

Mission Based Centers Six Year Plan - Spring 2019

Professor Andrea Grove

2019-02-20T23:18:35Z

The Center for International Affairs does not show up on this proposal because there was a ball dropped with getting questions answered by the former Provost. It is really unfortunate that things fell out the way they did.

Kirk England 2019-02-21T15:47:32Z

Hello Andrea,

Thank you for your comment as I'm sure others share the same concern. The idea was to leave a few of the Centers "as is" and to evaluate longer term needs at a later date. We should be able to incorporate a six year plan for the Center for IA and others soon. In the meantime, EU has submitted a proposal that may be able to leverage the expertise within the Center of International Affairs. Would be great to see both areas working together.

Monica Pereira

2019-03-15T23:26:13Z

The Four Pillars were the founding elements of CSU Channel Islands. We lure faculty here on the strength of these pillars: Internationality, Integrativity, Multicultural Engagement, and Community Engagement.

The funding afforded these pillar belies the amount programming and outreach they do. All four mission centers need to have funding commensurate with their contribution to the university community, and also to the community at large. Their directors need to be compensated appropriately, and provided with sufficient staff to uphold these pillars. I would not like to see them crumble.

Julia Baln, PhD

2019-03-16T19:35:37Z

A few notes:

1) It is stunning to me the degree to which the Mission Centers have increasingly been marginalized by administrators who have not understood their role, especially in relationship to WASC. When we started the centers and through the majority of my tenure as Faculty Director for the Center for Multicultural Engagement (2006-2015), Center Directors were invited to weigh in and even serve ex officio on many major committees and task forces as our responsibility was seen as one of keeping the mission front and center in all that we do. We played an important role in accreditation and in the broader campus discussions about what these elements mean and how we might better engage them as a campus. WASC spent substantial time with the Center Directors to weigh the degree to which we were keeping to our mission and the evaluators valued our work. The Centers also do a lot of important mission-centered faculty development work that seems under-acknowledged and, as we have grown, this work has taken more of our time. The university needs to review the role of the centers in relationship to both WASC and faculty development and either re-centralize them or faculty and administrators together need to decide on other ways to assure our mission stays front and center in faculty development and in all that we do.

2) Item 6 in the budget, a Supervisor/Manager/Assistant Director position for the EPIC-N program proposed by the Center for Integrative Studies, seems as though it should be a partnership with CCE as the kinds of MOUs that we need for student engagement in community projects is a substantial piece of work that the CCE offers.

3) Finally, it is important to note that the type of faculty development work and the student opportunities that the Centers engage in are all the types that increase student persistence and success and, are thus, central to the GI 2025.