Goal 3: Solidify California State University, Fullerton as a university of choice for a broad, diverse, and inclusive community of students, faculty, and staff.

3.1: Obtain a retention rate of % for continuing students through the strengthening of students’ sense of belonging.

3.2: Establish benchmarks appropriate for the recruitment and retention of diverse students, faculty, and staff to inform ongoing planning.

3.3: Following identification of benchmarks, establish and meet year-three goals for the recruitment and retention of diverse faculty and staff.

Comments or suggestions for alternative wording for Goal 3:

Very important Yes Moderately important Yes

Mildly important Yes Neutral Uncertain Slightly important Yes Slightly important Uncertain

Very important Yes Very important Uncertain Very important Yes Very important Yes

Low importance Yes Neutral Uncertain Neutral Uncertain Neutral Uncertain

Very important Uncertain Low importance Uncertain Moderately important Uncertain Moderately important Uncertain

Uncertain in Objective 3.2, we should not put so much effort and fund in recruiting students because we already have much more students applying for CSUF than we can teach. It is not appropriate to treat students, faculty, and staff equally in the effort of recruitment and retention. We certainly need to increase diversity among faculty and staff.

Very important Yes Very important Very important Very important Yes Very important Yes

I am unclear about Objective 3.2: Establish benchmarks appropriate for the recruitment and retention of diverse students, faculty, and staff to inform ongoing planning. Does that simply mean that we want to make sure that important planning committees are composed of a diverse group of students, faculty, and staff? ...

Very important Yes Very important Very important Very important Yes Very important Yes

I’m curious as to why retention needs to be through increasing sense of belonging. Both are laudable goals to improve our campus, but if one is not related strongly to the other, is that a problem? Increasing retention through a variety of means seems appropriate, and I do think that professional identity is an important component in terms of retention of students from underrepresented groups. However, other actions, such as cultural capital development, faculty and staff training, and structural changes to reduce unconscious bias, could all improve retention as well. More reflection on institutional practices and norms would be appropriate, I would think.

Very important Yes Very important Yes Very important Yes Very important Yes Very important Yes

Low importance Uncertain Slightly important Yes Low importance Yes Moderately important Yes

Goal 3 should include retention of high-quality faculty involved in research and teaching. There is no mention of merit-based faculty recruitment or retention.

Very important Yes Neutral Yes Moderately important Yes Moderately important Yes

These are all important but it would help to know what on-going planning means. Increasing students’ sense of belonging is a worthy, formidable, aspirational goal. It will be interesting to see how we define send of belonging and the corresponding activities/services/actions the university develops to meet this need.

Mildly important Yes Neutral Uncertain Yes Moderately important Yes Moderately important Yes

Goal three should be about employees only. ... Retention is especially important and will involve lots of management training and HR planning and systems. The lack of trust in our organization must be addressed. Leadership from the highest to lowest levels MUST work to create an environment of safety and trust for staff especially. Lenience is not what I’m recommending. Quite the opposite. Staff need to trust their management to address performance issues quickly, equitably, and appropriately. Managers need to have the support of HR to implement discipline effectively. To retain quality talent, there have to be opportunities to advance internally and regular improvements in compensation for a broad selection of performers (rather than a couple of handpicked allies).

Very important Yes Neutral Uncertain Very important Uncertain Very important Uncertain

Inclusion for all students continues to remain a prominent issue for diverse students on campus.

Mildly important Yes Very important Yes Very important Yes Very important Yes

Inclusion for all students continues to remain a prominent issue for diverse students on campus.

Very important Yes Neutral Uncertain Very important Very important Yes Very important Yes

Define student retention rate % as well as what exactly “sense of belonging” means. / Retention is especially important and will involve lots of management training and HR planning and systems. The lack of trust in our organization must be addressed. Leadership from the highest to lowest levels MUST work to create an environment of safety and trust for staff especially. Lenience is not what I’m recommending. Quite the opposite. Staff need to trust their management to address performance issues quickly, equitably, and appropriately. Managers need to have the support of HR to implement discipline effectively. To retain quality talent, there have to be opportunities to advance internally and regular improvements in compensation for a broad selection of performers (rather than a couple of handpicked allies).

Mildly important Yes Very important Uncertain Moderately important Yes Moderately important Uncertain

Don’t know how to begin with wording of Goal 3, put I encourage you to look at the suggestions of others. It just doesn’t sound right. / Also, I am unclear about Objective 3.2: Establish benchmarks appropriate for the recruitment and retention of diverse students, faculty, and staff to inform ongoing planning. Does that simply mean that we want to make sure that important planning committees are composed of a diverse group of students, faculty, and staff?

Mildly important Yes Very important Yes Very important Yes Very important Yes

Define belonging. Determine how to measure belonging. / If only retention rates are measured, remove belonging. / Consider other barriers to retention, beyond belonging, which is only one way.

Very important Yes Very important Yes Very important Yes

Define or capture the goal statement.
| Importance | Uncertain | Moderately important | Uncertain | Moderately important | Uncertain | Moderately important | Uncertain | Moderately important | Uncertain | Moderately important | Uncertain | Moderately important | Uncertain | Moderately important | Uncertain | Moderately important | Uncertain | Moderately important | Uncertain | Moderately important | Uncertain | Moderately important | Uncertain | Moderately important | Uncertain |
|------------|----------|----------------------|----------|----------------------|----------|----------------------|----------|----------------------|----------|----------------------|----------|----------------------|----------|----------------------|----------|----------------------|----------|----------------------|----------|----------------------|----------|----------------------|----------|
| Yes        | Very important | Yes | Very important | Yes | Very important | Yes | First recruitment and retention of students should be considered in a very in-depth and thoughtful way as we are already turning away 0s of thousands of students. It might be tempting to recruit students who will help CSUF achieve GI 2025 goals at the expense of some students who could make the most of an opportunity for higher ed. Faculty support is crucial. We're the CSU with the lowest per student funding, our student to faculty ratios are high, our course loads are heavy. People burn out. This is bad not only for the faculty but the students. If we want "immersive" and "high impact" experiences for students, faculty need to be supported in their workloads. |
| Yes        | Neutral | Uncertain | Very important | Yes | Very important | Yes | Diversity is what makes CSUF. I am glad these are being highlighted. |
| Yes        | Very important | Yes | Very important | Yes | Very important | Yes | Objective 3., "sense of belonging" is vague. Instead we should have a goal of identifying why students leave or don't continue and finish their degrees. |
| Yes        | Moderate | Very important | Yes | Very important | Yes | I think objective 3. should also include a goal for retaining a specific rate of diverse students, faculty and staff (depending on where there are gaps). I'm not sure how you would attribute the retention rate to "a sense of belonging" but otherwise I think this goal is important/achievable. |
| Yes        | Very important | Yes | Very important | Yes | Very important | Yes | In order to recruit and RETAIN diverse faculty, we need to ensure our campus culture/climate is supportive and affirming. There continue to be too many incidents of cultural animosity (racism, sexism, etc...some of which are under the guise of free speech) on campus, and I know several faculty who are leaving because of them. Additionally, our high teaching loads burn out faculty—especially those with the most scholarly productivity (see notes on goal 2) and those who bear a disproportionate burden of advising students (especially first gen or minority students) and/or take on service related to the racial & cultural climate on campus. We need to address this to prevent good—and diverse—faculty from leaving. |
| Yes        | Neutral | No | Very important | Uncertain | Neutral | Uncertain | Can't believe that "forcing" diversity upon an institution is appropriate. If an institution is intrinsically supportive of diversity, then the composition of the faculty will be diverse naturally. |
| Yes        | Very important | Yes | Very important | Yes | Very important | Yes | In order to recruit and retain diverse faculty, we need to ensure our campus culture/climate is supportive and affirming. There continue to be too many incidents of cultural animosity (racism, sexism, etc...some of which are under the guise of free speech) on campus, and I know several faculty who are leaving because of them. Additionally, our high teaching loads burn out faculty—especially those with the most scholarly productivity (see notes on goal 2) and those who bear a disproportionate burden of advising students (especially first gen or minority students) and/or take on service related to the racial & cultural climate on campus. We need to address this to prevent good—and diverse—faculty from leaving. |
| Neutral    | Very important | Yes | Very important | Yes | Low Importance | Yes | In order to recruit and retain diverse faculty, we need to ensure our campus culture/climate is supportive and affirming. There continue to be too many incidents of cultural animosity (racism, sexism, etc...some of which are under the guise of free speech) on campus, and I know several faculty who are leaving because of them. Additionally, our high teaching loads burn out faculty—especially those with the most scholarly productivity (see notes on goal 2) and those who bear a disproportionate burden of advising students (especially first gen or minority students) and/or take on service related to the racial & cultural climate on campus. We need to address this to prevent good—and diverse—faculty from leaving. |
Need to add diversity into 3.2. That is the goal!

3.2 and 3.3 seem to be tactical - consider eliminating and enhancing 3. to include increasing retention rates across all measures (diversity, faculty, staff, ...). by X%.

If you are going to commit to student sense of belonging and diversifying and retaining faculty and staff, there needs to be resources and training. The training needs to be broad to address various communities and cultural competencies. Supervisors especially, need training on how to interact and work with staff and faculty from diverse backgrounds, cultures, and lived experiences. They need to be equipped to respond to various issues and open to learning different "ways of doing." For student sense of belonging, many of our students do not feel they belong because of their identities. Human and financial resources are necessary to ensure care and support, especially when students are in crisis.

Students should never feel like there is only one space for them. This is why training of faculty, staff, and students is so important to meeting needs of a diverse student body. Students should be able to feel welcome in all spaces.

We need to recruit more Hispanic faculty. We have over 60% Hispanic students, but we have 0 Hispanic faculty.

I don't think we are to the point where solidify is a useful term. It is as though we are trying to freeze or harden something that should really constantly evolving. It is not a goal that we can reach solely by measuring quantifiable data. It is a task that is never finished and can always be improved.

Separate students, faculty and staff ... different issues!

It is unclear to me if this will work, because it is not stated what will actually happen. Who will determine these benchmarks? How these will be determined? Based on data or opinions?

I'd like to think that we have achieved this goal. The benchmarking may not be in place.

While I believe in diversity, excluding individuals because they aren't part of the diverse agenda fails in and of itself. The university should not recruit based on diversity, but based on what the department wishes to achieve as an educational goal and the professors that can provide that education to students. The focus should be on course content, a professor's ability to teach, and, what students need to know in the future to succeed in their chosen field.

Please see my prior comments. / I understand that my objections to the rhetorical overload and preoccupation with numerical goals will be ignored as being the product of a disaffected soul. / On the other hand, I just finished my twentieth year as CSUF, retired, and look back on my relationships with students very fondly. / On the OTHER hand, my dissertation was about quantity-v-quality. If you've read this far and are intrigued by this approach (as if...) here's a http://www.policeissues.com/Ukraine_article.pdf
To recruit and retain faculty and staff, they must be provided with opportunities to be successful at CSUF. For faculty this means that they should be given an opportunity to pursue research, scholarly, and creative activities (RSCA) involving undergraduate and graduate students.

Currently, effective support for RSCA at the university level is limited; a better and more clearly defined balance among teaching, RSCA, and service is needed. What is needed, from a faculty standpoint, to maintain high-quality RSCA and RSCA that involve undergraduate and graduate students, and to allow faculty to balance teaching, RSCA, and service contributions to benefit the campus community can be categorized into Faculty Time and Resources, and Funding Sources. The University should recognize the time and resource commitments required to maintain and manage an active RSCA program, especially one that involves students. Involving students in faculty-mentored RSCA requires much more time and support than faculty members doing the work themselves but the benefits for educating our students as they learn by doing, and being able to attract and retain research-active, student-centered faculty, are well worth it. There should be a focus on what CSUF needs to do: on a sustainable basis, to ensure that faculty RSCA and faculty-student RSCA flourish, and to address how faculty workloads can reflect the time commitment for RSCA and RSCA that involves students; currently, faculty are required to engage in RSCA, but time required is not acknowledged in typical workloads. The University must provide space suitable for the RSCA work by faculty and students; this should be a priority. / In terms of funding, assistance or support should be provided in a consistent way at similar times, across multiple years. Funds should also be available for unexpected opportunities as well as to provide bridge funding to faculty who are submitting a grant, but currently have no means to generate the necessary preliminary data to be competitive or to address reviewers' critiques. More flexibility in terms of how the PI can spend intramural funds should be allowed, because each project may have different needs. / Many departments are facing a severe shortage of staff. As a result, regular maintenance and repair falls by the wayside (deferred maintenance) which eventually leads to the curriculum being effected and students not receiving the proper training or experiences. In severe cases, it could lead to cancellation of classes which affects graduation. A simple solution (on paper) would be to allow a Department to choose whether to hire a faculty member or a staff member. It is absolutely essential to find a solution for the shortage of qualified staff members and therefore a new way of thinking about funding may be necessary. In addition, the incentives for staff members to come to CSUF need to be increased. Salaries should be more competitive with industry and staff members should be given more opportunities for growth (professionally). Some staff members would also make incredible instructors so being more flexible on their actual job descriptions would be a favorable development.

This is the first of the first three goals that's sufficiently specific to be measurable and in theory, achievable.

Goal 3.2 and 3.3 do not lump students, faculty, and staff together. / Objective 3.3 - the priority should be to test and establish successful programs and policies instead of setting goals. Setting goals with no plan of how to achieve them seems unwise.

The phrase "to inform ongoing planning" sounds like a walk-away from true progress. Suggest reword for its true purpose.

Yes I have no idea what Objective 3. means - it's more buzzwords. But having goals and benchmarks to help students is good.

Yes / The statement "Objective 3.2: Establish benchmarks appropriate for the recruitment and retention of diverse students, faculty, and staff to inform ongoing planning." The phrase "to inform ongoing planning" sounds like a walk-away from true progress. Suggest reward for its true purpose.

Yes Faculty should help to mentor and recruit students to PhD programs thus help in the pipeline to graduate women and underrepresented students.
3.2 and 3.3 have been a part of our operations for 20 years (on-and-off). Identifying benchmarks will only create the sense of micromanagement, and likely eliminate creativity across campus.

Engaged faculty and help student to become Ph.D. Candidate. Remove belonging and replace engagement. Once you engaged you will feel a sense of belong. 

Sense of belonging concept is fuzzy and not measurable. It is not an operational concept. Instead the focus should be on a more comprehensive first year experience.

Again goal is poorly articulated and trying to accomplish too many things, and the objectives are poorly aligned to the goal.

It’s difficult to answer the questions due to the troubling wording of the objectives and goals. Throughout the draft, the wording is very jargony and unnecessarily complex.

How about this—open the TSU food court and rec activities and the Bookstore on weekends? Have events on weekends. We are diverse, which is great. How are we “solidifying” the student choice? Benchmarks and goals are good, but how about real support for faculty diversity. How many departments are skewed male or white male? This should be made public. If deans keep on allowing hiring of non-diverse faculty, some departments will become more male and white male through like begets like recruiting.

We need more diverse faculty on this campus.

3.2 & 3.3 Benchmarks are not going to help; we aren’t there yet for things like that to help. First, the recruitment process needs to improve in order to get better faculty & staff. It takes ~5 months to come on board, but to day to finish the paperwork to separate. HR/DI cannot only have 2 recruiters for united employees & for MPPs. We are huge, and there are so many departments with various reqs opened. Our systems of operation need to improve. Good candidates are on the market for max 2 weeks. A lot of candidates that departments are interested in find a job before we get the final approval signature for a pay rate. We have had reqs for over 2 weeks waiting for Provost office/HR approval to be posted to the public. It takes too long to bring someone on board.
The school must remain committed to its values of diversity and inclusion in regards to its ability to foster any one student’s ability to successfully complete their desired degree. Students learning from professors they can relate to can be one of the ways of guaranteeing this. Ideological diversity is an important trait for any inclusive institution to have. Any metric developed to pursue a diverse campus MUST include attention to this detail—having a variety of personalities and viewpoints among professors pushes the student to examine their own views and guarantees a more-rounded professional.

Establish benchmarks for student, faculty, and staff satisfaction and adhere to a percent rate.

There is a pervasive culture of white masculinity at CSUF. The casual misogyny and open sexism that I have had to endure here is mind-boggling. This is compounded by the flight of women and faculty of color, whereby all senior positions are largely occupied by straight white men. The blind-spots that this structural inequality results in are glaring—why are we still relying on student evaluations of teaching when countless studies show these to be deeply flawed? Furthermore, CSUF lost all claims to support diversity when allowing Milo to speak at a prime location and prime time. How can we even pretend to support students when we allow a white supremacist to speak while shutting down any conversation about the CONTENT of his speech? Framing this as a free speech issue is a cowardly response when faced with the rising rates of hate crimes and the increased visibility of white supremacy and fascism. This was the most dis-heartening experience of my time here and has really made me question the institution’s commitment to diversity.

This university has shown over and over again that it does not care about retaining quality faculty. Simply putting it in a statement is meaningless. By the visible actions, the university has shown what it truly values and that is NOT the students and their success and it is NOT the faculty, diverse, talented or otherwise. / In addition, removing obstacles does not just mean this should turn into a diploma mill. We are churning out graduates who can not create simple cohesive sentences. We are giving diplomas to graduates who have no critical thinking skills. Yes, students should have access to free and low-cost materials and textbooks. No, they shouldn’t be able to avoid taking classes out of their major.
By increasing retention, students should still be prepared to meet the rigors of a challenging curriculum. At the community college level, I have seen retention initiatives lead to students passing courses without even understanding key concepts taught in the course. CSUF is already one of the most diverse campuses of the CSU system. Not much more needs to be done in that regard.

If going to focus on retention, please focus on goals that have to do with talent development and leadership empowerment initiatives. Talk to Mihaylo’s Gerard Beenen... Please!

I think we must find ways to turn the campus into a desirable location for interaction, instead of a commuter school.

Haggled that Goal 3 wording be changed to “first choice university” instead of “university of choice,” as CSUF is already a university of choice but needs to aspire to be a first choice university. / Objective 3.2: This objective is confusing in that it combines students, faculty, and staff, each of which has very different approaches to recruitment and retention and establishing benchmarks. / Objective 3.3: Reference to “year-three goals” is not clear and seems out of place.

As a faculty member, I find this goal extremely de-motivating. There is NO mention in any of these goals about creating a rich environment for faculty research (outside of support for staff/admin). If faculty don’t have university support for their research, the classroom suffers. It is a feedback loop. It needs to go beyond “retention” to address specifically what is causing faculty to leave and that is an environment that is not supportive of the research initiatives that gave faculty the passion to pursue their degrees and teaching in the first place. Rather you have a faculty overburdened with teaching, service, and advisement, continually moving further and further away from the very topics and ideas that bring passion to the classroom and university. Keeping this language out of the Strategic Goals is a sure-fire way to further demotivate faculty and send them searching for positions at other universities that value faculty research and writing as a pillar to outstanding and innovative instruction.

Objective 3: requires an end to tuition increase that price students out of continuing studies. This will not happen. / Objective 3.3 states goals for faculty and staff. Yet, in recent years the growth in upper Administration has taken excessive interest. Diversity in Administration should not be taken as diversity in “faculty and staff.”

This is an important goal, but if faculty is needed and there are no qualified diverse candidates, we still need the faculty! Searches should not be cancelled.
Diversity as mentioned here refers to racial and gender diversity, while entirely ignoring a diversity of ideas. An econ club on campus seeking a balance of ideas for a faculty debate was told that there were no conservative professors in the departments where one would think a diversity of ideas would be essential to a holistic view of diversity.

Diversity is an artifact of subjective goal and sometimes it is no difference of discrimination. / Diversity can be achieved in the cost of trading off some other values. / I recalled that affirmative action in Higher Ed had introduced some conflict or flaw which is violating its original purpose. / Diversity is good but can not be used as means when a personal interest is involved instead of the overall general good. / 

Goal 3: Solidify California State University, Fullerton as a university of choice for a diverse, inclusive, and global community......

I am one of the only white people in each of my engineering classes. I feel that the diversity is not equal. School talks about diversity, but then equality is not served? I try to study with people and they talk in Farsi or other languages making me unable to study with these people. Different ethnicities tend to study together. This is a fact.

Committees (recruiting, retention, search) need to include diverse faculty and be sure to compensate them appropriately for their service/time, so they are not being over-taxed by service work and end up not being able to be promoted/lost time for scholarly work; or are burnt out from being on too many committees. / Consult diverse faculty (even outside of the department) on where to recruit diverse faculty. / Salary needs to be competitive for diverse faculty to stay in so cal instead of going to other institutions.

Stop focusing so much on diversity and focus on providing a better learning environment and opportunities for students, we as students are here to learn and develop skills so I believe that should be top priority

There needs to be an institutionalized, campus-wide effort to promote an inclusive environment. Saying it in a mission statement is not enough. Optional one-time 2-hour diversity trainings are not enough. Mandatory semester-long diversity training at faculty, staff, and administrator meetings is a possible way to achieve this goal.
Very important Uncertain Very important Uncertain Very important Yes Very important Uncertain For goal 3, I think we can definitely get better. However, the continual loss of state funding is putting too much stress on our campuses. Faculty workloads have gone up dramatically in my near three decades here. There is less time to think and do research. If you want to still provide students with a quality education, and not all faculty will make this choice. As workloads go up, stress levels go up, which makes it a less desirable place to be. For objective 3, while a student’s sense of belonging is a very important indicator of retention, there are many other factors. What is our current retention rate for continuing students? What % increase are you hoping to obtain?

Faculty workloads have gone up dramatically in my near three decades here. There is less time to think and do research. If you want to still provide students with a quality education, and not all faculty will make this choice. As workloads go up, stress levels go up, which makes it a less desirable place to be. For objective 3, while a student’s sense of belonging is a very important indicator of retention, there are many other factors. What is our current retention rate for continuing students? What % increase are you hoping to obtain?

3. hard to respond with no percentage listed. I think for instance 0% might be double. 40% might be a different story. / 3.2- This is unclear to me. What might a benchmark be? and how will these benchmarks inform us for planning.

We need to define what ‘diverse’ means when we say ‘diverse students, faculty, and staff.’ Are we talking about skin color? Are we talking about gender? Are we talking about socioeconomic status? Are we talking about sexual orientation? Are we talking about ability? Are we talking about ethnicity? Are we talking about religious creed? Let’s be honest about what we’re looking for - if ‘diverse’ means skin color, then let’s just call it that. If we really want to take on a broader definition of “diverse,” then let’s define it and be honest about what it means. This is one of those things that people throw around - “Oh, we need to have a diverse faculty and staff!” but nobody is really talking about what that means and what that looks like.

3. I’m sure we can pick an achievable number / 3.2 & 3.3 - I am fully on board with improving/increasing diversity on campus and believe we should work to achieve that goal. I think the student body is already pretty diverse and it would be great if faculty and staff were as diverse as the students. However, much like with graduation rates, I don’t like assigning arbitrary numbers, so the definition of “benchmark” becomes very important.

What do you mean by broad? / The word broad is unclear and does not mean anything. / Remove the word broad. / Retention rates and University of choice and do not seem to support this statement.