional programming, reflecting a broad range of type and subject matter, its leadership, and the development of the CCC as a space that is used for multiple purposes, including casual hanging out, group project work, counseling, and meetings. We found that the CCC's vision and philosophical ideals are clearly developed and articulated and reflect the University's mission and diversity statements. When measured for furthering its original mission, the CCC has made clear strides in developing programming interconnectedness between academic and student affairs. When measured for long-term effectiveness, the CCC has created a solid foundation to move forward for the next five years. It is critical that the CCC adheres to periodical review and integrates the results into the centers' and university's strategic efforts.

## INTRODUCTION

In 1997, a Memorandum of Understanding was signed between California State University, Los Angeles and the University Student Union, Inc. in regard to (what were then named the Student Resource Centers). In this document, it was stated:

### *IV. EVALUATION*

*The SRC's will be included in the process for evaluating academic support programs, facilitated by the Office of the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs. The SRC's will begin the review process during their fifth year. The program goals and objectives will be reviewed annually and revised as necessary.*

The CCC at CSULA received its first program review in 2002. The second program review was mandated by the Division of Academic Affairs' Program Review Office and took place in February 2011. This program review was designed to fulfill the requirements of the memorandum of understanding but also to provide extensive feedback to the CCC about their progress over the past nine years. The analysis and recommendations emanating from this review will be relevant to the University, University Student Union and the CCC. The structure of the review was set by the University and allowed for a very brief visit from two external reviewers who had the opportunity to speak with representatives from a number of relevant constituencies.

Under the direction and guidance of the Division of Academic Affairs Program Review Process, the CCC is subjected to both an internal campus review and external review. The latter is reflected in this report and is intended to give the reader a comprehensive overview of the CCC program, its strengths, limitations, and recommendations for program improvement. It should be noted that the CCC, while reviewed under Academic Affairs' guidelines, does not necessarily operate like a traditional academic department. Therefore, some modifications of the review standards were necessary in order to fit the unique needs of the centers.

The reviewers had the chance to speak with Program Review Representatives prior to and during the evaluation process. Having the opportunity to meet with these individuals allowed us to better examine the critical components of the CCC department through informal discussion and dialogue. Following is a description of work required of the reviewers:

- Assess the strengths and weaknesses of the program based on national standards of academic excellence and/or accreditation standards (where applicable);
- Appraise the student learning outcomes of the program, its process for assessment of student learning, assessment results and the link to program improvements in addition to assessing the relationship between institutional learning outcomes (ILO's) and student learning outcomes determined by the CCC;

- Comment on the relationship between the CCC and other programs and centers on the CSULA campus, particularly the Presidential Centers and intentionality that exists in the collaboration between these entities;
- Assess the impact of the CCC on campus-wide retention and graduation initiatives;
- Evaluate the CCC's strategic planning efforts;
- Recommend strategies to enhance the quality of the program and of the support services provided by the University in order to promote the mission of CSULA;
- Present an oral summary of observations and findings in a meeting with University officials prior to departure from campus, to be followed by a written program review report submitted within four weeks of the site visit; and
- The report is to assist the director to improve the quality of their program by providing, a new, comparative, and broader perspective on the program, and its plans for the next five years.

### **Potential Limitations of Evaluation**

While every attempt was made to provide the most accurate assessment and evaluation, there are limitations to this report that affect the collection, analysis or interpretation of information received in the two day review period. There was little time to gather information outside the structured interviews, with the exception of brief conversations in the CCC itself. No information was garnered from casual conversations with faculty and staff who had not been invited to speak with external reviewers. While the report suggest several recommendations for change, the CCC will not be able to single-handedly correct problems for that is the role of management and other stakeholders, using the evaluation findings as one tool that will help them in that process.

### **Description of the Cross-Cultural Centers**

The creation of cultural centers on campuses across the nation is a topic increasingly analyzed in doctoral theses and published articles. It is, therefore, important to note the particular history behind the creation of cultural centers on each campus – what were the circumstances that led to the creation of such a space, who led the efforts and how were they received by campus administration.

The CCC 2003-2008 Self-Study provides a detailed overview of the background leading to the current model. Excerpts from that overview serve to provide a foundation for the information that comprises this report:

*Historically, women's centers and cultural centers were established on college campuses because of the 1960s civil rights movement and such legislation as the 1968 Higher Education Amendment to the 1965 Higher Education Act, Title IV. But they also arose in order to address the needs of our changing student populations. As the number of women and people of color began to increase on predominantly white, male campuses, institutions created centers to help aid in student retention and graduation rates.*

Established in 1976, the Women's Resource Center (WRC) was the first center created. The Pan African Student Resource Center (PASRC) was established in 1990. The Asian Pacific American Student Resource Center (APASRC) and the Chicana/o Latina/o Student Resource Center (CLSRC) were both established in 1993. With the presence of the PASRC, several Chicana/o Latina/o students also felt they needed a space to support the needs of their community. They formed alliances with Asian Pacific American students, and together they sought support from the administration to establish two new resource centers. All four centers were developed to provide resources for students, contribute to student retention and recruitment, and to raise awareness through educational programming.

Over the next four years, each of these centers continued to operate under the Division of Student Affairs. The centers functioned independently of each other, with differing spaces, staff structures, and resources. None of the centers had full-time coordinators. Eventually, the centers received \$40,000 in lottery funds, and graduate assistants were hired at \$10,000 per year to provide part-time support. Still, the centers did not have the general staff support needed in order to survive and grow. The centers also had varying spaces and facilities.

Dr. James Rosser, President of Cal State L.A., called together a task force to review the student resource centers and help determine how to support their development...The committee determined that the resource centers were beneficial to all aspects of the University. They also agreed that the centers needed the opportunity to grow, develop, and support each other. In June 1997, a Memo of Understanding was created between the U-SU and Cal State L.A.

Since 1997, the U-SU has maintained the administration of the resource centers. The U-SU has ensured that each of the centers is given equitable resources, space, and staffing. During this time, the resource centers have grown immensely, evident in the development of resources, programs, services, and staffing. It was also during this time that the resource centers became united under the umbrella of one department – the Cross Cultural Centers. Within this new structure, each of the centers works closely together to support each other. With an emphasis on serving historically underrepresented communities, each center shares in the vision of helping students and developing cross-cultural awareness on campus and throughout the community.

From 2003 to 2008, the Cross Cultural Centers were temporarily located in the lower level of King Hall, D-140, while construction of the new University-Student Union(U-SU) facility took place. The Director of the Cross Cultural Centers who facilitated and wrote the first self-study, Daria Yudacufski, resigned in February 2006, and the Assistant Director, Frederick Smith, was appointed Interim Director (February 2006) and then Director in September 2006.

## BRIEF OVERVIEW OF THE EVALUATION PLAN AND PROCEDURES

As there are, at present, no national templates or standardized blue prints for the formal assessment of cultural centers, our task must be approached on a case-by-case basis. Fortunately there are two major frameworks we can use: 1) proposed Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education (CAS) functional area standards and guidelines which specifically focus on the successful development and implementation of cultural centers, and 2) emerging models. The proposed CAS standards for cultural centers are a product of general consensus within the profession of cultural center directors and represent the results of much research, negotiations and compromise. It should be further noted that the California Council of Cultural Centers in Higher Education (CaCCCHE) who is at the forefront of this enterprise, authored the proposed standards and guidelines and submitted the draft to the CAS Executive Board. Moreover, we (your current appraisers) have extended experience in the field and are both active members and contributors to the educational efforts of CaCCCHE. The emerging models used consisted of the Cultural Center Establishment and Growth Model, the Cultural Proficiency Model and structuring tools for student learning outcomes put forward by the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators (NASPA) and the American College Personnel Association (ACPA). These instruments were used to signal areas that may have been overlooked in the focus on the CCC.

The external reviewers had the opportunity to meet with some members of the internal Program Review Committee who provided an overview of their expectations for the process. A full list of those with whom the external review team conducted interviews may be found in Appendix A. In addition to meeting these individuals, the external reviewers observed the *Cal State LA con Sabor* event which took place during their first evening on campus.

The external reviewers were provided with extensive information about the CCC, including a listing of all programs, a summary of the outcomes of program assessment, publications (including program advertising) and job descriptions. We also reviewed the CCC Self-Study Report 2003-2008, as well as the CCC's own recommendations from the 2008-2009 Self-Study (Section XII, Self-Study binder).

In the following pages of this report, a closer look at the CCC program, its current condition and future possibilities are examined. A synopsis of our observation, analysis and recommendations will be provided throughout this report and will end with several overall recommendations.

## PRESENTATION OF EVALUATION RESULTS

This section is divided into thirteen components based on the proposed CAS standards for cultural centers. Each component presents a foundational premise, implication for long-term effectiveness and recommendations.

### FOUNDATIONAL PREMISE ONE

**Mission** Cultural Centers (CC) must incorporate student learning and student development in its mission and enhance overall educational experiences. CC must regularly review its mission and goals. Mission statements must be consistent with the mission and goals of the institution. Cultural Centers must operate as an integral part of the institution's overall mission.

#### Implications for Long-Term Effectiveness

The CCC's mission fulfills all of the requirements listed above. It is clear that there was thought given to congruence in terms of CSULA's mission and vision.

*The mission of the Cross Cultural Centers at California State University, Los Angeles is to encourage student learning as well as foster an inclusive campus environment that challenges racism, sexism, heterosexism, and other forms of oppression. With a commitment to increasing cross-cultural awareness, we offer a wide variety of programs and services that explore both the shared and unique experiences, histories, and heritages of our diverse communities.*

#### Recommendations

We recommend that the CCC continues in its outstanding work in this area, ensuring that its mission and student learning outcomes remain in congruence with the University's mission and Institutional Learning Outcomes. No mission statement should remain stagnant and we recommend that it is reviewed regularly, alongside a review of Student Learning Outcomes. This review may best be conducted on an annual basis, in conjunction with the writing of an annual plan and development of strategic goals.

### FOUNDATIONAL PREMISE TWO

**Program** The formal education of students consists of the curriculum and the co-curriculum, and must promote student learning and development that is purposeful and holistic. Cultural Centers (CC) must identify relevant and desirable student learning and development outcomes and provide programs and services that encourage the achievement of those outcomes. Relevant and desirable outcomes may include: intellectual growth, effective communication, enhanced self-esteem, realistic self-appraisal, leadership development, collaboration, social and civic responsibility, cultural competence, spiritual awareness, and achievement of personal and educational goals. CC must provide evidence of its impact on the achievement of student learning and

development outcomes. CC must be intentional, coherent, based on theories and knowledge of learning and human development, reflective of developmental and demographic profiles of the student population, culturally competent and responsive to needs of individuals, emerging populations, and communities. CC staff must address the needs of all students regardless of ethnicity, race, religion, disability, sexual orientation, age, socioeconomic status, degree, and enrollment status and programs and services must work to assure equitable access to and involvement in all educational programs.

### **Implications for Long-Term Effectiveness**

The CCC has carefully prepared its Student Learning Outcomes to be congruent with those institutional learning outcomes established by the University. As noted above, this congruence should be applauded (see Appendix C for a direct comparison).

- *Understand the multiple perspectives (heritages, experiences, values) of others, while valuing their own heritages, experiences and values.*
- *Work with individuals as a team for both personal and collective good.*
- *Understand the interactive relationship of race, class and gender in society.*
- *Articulate their views and experiences around race, class and gender by integrating their personal experiences and academic perspectives.*
- *Appreciate the role that the arts and cultural events can play in developing an enlightened and culturally-empowered perspective.*
- *Examine and challenge personal acts of oppression.*
- *Examine personal behaviors and choices and their effects on campus, local and global issues.*
- *Identify and articulate the values and processes that lead to an inclusive and democratic community.*
- *Influence social change on campus and in society with creativity, integrity, and compassion.*

While there is some evidence that the CCC is intentional in its program development, we believe that there is room for growth in this area. While there is documentation completed for each program, we did not see evidence linking the event to the CCC's student learning outcomes as well as the institutional learning outcomes. A recurring comment will be that there has to be deeper assessment completed for all events in order to understand the full impact. With this deeper assessment, the proof of intentionality around programs that has been requested will become clear. From our perspective, there is intentionality in programming – it is simply not documented adequately.

To ascertain whether the CCC is meeting student learning and development outcomes, we asked a simple question of two groups of stakeholders (which included representatives from the Center for Student Involvement, faculty members, senior Student Affairs representatives, student users and student workers). We asked "If fun is aligned with student activities, what word would align with the CCC?" The full list of responses may be found in Appendix D, however it is important to note that the words included transformative, thought-provoking and challenging. All terms that mesh perfectly with the CCC's learning outcomes as well as those of the University.

The External Reviewers were asked whether the quantity and variety of programs are similar to that found on other campuses. In requesting program data from similarly-sized campuses, it would appear that the CCC is well within the range expected, if not exceeding anticipated numbers and selections of programs.

We would like to note that in stating that there is a variety of programs available, we are including both one-time events (speakers, films, discussions) as well as far more labor-intensive programs such as the S.T.A.R.S (Students Taking Action for Retention and Success) mentoring program. There is extensive information about the program on the CCC's website (<http://calstatelasu.org/ccc/stars/mentor>). However, the description of the program serves to illustrate the intentionality of CCC programs as well as their desire to work on all aspects of students' lives, not simply social programming.

*The S.T.A.R.S. Mentor Program is a program designed to assist in the social, personal, and academic acclimation to CSULA by pairing incoming first-year students with outstanding continuing undergraduate and graduate students, staff, and faculty who act as mentors throughout the academic year. More specifically, this program aims to address the needs of students from marginalized identities by providing programs that will aid in their retention and success at Cal State L.A.*

## **Recommendations**

We recommend that the CCC talk to faculty partners and request anonymous access to reflections and extra credit writings that are submitted after attendance at CCC-sponsored and co-sponsored events. These reflections will provide more detailed analysis of the event than the evaluations handed out at the door. We think the latter can play a useful role and recommend their continued usage but establishing the CCC's worth to the University campus will require more meaningful evaluation and assessment.

The CCC has developed a Publicity Control Sheet which is used when looking through the class schedule for classes that might be interested in a particular event. We recommend that the CCC makes even better use of this tool. They should request access to the class schedule at a much earlier date. This will allow them to work even more closely with faculty and possibly involve faculty in the planning process for a speaker or event. Other entities on campus need to know that this is the mechanism that the CCC is utilizing in order to schedule intentionally.

We understand that there is a need to know the numbers of people utilizing the services of the CCC. We do not believe that relying on a counter at the door is an effective tool. This does not mention discrete visits and captures a lot of everyday administrative traffic (deliveries and the like) that are not relevant. The CCC does keep an accurate headcount at all events and we believe that this is one tool that should be continued. Cultural Centers across the country struggle with the dilemma of how to count all those affected by their programs. We suggest the CCC keep up to date on best practices utilized by their peer cultural centers.

We recommend that the CCC become an interested party in campus meetings where retention and graduation rates are the focus of discussion. This will enable entities across campus to assess the value of the CCC programs that aid retention and graduation efforts.

We recommend this more holistic approach as we believe retention and graduation rates are increased through campus-wide efforts, rather than the efforts of any single unit.

## **FOUNDATIONAL PREMISE THREE**

### **Leadership**

Effective and ethical leadership is essential to the success of all organizations. Institutions must appoint, position, and authorize leaders of Cultural Centers (CC) within the administrative structure to accomplish stated missions. CC leaders at various levels must be selected on the basis of formal education and training, relevant work experience, personal skills and competencies, relevant professional credentials, as well as potential for promoting learning and development in students, applying effective practices to educational processes, and enhancing institutional effectiveness. CC leaders must identify and find means to address individual, organizational, or environmental conditions that inhibit goal achievement. CC leaders must promote campus environments that result in multiple opportunities for student learning and development. CC leaders must continuously improve programs and services in response to changing needs of students and other constituents, and evolving institutional priorities.

### **Implications for Long-Term Effectiveness**

The leadership of the CCC was praised explicitly in virtually all conversations, from faculty through student workers and CCC users. We heard from both the Center for Student Involvement full-time staff as well as faculty about the level of professionalism exhibited by the CCC's student staff. Such compliments are testament to the training, modeling of behavior and mentoring provided by the CCC's professional staff. The CCC's leadership understands student development in theoretical and practical terms and put their knowledge to use in ways not frequently found on other campuses.

### **Recommendations**

This is not an area in which we see need for improvement. It would be helpful to the self-confidence of the CCC's professional staff if they took to heart the many compliments that came their way from all those interviewed by the external reviewers.

## **FOUNDATIONAL PREMISE FOUR**

### **Organization and Management**

Guided by an overarching intent to ensure student learning and development, Cultural Centers (CC) must be structured purposefully and managed effectively to achieve stated goals. Evidence of appropriate structure must include current and accessible policies and procedures, written performance expectations for all employees, functional workflow graphics or organizational charts, and clearly stated service delivery expectations. Evidence of effective management must include use of comprehensive and accurate information for decisions, clear sources and channels of authority, effective communication practices, decision-making and

conflict resolution procedures, responsiveness to changing conditions, accountability and evaluation systems, and recognition and reward processes. CC must provide channels within the organization for regular review of administrative policies and procedures.

### **Implications for Long-Term Effectiveness**

The CCC fulfills the requirements of appropriate structure, effective management and regular review of administrative policies and procedures. While the CCC is in congruence with the tenets, the recent change to suspend the Assistant Director, a professional position, and increase the number of Student Program Coordinators surfaces as an area to monitor in terms of its impact on the sources and channels of authority (as it relates to the Director).

### **Recommendation**

At the end of one year, it would be helpful for the CCC to conduct a comparative assessment of the management function working with increased Program Coordinators and without an Assistant Director. This will help the CCC in its efforts to improve documentation of its function.

## **FOUNDATIONAL PREMISE FIVE**

### **Human Resources**

Cultural Centers (CC) must be staffed by diverse individuals qualified to accomplish its mission and goals. CC must strive to improve the professional competence and skills of all personnel it employs. CC professional staff members must hold an earned college degree in a field relevant to the position they hold or must possess an appropriate combination of educational credentials and related work experience.

Student employees and volunteers must be carefully selected, trained, supervised, and evaluated. Student employees and volunteers must be provided clear and precise job descriptions, pre-service training based on assessed needs, and continuing staff development.

CC must have experienced technical and support staff members to accomplish its mission. Staff members must be technologically proficient and qualified to perform their job functions, be knowledgeable of ethical and legal uses of technology, and have access to training. The level of staffing and workloads must be adequate and appropriate for program and service demands.

Salary levels and fringe benefits for all CC staff members must be commensurate with those for comparable positions within the institution, in similar institutions, and in the relevant geographic area. CC must create and maintain position descriptions for all staff members and provide regular performance planning and appraisals.

### **Implications for Long-Term Effectiveness**

The Human Resources tenets are being fulfilled by the CCC. While the recent change in professional staff aligns training and supervision of student staff under the Director and Coordinator of Gender and Sexuality Resource Center, the training materials for the centers' operation should aid in this redistribution of responsibilities. Through the University-Student Union, the CCC has access to experienced technical support. Their satisfaction with the quality of technical support from the Union was high. There has been a re-configuring of responsibilities recently with the elimination of the Assistant Director position and an increase in the number of student Program Coordinators. Such changes should always create a net positive effect for the department.

### **Recommendations**

We recommend (as above in Premise Four) that this re-configuration of responsibilities in terms of the Assistant Director/Program Coordinators shift be re-assessed after one year. If there is not a net positive effect, there should be discussion about reverting to the previous model or consideration of a request for the reinstatement of the Assistant Director position.

To expand its staff abilities, we encourage the use of graduate assistants and interns. Such assistants provide peer role models and give valuable pre-professional experience.

## **FOUNDATIONAL PREMISE SIX**

### **Financial Resources**

Cultural Centers (CC) must have adequate funding to accomplish their mission and goals. Funding priorities must be determined within the context of the stated mission, goals, objectives, and comprehensive analysis of the needs and capabilities of students and the availability of internal or external resources. CC must demonstrate fiscal responsibility and cost effectiveness consistent with institutional protocols.

### **Implications for Long-Term Effectiveness**

The funding sources for the CCC are shared between CSULA and the U-SU. The funding allocation of approximately \$511,000 appears adequate to accomplish their mission and goals. The interviews with several groups revealed a concern about full budget disclosure.

### **Recommendations**

We recommend that there is transparency in reporting budget funding. This would make collaborative efforts more productive. Should suggestions from the University for increased programming by the CCC be put forward at any time, there should be either an increase in funds or an understanding that some other program will have to be eliminated.

## FOUNDATIONAL PREMISE SEVEN

### **Facilities, Technology and Equipment**

Cultural Centers (CC) must have adequate, suitably located and accessible facilities, adequate technology, and equipment to support its mission and goals efficiently and effectively. Facilities, technology, and equipment must be evaluated regularly and be in compliance with relevant federal, state, provincial, and local requirements to provide for access, health, safety, and security.

### **Implications for Long-Term Effectiveness**

The CCC is located in the upper level of the recently built U-SU building located at one of the high student traffic areas on the campus. The centers' technology and equipment are maintained through support from the University-Student Union and are evaluated on a three-year cycle.

### **Recommendations**

The CCC has a great space with a notable technology and equipment upgrade program and these should be maintained at the current or higher level of efficiency.

## FOUNDATIONAL PREMISE EIGHT

### **Legal Responsibilities**

Cultural Centers (CC) staff members must be knowledgeable about and responsive to laws and regulations that relate to their respective responsibilities. CC staff members must inform users of programs and services and officials, as appropriate, of legal obligations and limitations and the institution's policies. CC staff members must use reasonable and informed practices to limit the liability exposure of the institution, its officers, employees, and agents.

The institution must inform CC staff and students in a timely and systematic fashion about extraordinary or changing legal obligations and potential liabilities.

### **Implications for Long-Term Effectiveness**

While the evaluation period did not provide the opportunity for an extensive observation of the practices of the staff in their interactions with constituents, interviews indicated that the CCC fulfills the tenets of legal responsibilities..

### **Recommendations**

It would be helpful to put a "Legal Responsibilities" section in the centers' training and operational materials.

## FOUNDATIONAL PREMISE NINE

### **Equity and Access**

Cultural Centers (CC) staff members must ensure that services and programs are provided on a fair and equitable basis. Policies and practices of CC must not discriminate on the basis of age, color, disability, sex, national origin, race, religious creed, sexual identity, and/or veteran status.

As the demographic profiles of campuses change and new instructional delivery methods are introduced, institutions must recognize the needs of students who participate in distance learning for access to programs and services offered on campus.

### **Implications for Long-Term Effectiveness**

The CCC does not discriminate on the basis of any characteristics and does provide services and programs on a fair and equitable basis. The CCC is paying attention to demographics, particularly the number of first generation and commuter students. The timing of programs is aimed to reach commuters, although this may not result in an increased number of these students attending programs.

We did not ask about distance learning programs. From anecdotal reports across the country it would appear that while this is an area that Academic Affairs departments have to clearly assess in terms of equity and access, it is a very difficult area for CC's in general to have an impact. Certainly the professional staff's expertise could be utilized.

While issues around disability are not an explicit part of the CCC's programming, it is clear that there have been conversations about this as an area of intersectionality that cannot be excluded from programming. The CCC itself appears to comply with ADA requirements in its physical space.

### **Recommendations**

The CCC should look for best practices in the area of programming for commuter students. It is possible that some campuses have developed strategies that better involve this group in campus events.

We would encourage the CCC to continue the collaboration with the Office for Students with Disabilities. We were pleased to see that partnerships are already being developed in this area.

## FOUNDATIONAL PREMISE TEN

### **Campus and External Relations**

Cultural Centers (CC) must establish, maintain, and promote effective relations with relevant individuals, campus offices, and external agencies. Professional staff members must coordinate, or where appropriate, collaborate with faculty and other staff in providing services and programs for students.

## **Implications for Long-Term Effectiveness**

Campus and external relations are one of the centers' strongest attributes with a very high level of coalition building and inclusiveness. The CCC has established, maintained, and promoted effective relations with both academic and student affairs constituents, and external community individuals and agencies. It became clear that the vigorous leadership of the Director is primarily responsible for achieving this positive balance. CCC staff members actualize the centers' philosophy through initiating programmatic and service collaborations with other faculty members and staff. Interviewed faculty regard the CCC as a place where they can share their work with the community in a way that is not necessarily supported in other areas of the campus. This is a particularly laudatory accomplishment.

While the CCC conducts an assessment of the collaborative partnerships, there was no evidence of how the CCC uses the information.

In its earlier years, the CCC was serviced by an advisory council which over time dissolved. During the interviews an interest in revitalizing an advisory council was raised by faculty.

## **Recommendations**

We recommend that the CCC continue to serve as conduits between entities, providing validation of interdependence across cultures. In documenting the role of the CCC in its collaborative partnerships, provide evidence of using the information to build institutional awareness and improve centers' efficiency.

Consider initiating an acknowledgment and rewards system that functions throughout the year to feature the centers' partnership with various constituents. This strategy will increase the centers' recognition and the university's knowledge of its contribution.

We recommend that there is strong consideration provided to establishing a functional advisory council for the CCC. Such a council should reflect the various constituencies who are regular users of the CCC's services, including students, faculty, administration, staff and, perhaps, external community members. The precise nature and purpose of the council should be discussed with the leadership of the CCC and their direction should be followed.

Possibilities for collaboration could be established with Minority Opportunities in REsearch (MORE), Center for Cross-Cultural Research and Center for Multicultural Education.

## **FOUNDATIONAL PREMISE ELEVEN**

### **Diversity**

Within the context of each institution's unique mission, diversity enriches the community and enhances the collegiate experience for all; therefore, Cultural Centers (CC) must nurture environments where commonalities and differences among people are recognized and honored. CC must promote educational experiences that are characterized by open and continuous communication that deepens understanding of one's own identity, culture, and heritage, and that of others. CC must educate and promote respect about commonalities

and differences in their historical and cultural contexts.

CC must address the characteristics and needs of a diverse population when establishing and implementing policies and procedures.

### **Implications for Long-Term Effectiveness**

Attention paid to diversity is evident in the centers' variety of programs, literature and collaborations. It is also clear that the CCC's definition of diversity is all-encompassing, understanding that diversity is the differences that make all of us unique, rather than a few visible characteristics such as 'race' and sex. As noted in Premise Nine which examines equity and access, one element of diversity that could be ignored is the fact that most students are commuters. This impacts the timing of programs as well as attendance. The CCC appears to be paying attention to this fact although resolution is somewhat more difficult.

### **Recommendations**

The CCC should continue its strong work in this area, always checking the pulse of programming endeavors to make certain that the needs of diverse populations are being met. As suggested in Premise Nine, the CCC should explore delivering programs and services that accommodate commuter students within the university's diverse populations.

Attention is paid to intersections of identity – while there are separate spaces within the CCC, it is clear that students feel they can move between spaces, regardless of primary racial/ethnic affiliation and/or gender identity/sexual orientation. We commend this model and urge caution about changing abruptly to a multicultural center model which would not appear to fit well with the CSULA population.

## **FOUNDATIONAL PREMISE TWELVE**

### **Ethics**

All persons involved in the delivery of Cultural Centers (CC) programs and services must adhere to the highest principles of ethical behavior. CC must develop or adopt and implement appropriate statements of ethical practice. CC must publish these statements and ensure their periodic review by relevant constituencies.

### **Implications for Long-Term Effectiveness**

Through information gathered from interviews, the CCC staff members were highly regarded for their professional conduct and behavior. There was no indication that the center or its staff members have operated in a manner that compromised their integrity or reputation. This was evidenced by the positive working relationship they have with colleagues, students and community members and a review of the training provided by the CCC and the University-Student Union.

We commend the CCC for developing and distributing "Points of Unity", a community standards guide for people utilizing the CCC. This has been adopted for use throughout the Union.

### **Recommendations**

Given the strong adherence of the CCC professional staff to ethical practices and behaviors, we recommend continuing on this path. If relevant within the CSULA culture, statements reflecting ethical practices should be posted publicly. Statements should be published as appropriate.

We recommend the CCC include a review and evaluation of their ethical practices in their assessment of constituents.

## **FOUNDATIONAL PREMISE THIRTEEN**

### **Assessment and Evaluation**

Cultural Centers (CC) must conduct regular assessment and evaluations. CC must employ effective qualitative and quantitative methodologies as appropriate, to determine whether and to what degree the stated mission, goals, and student learning and development outcomes are being met. The process must employ sufficient and sound assessment measures to ensure comprehensiveness. Data collected must include responses from students and other affected constituencies.

CC must evaluate periodically how well they complement and enhance the institution's stated mission and educational effectiveness. Results of these evaluations must be used in revising and improving programs and services and in recognizing staff performance.

### **Implications for Long-Term Effectiveness**

We commend the CCC for implementing regular assessment and evaluation of its programs and services. A review of the instruments revealed the need for content adjustment that assesses a correlation to the CCC's learning outcomes. The necessity of the correlations between programmatic and services assessment to student learning outcomes is critical to documenting the centers' contribution student learning.

To ensure continuous dynamic growth, it would benefit the CCC to engage in and document a strategic planning process. Using information from the internal and external reviews and the CCC's Self Study to create a strategic plan that includes identifying long term goals, objectives and learning outcomes can help reveal individual and organizational conditions that may immobilize the growth of the center.

### **Recommendations**

It would be helpful for the CCC to utilize innovative methods to achieve effective assessment. The publication, "Learning Reconsidered" (ACPA and NASPA) identified several tools, some of which are: observations of student behavior; interviews; focus groups; peer

assessments and presentations. Data collected from various sources should be included in a yearly report and shared with the campus community and supervisor.

The documentation of a clearly identified strategic plan should be included in the CCC's training materials and shared with constituents.

## EMERGING THEMES

Several emerging themes surfaced during the selected group interviews and many of them were affirmed by the Director. Some themes spoke highly of the CCC while others underscored the need for ongoing attention and discussion. These themes are in no particular order of importance.

1. Many of those interviewed found it difficult to articulate what areas require improvement. This is testament to the outstanding work being done by the CCC.
2. The CCC is intentional in all that it does – programming, listing of SLO's on its website, training of its student staff and volunteers and interactions across campus, including faculty. A faculty member noted that the CCC is “an important locus for co-curricular learning”. The comment was echoed by others.
3. The CCC is playing a vital role on campus in the student development area, specifically in terms of identity and leadership development.
4. The advertising produced through the CCC is of a high quality and is visible around campus.
5. While there is ongoing assessment, this is an area for discussion and growth. The CCC needs to determine what forms of assessment will best provide the data required for its own purposes and well as meeting the CSULA requirements.
6. The strategic plan has to be more than words on paper. It must be updated regularly and used on an ongoing basis.

## OVERALL RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CONTINUING AND DYNAMIC GROWTH

For the CCC to continue to thrive and develop, a number of recommendations are addressed.

1. We recommend that the CCC continues in its outstanding work of ensuring its mission and student learning outcomes remain congruent with the University's mission and Institutional Learning Outcomes.
2. We recommend that the CCC undertake more meaningful assessment of co-curricular programs. In particular, they should work with faculty partners. While the current satisfaction surveys provide basic data, we feel the CCC will be better served by an ability to provide assessment results that correlate with learning outcomes.
3. We recommend that the CCC makes even better use of its Publicity Control Sheet. They should request access to the class schedule at a much earlier date.
4. We recommend that the CCC keep up to date on best practices utilized by their peer cultural centers in terms of analyzing usage. We recommend against a reliance on counters at doors.
5. We recommend that the CCC become an interested party in campus meetings where retention and graduation rates are the focus of discussion. We recommend this more holistic approach as we believe retention and graduation rates are increased through campus-wide efforts, rather than the efforts of any single unit.
6. We recommend that the re-configuration of responsibilities in terms of the Assistant Director/Program Coordinators shift be re-assessed after one year.
7. We recommend that there is transparency in reporting budget funding. We believe this would make collaborative efforts more productive.
8. The CCC should look for best practices in the area of programming for commuter students. It is possible that some campuses have developed strategies that better involve this group in campus events.
9. We encourage the CCC to continue the collaboration with partners such as the Office for Students with Disabilities. Possibilities for collaboration could be established with Minority Opportunities in REsearch (MORE), Center for Cross-Cultural Research and Center for Multicultural Education.
10. We recommend that the CCC continue to serve as conduits between entities, providing validation of interdependence across cultures. In documenting the role of the CCC in its collaborative partnerships, provide evidence of using the information to build institutional awareness and improve centers' efficiency.
11. We recommend that there is strong consideration provided to establishing a functional advisory council for the CCC. Such a council should reflect the various constituencies who are regular users of the CCC's services, including students, faculty, administration, staff and, perhaps, external community members.
12. We recommend the CCC include a review and evaluation of their ethical practices in their assessment of constituents.
13. It would be helpful for the CCC to utilize innovative methods to achieve effective assessment. The publication, "Learning Reconsidered" (ACPA and NASPA) identified

several tools, some of which are: observations of student behavior; interviews; focus groups; peer assessments and presentations.

14. We recommend that the CCC undertake an annual strategic planning process in alignment with its student learning outcomes and the institutional learning outcomes. The results of this process should be distributed to all partners and interested parties.

Finally, it is recommended that the CCC's professional staff should take to heart the many compliments that came their way from all those interviewed by the external reviewers.

## APPENDIX A

### Data-Collection Instruments:

#### Selected Group Interviews:

- Internal Review Committee
- Full-time staff of the CCC (Frederick Smith, Denise Carlos and Rhonda Mitchell)
- Joseph Aguirre, Executive Director, U-SU and Student Life
- Dr. Anthony Ross, VP, Student Affairs
- Dr. Nancy Wada-McKee, Assistant VP, Student Affairs,
- Full-time staff of the Center for Student Involvement
  - Jennifer Celaya Davis - Director,
  - Frangelo Ayran - Assistant Director for Student Development
  - Christopher Johnson - Campus Involvement Coordinator,
- Faculty
  - Dr. Melina Abdullah, Pan-African Studies
  - Dr. Beth Baker-Cristales, Latin American Studies
  - Dr. Talia Bettcher, Philosophy, and Director, Center for the Study of Genders and Sexualities
  - Dr. Dionne Espinoza, Women's and Gender Studies
  - Dr. Maria Karafilis, English, and Director, American Communities Program
  - Dr. ChorSwan Ngin, Asian and Asian American Studies
- Student Staff Members, CCC
- Student Users of the CCC

### General Interview Questions

1. What are your perceptions of the Cross-Cultural Centers staff, services, and programs?
2. Do you believe that the CCC contributes to student success, retention and graduation? Why or why not?
3. What are the institutional organizational structures that define enable or restrain the CCC?
4. We've heard about the proposed abolition of the Asian and Asian American Studies program. We know of the collaborative relationship between the APA Student Resource Center and the Asian and Asian American Studies Program. Should the department be closed what implications for the CCC could occur?

### Review of Archival Data

We were provided with a number of paper resources, including the [2003-2008 Self-Study Report](#) which included [the CCC's response to the 2002 External and Internal Review Reports](#). We were also given examples of advertising for a variety of programs, as well as the publications produced for various events. We accessed

both the CCC website and the CSULA website on numerous occasions. We examined the job descriptions for all professional staff.

Data-Analysis Instruments:

W. James Popham (author of *Educational Evaluation*, University of California, Los Angeles) posits a triangulation assessment strategy which we used to tell us about the CCC status with respect to an affective dimension. The following three criterion-referenced instruments were used to triangulate data to describe the affective attribute of the CCC.

Council for the Advancement Standards (CAS) (proposed submission) authored by CaCCCHE

Cultural Centers Establishment and Growth Model authored by CaCCCHE

Cultural Competence and Proficiency Models

## APPENDIX B

### Comparison: CCC and CSULA Mission Statements

The California State University Los Angeles' mission statement begins with a description, followed by its mission and concludes with its objective.

<p>Cal State L.A., a member of the California State University (CSU) system, offers excellent and innovative educational opportunities to an urban student population that reflects the diversity of the Los Angeles basin.</p>	<p>Description And Mission</p>
<p>Educational opportunities include:</p> <p>Preparing students to appreciate, engage, enhance and transform the social, cultural, civic, and workplace structures of American and global societies;</p> <p>Providing students with the capabilities, skills, and opportunities to take full advantage of life-long learning, including graduate and professional studies, and opportunities to participate in research, scholarly, and creative activities;</p> <p>Offering students tools for personal and academic achievement, economic mobility, and healthier lives;</p> <p>Serving as a gateway among the Cal State L.A. community, the greater Los Angeles community, and world community for shared educational and cultural life;</p> <p>Providing high quality professional services to all constituencies of the University.</p>	<p>Objective</p>

The Cross Cultural Centers' mission statement begins with its mission and concludes with its objective.

<p>The mission of the Cross Cultural Centers at California State University, Los Angeles is to encourage student learning as well as foster an inclusive campus environment that challenges racism, sexism, heterosexism, and other forms of oppression.</p>	<p>Mission</p>
<p>With a commitment to increasing cross-cultural awareness, we offer a wide variety of programs and services that explore both the shared and unique experiences, histories, and heritages of our diverse community.</p>	<p>Objective</p>

## APPENDIX C

### Comparison: CCC Student Learning Outcomes and CSULA Institutional Learning Outcomes

The Student Learning Outcomes (SLO's) defined by the CCC are congruent with the Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILO's) of CSULA as evidenced through CCC programs, interdependent efforts, and service to the campus and surrounding community. In this chart, the CSULA ILO's are found in the left column while the relevant CCC SLO's are listed on the right. As can be seen, in the last category of "Transformation", even CCC SLO is found to be congruent.

<b>CSULA Institutional Learning Outcomes</b>	<b>Relevant CCC Student Learning Outcomes</b>
<p><b>Knowledge: Mastery of content and processes of inquiry</b>            CSULA graduates have a strong knowledge base in their academic major and can use powerful processes of inquiry in a range of disciplines. They engage contemporary and enduring questions with an understanding of the complexities of human cultures and the physical and natural world and are ready to put their knowledge into action to address contemporary issues.</p>	<p>Understand the interactive relationship of race, class and gender in society.</p> <p>Articulate their views and experiences around race, class and gender by integrating their personal experiences and academic perspectives.</p>
<p><b>Proficiency: Intellectual skills</b>            CSULA graduates are equipped to actively participate in democratic society. They are critical thinkers who make use of quantitative and qualitative reasoning. They have the ability to find, use, evaluate and process information in order to engage in complex decision-making. They read critically, speak and write clearly and thoughtfully and communicate effectively.</p>	<p>Identify and articulate the values and processes that lead to an inclusive and democratic community.</p>
<p><b>Place and Community: Urban and global mission</b>            CSULA graduates are engaged individuals who have contributed to the multi-lingual and multiethnic communities that constitute Los Angeles and the world of the future. They are aware of how their actions impact society and the environment, and they strive to make socially</p>	<p>Understand the multiple perspectives (heritages, experiences, values) of others, while valuing their own heritages, experiences and values.</p> <p>Understand the interactive relationship of race, class and gender in society.</p> <p>Articulate their views and experiences</p>

<b>CSULA Institutional Learning Outcomes</b>	<b>Relevant CCC Student Learning Outcomes</b>
<p>responsible decisions. They are community builders sensitive to the needs of diverse individuals and groups and committed to renewing the communities in which they live.</p>	<p>around race, class and gender by integrating their personal experiences and academic perspectives.</p> <p>Examine personal behaviors and choices and their effects on campus, local and global issues.</p> <p>Identify and articulate the values and processes that lead to an inclusive and democratic community.</p> <p>Influence social change on campus and in society with creativity, integrity and compassion.</p>
<p><b>Transformation: Integrative learning</b>            CSULA graduates integrate academic learning with life. They engage in community, professional, creative, research and scholarly projects that lead to changes in their sense of self and understanding of their worlds. Graduates integrate their knowledge, skills and experience to address complex and contemporary issues and act ethically as leaders for the 21st century.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Understand the multiple perspectives (heritages, experiences, values) of others, while valuing their own heritages, experiences and values.</li> <li>2. Work with individuals as a team for both personal and collective good.</li> <li>3. Understand the interactive relationship of race, class and gender in society.</li> <li>4. Articulate their views and experiences around race, class and gender by integrating their personal experiences and academic perspectives.</li> <li>5. Appreciate the role that the arts and cultural events can play in developing an enlightened and culturally-empowered perspective.</li> <li>6. Examine and challenge personal acts of oppression.</li> <li>7. Examine personal behaviors and choices and their effects on campus, local and global issues.</li> <li>8. Identify and articulate the values and processes that lead to an inclusive and democratic community.</li> <li>9. Influence social change on campus and in society with creativity, integrity and compassion.</li> </ol>

## APPENDIX D

Two groups of interviewees were asked the following question: If fun is aligned with student activities, what word would align with the CCC?

We believe that the responses are a testament to the work that is being done by the CCC and the recognition of the impact of their work across the campus. Those responding included administrators, faculty, student users of the CCC and student workers.

- Fun Plus Engagement
- Fun Plus
- Dynamic
- Eye-opening
- Transformative
- Thought-provoking
- Timely
- Brave
- Smart
- Creativity
- Education
- Challenging
- Important
- Relevant
- Acceptance
- Deep
- Intimacy – the atmosphere that allows them to speak to people without filters, ask questions and learn from the process