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I. Introduction

Established in 1957, California State University, Fullerton is a public, regional comprehensive university that proudly serves an ethnically, culturally, and economically diverse student body. The University’s primary mission is to promote opportunity and social mobility by providing access to a high-quality affordable education to California residents seeking undergraduate degrees, graduate degrees, credentials, certificates, and those seeking to further their professional development through continuing education. Through experiences in and out of the classroom, Cal State Fullerton students develop the habits of intellectual inquiry and curiosity, prepare for challenging professions, strengthen relationships to their communities, and contribute meaningfully to campus life and society.

As the landscape of challenges in the field of higher education continues to shift, Cal State Fullerton has engaged in multiple strategic planning processes to reflect on our institutional history and set bold objectives for our future. One of these processes has been the development of this document, Cal State Fullerton’s first-ever Academic Master Plan (AMP). The AMP is designed to support and augment the University’s 2013–18 Strategic Plan, which established University-wide goals and objectives over a five-year period. The AMP, in turn, aims to ensure that the decisions we make and the actions we take toward accomplishing those goals—as well as goals established by future strategic plans—are aligned with our core values and long-term academic vision.

The final AMP encompasses the entirety of this document, including the Appendix. Section II lays out the background and context for the development of the AMP as well as the extensive excavation and articulation work performed by each of the four themed AMP subcommittees and the AMP Steering Committee. Section III presents the goals and objectives that shall provide guiding principles for how Cal State Fullerton can make decisions today that will keep us on track to fulfill our academic mission and achieve our strategic goals. The Appendix is comprised of the draft narratives submitted by each subcommittee summarizing the work done prior to October 2016.
II. Development of the Academic Master Plan

The Cal State Fullerton AMP is the product of a collaborative undertaking involving faculty, staff, administrators, and students that began in the spring of 2014. In its annual budget letter to the University president in May of that year, the Academic Senate’s Planning, Resource and Budget Committee (PRBC) recommended to President García that the University undertake the development of an AMP to provide a long-term framework for advancing the University’s academic vision. The PRBC noted that as Cal State Fullerton had already started to carry out its 2013–18 Strategic Plan, the campus needed to lay the groundwork for subsequent plans by articulating long-term goals and objectives for the University. In her fall 2014 convocation address, President García underscored the importance of the project, asserting that completion of the AMP was one of the highest priorities of her administration, a position she subsequently reaffirmed in her convocation addresses in 2015 and 2016. This document is the fruit of that commitment.

Laying Out the Framework

Following the PRBC’s recommendation, campus leadership turned to the task of laying out the process for writing the AMP and articulating a conceptual framework for the project. During the 2014–15 academic year, the Office of Academic Programs facilitated a discussion among the Council of Deans (COD), the chair of the Academic Senate, and the president of Associated Students, Inc. (ASI) on a proposed consultative framework for the development of the AMP. The President’s Advisory Board (PAB) reviewed the document and approved a new draft that was published to the campus for comments and suggestions and discussed with important constituent groups such as the Executive Committee of the Academic Senate, the ASI Board, the PRBC, COD, Council of Chairs, and others. The Office of Academic Programs integrated the comments received into a new version and presented it to the PAB, which formally approved the proposed “Framework for Drafting a Campus-Wide Academic Master Plan” (the Framework) in June 2015.

Conceptually, as described in the Framework, the AMP is intended to be a visionary document, not a strategic plan. The aim is to identify those aspects of the University toward which the institution should direct future strategic plans. Rather than identifying specific measures to be accomplished on a defined timeline, the AMP looks to the long-term and sets forth the values and ideals that should inform the more concrete planning that guides the University’s day-to-day operations. Those who participated in preparing the plan were, therefore, charged with thinking boldly about where we would like CSUF to be in ten to fifteen years. While recognizing those constraints and obstacles that limit just how high we can reach, participants could be expansive and even daring in their vision.

Beginning the Work

Over the summer of 2015, in consultation with the Division of Academic Affairs and the Academic Senate Executive Committee, the president identified and appointed the members of the AMP Committee, comprised of a steering committee and four subcommittees. The Framework contemplated a process in which four subcommittees—made up of faculty members, administrators, students, staff, alumni, and community members—would each answer one of four sets of questions posed in that document. Those questions addressed fundamental issues: what and where shall we teach; whom and how many shall we teach; who shall do the teaching and how; and what do we require to support the educational mission. The Framework proposed that each subcommittee would consist of approximately
ten members and suggested some of the kinds of roles members might currently be fulfilling in the campus community. Each subcommittee was to be chaired by a representative of the campus leadership on the administrative side of the institution (deputy provost, associate vice president for Academic Programs, vice president of Student Affairs, vice president of Administration and Finance) and a member of the Academic Senate Executive Committee on the faculty side. The Steering Committee, whose members were appointed by President García, included the eight co-chairs of the subcommittees as well as the provost and vice president for Academic Affairs and the chair of the Academic Senate, the vice president of Information Technology, the president of ASI, a second student recommended by the provost and the president of ASI, the chair of the PRBC, and (effective summer 2016) the assistant vice president for Strategic Initiatives. The steering committee was to coordinate the work of the subcommittees and serve as the interface between the PAB and the broader campus community and external stakeholders.

Work in earnest began in the fall of 2015 as the subcommittees gathered information and initiated their discussions of the issues before them. Early in this stage the subcommittees were expanded to ensure that each included at least one faculty from every college. Throughout this phase, participants focused on the questions and considerations that had been proposed as driving the development of the AMP, reproduced below for each subcommittee.

**Subcommittee 1—Programs, Degrees, and Outcomes**  
*Focus Questions:* What will we teach? Why will we teach what we teach? Where will we teach? What outcomes will guide our work?  
*Possible Considerations:* Cal State Fullerton program history; Irvine Campus; regional workforce needs; contributions to the public good; maintaining and enhancing campus commitment to a liberal arts and professional education; aligning general education with discipline needs; community college bachelor’s degrees; degree completion programs; current program strengths and areas of opportunity; interdisciplinary collaborations; assessment of educational effectiveness; undergraduate and graduate programs; living labs (e.g., Arboretum); experiential learning through High-Impact Practices (HIPs); community responsibility/civic participation.

**Subcommittee 2—Students**  
*Focus Questions:* Whom will we teach? How many students will we teach?  
*Possible Considerations:* CSU Academic Sustainability Plan; enrollment management; outcomes-based funding trends; demographics; enrollment growth; undergraduate and graduate students; freshmen and upper-division transfers; SB1440; SB 850; resident and nonresident students; international students; impaction; student success metrics.

**Subcommittee 3—Faculty and Pedagogy**  
*Focus Questions:* Who will teach? How will we teach?  
*Possible Considerations:* Faculty diversity, including international faculty, contingent faculty, and faculty of color; on-ground, hybrid, and online courses; community engagement; High-Impact Practices; teaching, scholarship, and service; tenure-track and contingent faculty; faculty development; course redesign; workloads; tenure-track density and hiring plans; graduate assistants.

**Subcommittee 4—Infrastructure and Resources**  
*Focus Questions:* What is a “model public comprehensive university”? What are the challenges we face? What policies/procedures/practices/facilities would we need to have/change/adjust/modify to support/maintain/sustain the AMP?
Possible Considerations: California Master Plan; internal and external forces of accountability; space optimization (including scheduling); private–public partnerships, including endowments; fiscal and physical resources; modernization of facilities; distinguishing Cal State Fullerton from other public comprehensive universities; capitalizing on the University's geographic location and high-quality programs to increase domestic and international visibility.

By October 2015, an AMP website had been published; this website became the primary source of information and updates for the campus community. Faculty, staff, administrators, and students were encouraged to make comments regarding the development of the AMP via an anonymous, confidential survey link available on the website. In addition, the co-chairs of the Steering Committee sent out periodic updates in the form of emails to the campus community (these updates were also published on the website).

The subcommittees were charged with completing a draft by February 2016, and the Framework had contemplated completion of the AMP by June 2016. However, the scope of the work and the need for more extensive conversation about the AMP prompted a revision to the timeline and a new completion date in December 2016.

Campus Discussion of the Academic Master Plan
By mid-February 2016, each subcommittee had produced a preliminary draft of their respective section. On March 18, the Academic Senate and Academic Affairs held a retreat dedicated to the AMP, providing a rich opportunity for members of the campus community to engage in an open discussion of progress to date. To facilitate conversation, the AMP Steering Committee distilled the subcommittees’ drafts into brief outlines that, along with the full drafts, were posted on the website and included in the retreat materials. Retreat participants were invited to (1) individually produce a free-write reaction to the AMP and (2) collectively discuss each of the draft reports from the subcommittees. The energetic engagement of all attendees was critical to this stage, and the importance of this process was apparent in the uniformly positive assessment of the retreat afterwards.

First and Second Drafts
The hundreds of comments generated at and following the retreat were captured electronically and were both posted on the website and delivered to the individual subcommittees to guide their preparation of the first complete draft of the AMP, which was posted to the “First Draft” tab of the website and shared with campus on April 29. This draft comprised four separate documents (one from each subcommittee) along with all comments and feedback that had been received to that point.

Throughout April and May, each subcommittee revised the draft narratives that had been shared with the campus in February, prior to the retreat. By late May, second drafts were submitted by the subcommittees. Although the original plan had been to post those documents on the website in the spring, the steering committee concluded that the results of this work would be communicated better if the separate reports were integrated into a single document, a project that was completed over the summer. The second (integrated) draft, as the document was identified, was posted on the AMP website on August 17.

The Final Draft
By mid-summer of 2016, three key participants in the AMP development—the associate vice president for Academic Programs, the deputy provost, and the provost—had left Cal State Fullerton for positions
at other institutions. This change provided an opportunity for a fresh look at the AMP and a refocusing that has led to the final form of this document.

To provide a clearer direction to the AMP, the co-chairs of the steering committee met with the subcommittee co-chairs in early September and charged them with articulating one to two goals each with four to five objectives that should constitute a distillation of their subcommittee’s vision of the issues they had addressed. Those goals and objectives were drafted during September 2016 and submitted to the steering committee in early October.

After modest redrafting to provide a more uniform style, these goals and objectives were shared with the campus community and the Academic Senate for further discussion. In addition, the co-chairs of the steering committee emailed the campus community regularly throughout the fall semester with updates on progress and invitations to make comments via the AMP website. The final AMP document was submitted to the Academic Senate Executive Committee and the President’s Cabinet in early December, and was submitted to President García for her approval and signature on December 5, 2016.
III. Goals and Objectives

The Goals and Objectives listed below are not in order of priority.

GOAL 1 - Offer a comprehensive, dynamic, and outcome-driven curriculum that prepares students for success in academic, personal, and professional lives and for engagement with local and global communities.

Objectives

1. Provide a liberal arts curriculum that lays a foundation for a fulfilling life with a broad general education base, interdisciplinary opportunity, and specialized majors that encourage free expression and together require critical thinking, problem solving and analytic skills, effective written and oral communication, quantitative reasoning, information literacy, cultural competency, global awareness, and professional preparation.
2. Provide a broad array of undergraduate and graduate programs that enable students to acquire the knowledge, skills, and technical expertise required to succeed in diverse professions, including those that do not yet exist, and to be engaged citizens of both local and global communities.
3. Develop and utilize technological and pedagogical innovations to enhance campus and off-campus resources and opportunities, incorporate high-impact practices, and provide an educational environment that addresses the whole student.
4. Develop outcome-based strategies that focus on promoting student success including achieving not only learning outcomes and progress toward degree, but also success after graduation and personal fulfillment.
5. Support faculty research and scholarly and creative activities, as well as professional development opportunities relevant to the staff, that enhance the efficacy and applicability of technological and pedagogical innovations.
6. Identify and build learning experiences that take students out of the classroom

GOAL 2 - Support student success by employing multiple facilities, locations, and technologies to (a) maximize access, learning impact, and experience, and (b) offer students opportunities for a variety of learning experiences in terms both of locations and teaching modalities.

Objectives

1. Create and maintain learning environments on both the main and satellite campuses that maximize students’ opportunities to choose from an array of teaching modalities such as experiential high-impact learning, face-to-face, hybrid, and online environments.
2. Provide regular, comprehensive data sets to properly trained staff and faculty in colleges, departments, and relevant operational units. Data sets would be disaggregated by student level, demographic information, student work and family commitments, enrollment patterns, and unit load patterns.
3. Ensure that enrollment management plans, retention and graduation initiatives, scholarly environments, and comprehensive support services are implemented strategically and that program-specific needs are targeted.

**GOAL 3** - Ensure not only access to admission, but also access to success as an active, well rounded student and an engaged citizen.

**Objectives**

1. Provide student access to a stimulating scholarly environment. Balance ensuring access to as many students as possible with maintaining the rigor and quality of our programs by providing faculty and staff with the resources—facilities, support, and funds—needed to sustain and improve faculty-student collaborative research, scholarship, and creative activities; high-quality and innovative instruction and pedagogy; and effective co-curricular programming and support.
2. Actively, intentionally and strategically recruit students. Focus on surrounding communities and continue finding strategies to strengthen the diversity of our increasingly college-ready student body.
3. Increase retention and timely progress toward degree. Strengthen collaboration across campus to offer students the resources they need to safely navigate college life and become successful as they make progress toward graduation. Provide comprehensive support for students through robust systems of advisement and mentoring. Serve the needs of students at a more decentralized level, helping them develop the ability to manage academic, employment, and personal workloads; organizing peer-to-peer mentoring activities; and teaching them “life skills” like networking and career planning.
4. Identify and remove barriers to success and close the opportunity and achievement gaps by streamlining bureaucratic processes for students, faculty, and staff.

**GOAL 4** - Encourage and support faculty unit employees and staff to engage in ongoing professional development consistent with the teacher-scholar model—an important part of maintaining high-quality and rigorous teaching as well as effective institutional structures—and recognize that participation throughout review and evaluation processes.

**Objectives**

1. Align (faculty, staff, and other relevant) policies, procedures, expectations, and resources to ensure that faculty and staff are engaged and supported throughout their careers.
2. Provide professional development opportunities and resources that enable faculty and staff to engage students in quality learning opportunities using evolving best practices that are adapted to various disciplines and modes of delivery, with an emphasis on opportunities targeted at traditionally underserved student populations.
3. Support faculty and staff development for all types of research, scholarly, and creative as well as service activities consistent with the teacher-scholar model and in recognition of staff members’ role in such activities.
4. Support and encourage faculty and staff pursuits in teaching and learning innovations as well as institutional effectiveness and service.

**GOAL 5** - Recruit and retain diverse faculty who are experts in their discipline, while also possessing a broader perspective, and who provide high-quality and diverse learning opportunities for CSUF’s evolving/diverse student body, and recruit and retain the diverse staff essential to this mission.

**Objectives**
1. Maintain concerted efforts to improve the campus-wide tenure density with the aspiration to be at or above the CSU average tenure density level, and regularly re-assess faculty tenure-density as it relates to the University’s access mission and our institutional capacity for teaching, scholarship, and service.
2. Monitor and adjust the diversity of faculty and staff to reflect the changing student population and global community that we serve.
3. Ensure that recruiting processes and hiring goals include criteria that examine candidates’ teaching skills, potential, and experience emphasizing pedagogy and modalities aligned with delivering quality learning experiences to all students.
4. Continue to build a culture of inclusivity and identify additional strategies to strengthen retention.

**GOAL 6** - Enhance policies and procedures to optimize utilization of existing physical, financial, human, and information technology resources.

**Objectives**
1. Assess the current usage of all types of available physical space to identify, develop, and implement objective metrics to ensure the optimal and efficient use of University resources (in consultation with representative stakeholders).
2. Develop, adopt, and implement consistent procedures for determining and allocating university-, college-, and department-level usage of current instructional spaces, including space required for online and hybrid instruction.
3. Strategically develop and apply guidelines for a funding model that provides sufficient funds for instruction and institutional support while also enabling colleges and departments to selectively allocate funds for focused strategic initiatives or performance-based funding.
4. Create a methodology for allocating technology resources that helps to design, fund, acquire, and maintain infrastructure for provision of high-quality instruction.
5. Actively and strategically identify and apply procedures and practices that ensure all staff are able to fulfill their potential.

**GOAL 7** - Develop plans for future growth and sustainability of physical, financial, human and information technology resources.

**Objectives**
1. Based upon goals established under other themes of AMP, develop 5-year and 10-year plans to enhance and increase our infrastructure for academic, general, and student use.

2. Recommend and adopt strategies to secure funds for new programs, infrastructure projects, and technological innovation that support teaching, research, and institutional effectiveness.

3. Assess future FTE targets/guidelines set by state and CSU policies; review facility and staff needs in meeting those targets/guidelines to determine the optimal use of existing space; and identify any necessary additions or modifications.

4. Align the Physical Master Plan with the Academic Master Plan to facilitate prioritization of those needs and determine sustainable growth that will be aligned with CSUF admissions practices.
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Appendix A: AMP Framework Document

**Cal State Fullerton: Division of Academic Affairs**
**Framework for Drafting a Campus-wide Academic Master Plan**
*Approved in June 2015 by the President’s Advisory Board*

What is an Academic Master Plan, and why does Cal State Fullerton need one?

In the 60 years since its inception, Cal State Fullerton has grown in size and stature to become a national engine of access and opportunity. The University’s 2013–2018 Strategic Plan sets forth bold objectives for amplifying those achievements to become a model public comprehensive university, nationally recognized for exceptional programs and student success.

This is no small task, and in the spring of 2014, the University’s Planning, Resource, and Budget Committee (PRBC) recommended to President García the development of an Academic Master Plan (AMP) to provide a long-term framework for advancing the University’s academic vision. In her fall 2014 convocation address, President García stated that completing the AMP was one of the highest priorities of her administration.

This AMP—the first in Cal State Fullerton’s history—will keep the University on track to achieve its strategic goals by answering, among many other questions: What will we teach? Whom will we teach? Who will teach? How will we teach? How well will we teach?

Faced with a shifting landscape of challenges in the field of higher education—including access and completion, college cost and affordability, and public questions about the value of a college education—Cal State Fullerton will need both map and compass to maintain and assert the vitality of our institution and mission. Together, the Strategic Plan and the AMP will keep the University’s course true.

**Committees**

The development of the AMP will be led by a steering committee and four subcommittees composed of faculty members, administrators, students, staff, alumni, and community members.

The steering committee will coordinate the work of the subcommittees and serve as the interface between the President’s Advisory Board and the broader campus community and external stakeholders. The steering committee will be chaired by the provost and will include the following members: Chair, Academic Senate; President, ASI; Chair, PRBC; Deputy Provost; AVP, Academic Programs; Vice President, Student Affairs; Vice President, Administration and Finance; Vice President, Information Technology; representative, ASI; chairs of subcommittees (4).
Each of the four subcommittees will be composed of approximately 10 members appointed by President García, including a minimum of four faculty members jointly recommended by the provost and the chair of the Academic Senate and two students jointly recommended by the provost and the president of ASI. Each subcommittee will focus on a discrete area of the AMP and an effort will be made to ensure that all constituencies are adequately represented in the work.

**Subcommittee 1—Programs, Degrees, and Outcomes**

*Focus Questions:*
What will we teach? Why will we teach what we teach? Where will we teach? What learning outcomes will guide our work?

*Possible Considerations:*
Cal State Fullerton program history; Irvine Campus; regional workforce needs; contributions to the public good; maintaining and enhancing campus commitment to a liberal arts and professional education; aligning general education with discipline needs; community college bachelor’s degrees; degree completion programs; current program strengths and areas of opportunity; interdisciplinary collaborations; assessment of educational effectiveness; undergraduate and graduate programs; living labs (e.g., Arboretum); experiential learning through High-Impact Practices (HIPs); community responsibility/civic participation.

*Possible Members:*
Faculty and student representatives; AVP, Academic Programs; designee, Extended Education; alumni member; member, Philanthropic Board; representative, North–South County; college dean; representative, community colleges.

**Subcommittee 2—Students**

*Focus Questions:*
Whom will we teach? How many students will we teach?

*Possible Considerations:*
CSU Academic Sustainability Plan; enrollment management; outcomes-based funding trends; demographics; enrollment growth; undergraduate and graduate students; freshmen and upper-division transfers; SB1440; SB 850; resident and nonresident students; international students; impaction; student success metrics.

*Possible Members:*
Faculty and student representatives; Dean, Students; community college president; designee, Institutional Research and Analytics (IRAS); AVP, Enrollment Services; representative, InterClub Councils (ICC); Director, Freshman Programs; designee, Online Programs/Instruction; designee, Special Populations; representative, Disabled Student Services; Director, Graduate Studies; AVP, Student Affairs; college dean; high school superintendent; designee, International Programs.

**Subcommittee 3—Faculty and Pedagogy**

*Focus Questions:*
Who will teach? How will we teach?

*Possible Considerations:*

Faculty diversity, including international faculty, contingent faculty, and faculty of color; on-ground, hybrid, and online courses; community engagement; High-Impact Practices; teaching, scholarship, and service; tenure-track and contingent faculty; faculty development; course redesign; workloads; tenure-track density and hiring plans; graduate assistants.

Possible Members:
Faculty and student representatives; Director, Faculty Development Center (FDC); Director, Academic Technology Center (ATC); Director, Graduate Programs; Common Core specialist; designee, Library; designee, Online Programs/Strategy; designee, Human Resources, Diversity and Inclusion (HRDI); college dean; designee, Center for Internships and Community Engagement.

Subcommittee 4—Infrastructure and Resources

Focus Questions:
What is a “model public comprehensive university”? What are the challenges we face? What policies/procedures/practices/facilities would we need to have/change/adjust/modify to support/maintain/sustain the AMP?

Possible Considerations:
California Master Plan; internal and external forces of accountability; space optimization (including scheduling); private–public partnerships, including endowments; fiscal and physical resources; modernization of facilities; distinguishing Cal State Fullerton from other public comprehensive universities; capitalizing on the University’s geographic location and high-quality programs to increase domestic and international visibility.

Possible Members:
Faculty, staff, and student representatives; designee, Facilities; designee, Administration and Finance; designee, PRBC; designee, Information Technology (IT); AVP, Research, Creative Activities and Technology Transfer (RCATT); designee, University Advancement; designee, Auxiliary Services; college associate dean; college dean.

Proposed Timeline

Spring 2014
— PRBC formally recommends the development of an Academic Master Plan in a memo to President Garcia (May 22, 2014): “The PRBC supports the Provost’s proposal to lead the various stakeholders represented on the President’s Advisory Board in the development of an Academic Master Plan. The plan should be completed on or before the end of the 2015–16 academic year and provide answers to the following fundamental questions: What will we teach? Who will teach? Whom will we teach? How will we teach? How many students will we teach? Answers to these questions will guide our enrollment management plans and provide a basis upon which to establish measurable targets for our tenure-track and contingent faculty hiring plans.”

Fall 2014
— President García identifies the AMP as a top priority in her August 18, 2014 convocation speech: “Using the first goal of the University’s Strategic Plan as a springboard, we will develop
the University’s first-ever Academic Master Plan, which will provide answers to the fundamental questions driving all the short- and long-term visions for the institution, e.g.: What will we teach? Who will teach it? Who will we teach? How will we teach? How many will we teach? Answers to these questions will guide our enrollment management and provide a basis upon which to establish measurable targets for our tenure-track and contingent faculty hiring plans. Moreover, it will revolutionize and guide our expansion of data-driven decision making; and mandate cross-campus collaboration between Academic Affairs, the Council of Deans, Student Affairs, our WASC steering committee, and IT.”

— Office of Academic Programs facilitates Council of Deans (COD) discussion on a proposed consultative framework for the development of AMP; chair of Academic Senate and president of ASI participate in the discussion. COD approves draft framework.

**Spring 2015**
— President’s Advisory Board (PAB) reviews document summarizing framework approved by COD, makes recommendations, and approves new draft to be used to request comments from the campus community.
— Campus comments on proposed framework via survey and meetings with key constituent groups (Academic Senate Executive Committee, ASI Board, PRBC, COD, Council of Chairs, and others). Office of Academic Programs integrates comments into new version and presents to PAB.

**Summer 2015**
— PAB reviews new version of proposed framework, revises, and approves for implementation.
— President, in consultation with PAB, appoints members of steering committee and subcommittees.

**Fall 2015—Spring 2016**
— Steering committee and subcommittees refine scope of work, develop internal calendars, and begin the drafting process.
— Subcommittees present draft reports to the Office of Academic Programs, which in turn integrates them into the first draft of the AMP.
— Steering committee iterates with subcommittees as needed on first draft and sends the result of this effort to the PAB.

**Spring 2016**
— PAB reviews draft AMP and approves for distribution to campus community and relevant external constituents for further comment.
— Office of Academic Programs integrates comments, and steering committee makes final edits before sending to PAB for final recommendation to the president.
— President evaluates AMP for approval. Consults as needed.

**Summer 2016**
— President approves AMP.
Communications

The AMP website (http://www.fullerton.edu/amp/) will be the primary source of information and updates. At designated points in the development process, the campus community will be invited to share feedback and comments about the framework for creating the AMP as well as feedback on the draft AMP itself. Additionally, updates will be distributed periodically, keeping the campus informed of progress and important milestones in the drafting process.
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Appendix C—Subcommittee 1: Programs, Degrees, and Outcomes

Subcommittee Charge
The Programs, Degrees, and Outcomes Subcommittee is charged with preparing responses to the following questions: What will we teach? Why will we teach what we teach? Where will we teach? What outcomes will guide our work? Thinking about what we will teach could include (but is not limited to) such matters as aligning general education with the disciplines while maintaining breadth; interdisciplinary collaborations; the connection between the campus commitment to the liberal arts and professional education; our current program strengths and areas of opportunity; and the balance between undergraduate and graduate programs. These reflections would be set within the larger framework of Cal State Fullerton’s program history. In addition to these internal elements, there are a variety of external forces—such as the demand for degree completion programs and the emergence of community college bachelor’s degrees—that may be relevant. Discussion of why we will teach what we teach could include consideration of contributions to the public good, commitment to instilling community responsibility/civic participation, and regional workforce needs, among other topics. Considering where we will teach could include reflecting on the current plan for two-plus-two programs on the Irvine Campus as well as using other places as living labs (e.g., the Arboretum). Discussion of outcomes could look not only to assessment of educational effectiveness and the meaning, quality and integrity of degrees, but also the effect of experiential learning such as High-Impact Practices.

What Will We Teach and Why Will We Teach It?
California State University, Fullerton (CSUF), an institution in the California State University state-wide educational system, will offer students a high-quality education that prepares them to reach their full potential in their personal and professional lives. Our state support and self-support undergraduate and graduate curricula are designed to educate and empower students to be informed, ethical, engaged, socially responsible citizens who chart their own course, shape the future, and contribute to the public good. A CSUF education will prepare students to respect diversity of thought and ideas and work effectively in diverse communities. Students will learn to succeed in evolving, dynamic, and competitive regional, national, and global environments. With direct access to cutting-edge research and creative activity, students will acquire knowledge that is current and applicable.

Our comprehensive liberal arts curriculum will be based on a breadth of courses in General Education and specialized majors and will promote core competencies. In all fields of study, students will acquire necessary skills including critical thinking, clear and effective written and oral communication, creative thinking and problem solving, analytical skills, cultural competence, quantitative reasoning, and information literacy. These skills will be developed and applied through a wide range of disciplinary and interdisciplinary perspectives and will
prepare students to enter an evolving workforce and respond to challenges with resiliency and flexibility.

Our curriculum will embrace innovation. It will respond to changes in academic disciplines and address the evolving needs of a diverse, technologically driven global society. Our classrooms will incorporate technologies to enhance the learning experience. Our curriculum will integrate teaching and research to provide an effective learning environment informed by the latest and most up-to-date findings. We will encourage and reward innovative approaches to teaching challenges by exploring new teaching methods and utilizing student-to-student teaching opportunities, supplemental instruction, and graduate student teaching and mentoring. We will strive to be dynamic and responsive to changing student demographics and to developments in scholarly and creative activities and within academic disciplines.

CSUF will provide students with intensive learning experiences that take them out of the classroom and beyond traditional teaching methods. We will promote experiential learning through study abroad and study away programs, field classes, field trips, and internships. We will create opportunities for active and collaborative learning through research projects and creative activity, and by pursuing opportunities that strengthen collaboration between the University and the community.

Undergraduate and graduate courses of study at CSUF will provide rich student-centered academic and intellectual environments. We will offer an engaging and effective learning environment in all settings: face-to-face (in-class), hybrid, and online courses. Our curriculum is informed by learners’ abilities and interests while advancing and promoting collaborations within and across disciplines. We will create a variety of learning spaces for students to gather inside and outside the classroom in order to establish communities and share experiences. To attain educational goals, the University will develop better coordination within and across CSU campuses and will eliminate roadblocks to intra- and inter-college collaboration.

CSUF will encourage independent thought and promote freedom of expression. Students will acquire lifelong skills for effective citizenship and civic responsibility. We will support a concern for social justice, a desire to respond to community needs, and a strong sense of personal and professional character. Additionally, students will gain an understanding of values, ethics, cultural awareness, and humanitarianism. Students will develop global awareness, a cosmopolitan world view, and an appreciation for different viewpoints, cultures, and values.

Promoting community stewardship and local connections, CSUF will provide a wide variety of internships, research and creative projects, and other activities to strengthen the bonds between CSUF and local communities where most of our students come from and will continue to live. We will build partnerships with alumni, communities, and organizations in the regional, national, and international arena. The CSUF curriculum will be responsive to professional, workforce, and community-based needs.
Where Will We Teach?
CSUF delivers a high-quality comprehensive education that supports student success by leveraging facilities, locations, support services, and technologies to maximize access, impact, and experience. CSUF will create multiple learning environments that include flexible, technology-rich, collaborative-style university classrooms, labs, and studios at main and satellite campuses, external classrooms, face-to-face and online environments, internships, and other community-based experiences. Learning environments will also include the field and regional, national, and international venues. Within these learning environments, we will maximize the interaction among students and teachers and increase opportunities for experiential, high-impact learning.

Additionally, to ensure maximum access and success, the teaching environment will be adaptable to the available resources and the needs of students, faculty, and the curriculum. The locations of learning will offer students a choice of locations and teaching modalities that maximize their learning.

CSUF currently utilizes a wide variety of locations, venues, and modalities to achieve its academic mission. These include the following:

The Main Fullerton Campus
Academic programming is primarily offered at the campus in Fullerton, with most courses offered in a traditional classroom setting. Face-to-face instructional spaces range from auditorium-style lecture halls, midsized lecture-discussion rooms, seminar-style classrooms, instructional support laboratories and studios, and digital facilities. The campus will continue to develop the University as a living lab that utilizes campus resources and space for teaching. The campus also includes common public spaces for educational events, faculty offices, study and research space, student recreational facilities, and a limited number of residential facilities. Main campus facilities also include sports, theater, and music-oriented venues, as well as ancillary support facilities to accommodate athletic– and co-curricular–based educational programs and competitions. Future considerations include technology-rich and collaborative-style classrooms that support group work and student interaction.

Satellite Campuses and Facilities
CSUF utilizes and continues to leverage satellite campuses and facilities, such as Irvine, Garden Grove Center, Grand Central Art Center, Santa Ana, the Fullerton Arboretum, the Cooper Center, the Desert Learning Center, and Tucker Wildlife Center, to provide access and maximize learning. CSUF’s Irvine campus is established as a secondary physical environment that provides teaching venues similar to the main campus though fewer in number and with intentional scope. The Irvine campus and other facilities provide more “local” access to courses and instruction as well as focused instruction in discipline-specific areas (e.g., Grand Central Art Center in Santa Ana, the Tucker Wildlife Center, and the Desert Learning Center).
Moving forward, decisions regarding such facilities will include considerations of resources available at satellite campuses and facilities, availability of full degree programs at satellites, innovative and unique programs, incentivizing faculty to teach at satellite locations, making course scheduling convenient for students to use satellite locations, and ensuring core services are equivalent.

**Online Environment/Distance Learning**
CSUF also provides a robust and intentional online environment through both Fullerton-based programming and participation in the CSU online system. As the popularity and demand for online course and degree programming increases, CSUF will meet those needs by providing more online course and degree offerings, and an increased emphasis will be placed on faculty preparation, support, and expertise in online learning and upon preparing students for success in online courses and degree programs. Additionally, as technologies develop and become more affordable, systems will be explored for use in the broadcast of courses from the main campus to remote sites to extend our reach.

**Community Partnerships, Engagement, and Service Learning**
As noted by CSUF’s Carnegie community engagement classification, significant numbers of students also participate in field-based service-learning, practicum, and internship experiences. These experiences include public–private partnerships and relationships with business and arts institutions for enhanced learning opportunities. Relationships with governmental units, for-profit organizations, and non-profit organizations provide students with opportunities for political involvement, working with local governments, and interaction with legislators. Additionally, community engagement is an important component in achieving CSUF’s goals for attracting, retaining, and matriculating underrepresented students. Links to ethnically based and/or oriented organizations are currently utilized and will continue to be utilized as they provide visibility, support, and opportunity for students and for participating businesses and organizations.

**Higher Education Partnerships**
CSUF maintains many relationships with local high schools and community colleges. We will continue to develop innovative, collaborative programs with these partners such as the 2+2+2 cohort model in which students are selected during the last two years of high school and matriculate into curriculums based on career interests (currently Accounting and Nursing programs are following this model). Additionally, these linkages have led to teacher preparation programs that provide students with teaching practicum opportunities based on higher education partnerships.

**International Educational Programs/Study Away, Study Abroad**
To achieve its strategic goal of preparing students to participate in a global society, CSUF will be committed to providing students and faculty with a global perspective and an in-depth understanding of diverse cultures and peoples. To achieve this mission, CSUF will continue to develop high-quality international education programs and opportunities for students and
faculty. These programs provide students with the perspectives, skills, and abilities to be competitive in a global workforce economy. Furthermore, these programs need to be constructed and designed in a flexible manner to expand opportunities for students—including those who may be challenged by cost, time, work, and family commitments—to have affordable and enriching study away, study abroad, and international studies experiences. For example, current efforts have focused on building affordable, short-term study abroad and study away opportunities for students who are not able to participate in traditional semester or academic-year programs. From a faculty perspective, opportunities for international research and collaboration will be developed as well as training programs to assist faculty with curricular integration, developing and facilitating study abroad and study away programs, and aligning these experiences with designated learning goals.

What outcomes will guide our work?

Student Outcomes

The discussion of student outcomes that guide our work is framed by consideration of the following questions:

- Did they achieve mastery of the learning outcomes for the programs they enrolled in?
- Are they making progress toward degree completion? (e.g., time to degree, retention rate)
- Did they complete or graduate? (e.g., 4-year and 6-year graduation rates)
- What are they doing upon completion? (e.g., placement rate, graduate school, workforce)
- Are they contributing to the public good? (e.g., functioning members of a democratic society)

Knowledge, Skills, Resilience, Collaboration, Advising

Within their majors, we will focus on students achieving mastery of their subject matter: its heritage, its nuances, its most recent developments. We will support students in the development of a breadth of knowledge that they can draw from critically and creatively to effectively solve problems and adapt to changing work, personal, social, and cultural environments. They will write and speak about what they have learned with authority and confidence. Students will develop and strengthen skills that can be transferred to the needs of their careers or professions. They will graduate with both theoretical and applied knowledge and will acquire the ability to seek out solutions to novel concerns and to update their intellectual capacities to suit the needs of changing circumstances.

Students will understand and articulate why what they do is important to society and they will thoughtfully and effectively engage with work, cultural, social, and personal environments cognizant of the impact and outcomes of their choices and actions.
Students will develop strategies to cope with both success and disappointment. They will learn from failure and adversity, understand the parameters of taking risks, and think creatively when responding to challenges.

Students will work effectively within a group. They will be willing and able to pull their weight in a given task and be confident in their contributions. They will work with others collaboratively and collegially toward a common purpose by sharing their ideas, accepting those of others, and subjecting all ideas to thoughtful critiques.

CSUF will be more acute and more diligent regarding students’ individual unique talents and where students should be investing their time, energies, and money. Each student is unique, and it is that uniqueness that is their greatest asset. If a student is not passionate about what they are doing, why are they doing it? We must be willing, as experts in our fields, to better identify students who are struggling and advise them in finding what suits them. As a university, we can support programs and approaches that meet students where they are.

CSUF will maintain a robust GE program with the understanding that students benefit from having a broad-based education and complementarity between liberal arts and applied degree programs.

**Progress toward Degree and Completion**
The University will study, develop, and support retention strategies and students’ progress toward degree by removing institutional roadblocks, but will also remain cognizant of and supportive of the range of time frames within which CSUF students progress through their degree programs.

**After Graduation**
In considering students’ post-graduation outcomes, quality of life, contributions to the public good, a sense of purpose, civic engagement, career satisfaction, and other qualitative and quantitative measures will offer indications of student success.

**Faculty Outcomes**
The University will develop programs and infrastructure to support innovations in teaching, the incorporation of high-impact practices and experiential learning, and curricular development.

The University will support faculty research and creative activity with the goal of improving scholarly and creative productivity and the acquisition of external funding.

**Institutional Outcomes**
The University will support, record, and celebrate stewards of place programs, including community partnerships, partnerships with other universities, international partnerships, and increased connections with alumni.
The University will consider quality of life, satisfaction, and sense of purpose of employees of the University.

Additional Notes, Questions, Concerns, Data Needs
As an institution, we will support and study post-graduation outcomes by:

• Having alumni/outreach programs that keep in contact with alumni
• Surveying alumni about quality of life, community engagement, etc.
• Keeping track of alumni contributions to the region, both financially and through community involvement
• Gathering business data that show alumni contributions to the economy (e.g., CSUF alumni contribute $100,000,000 per year to the general Orange County economy through business ownership, spending, and contributions to educated workforce...)

Additional Resources Needed
What We Need to Support the WHAT WILL WE TEACH Section

• Data on effectiveness of students doing research projects—do they have better graduation rates, time to graduation, retention
• Data on effectiveness of internships
• Data on study abroad/study away effectiveness
• Data on courses that involve true high-impact practices
• National data on the effectiveness of GE courses
• Information on technology predictions that could help guide us in a “master” plan.
• Are there data on what major employers want comprehensive universities to include in curriculum? For example, are academics (us) and industry leaders (employers) on the same page? There must be reports about what employers think is important.
• Research on what works at institutions with student demographics similar to ours.
• Info on: What are the trends for student satisfaction with education, success, and career optimization?
• Info on: What types of educational models, nationally, appear best suited to personal, community, and economic success of students?
• Info on: Study abroad, study away programs, field classes, and internships. What do we do now? What is lacking and in what areas do we need to expand/focus?
• Info on: Business surveys—what are the local workforce needs? What types of skills employers value/seek? What can we do to bridge that gap?
• Local reports:
• Articles that explore and provide evidence to reinforce the value of a liberal arts education
• News articles on liberal education from AAC&U
• http://www.xconomy.com/boston/2015/10/07/renaissance-futurism-liberal-arts-for-the-21st-century/
• http://www.starnewsonline.com/article/20151031/ARTICLES/151039930
• http://www.forbes.com/sites/mattsymonds/2015/11/30/5-reasons-a-liberal-arts-education-rocks/#73cf572e1f02
• http://chronicle.com/article/What-Im-Reading-In/235493
• http://www.kentucky.com/opinion/op-ed/article64126557.html
• Employer surveys that indicate the value of liberal arts skills to the workplace

To support the “WHERE WILL WE TEACH?” section:
• Add information about trends in classrooms of the future.
• Insert data on current and projected use and capacity at each location. Also include current number of online, hybrid, and face-to-face classes compared to CSU and national statistics.
• Add community engagement and internship numbers.
• Insert data from survey on study abroad and faculty experiences/needs.
Appendix D—AMP Subcommittee 2: Students

October 13, 2016 Update of AMP Subcommittee 2 Report

The Students Subcommittee has revised this document in light of the information received from the campus community, Academic Affairs/Academic Senate Retreat, and our further discussions. While we have made an effort to include everything, there are still areas where the subcommittee would like to add data and discussion. We have tried to indicate these in the report with text in brackets and [highlighting].

We strongly feel that effective decision-making requires and will continue to require comprehensive data about our students. Beyond their academic performance, the more details gathered about the demographics, needs, and behaviors of our students, the better equipped we will be to provide adequate support services and predict future trends. Comprehensive data must be made available so that enrollment management plans, retention and graduation initiatives, scholarly environments, and holistic support services can be implemented strategically. Additionally, data should be disaggregated by undergraduate, post-baccalaureate, and graduate student status as well as by other variables (e.g. ethnicity, parent’s education level, Pell Status etc.) to ensure program specific needs can be targeted.

To that end, the following data should be made available to properly trained staff and faculty in Colleges/Departments on an on-going and/or annual basis, as appropriate:

1. Application data (i.e. application, rejection, acceptance)
2. Enrollment data (including available characteristics of students accepted but not enrolled)
3. Average SAT/ACT and ELM/EPT test scores
4. Incoming GPA (high school and two-year college)
5. Gender
6. Previous institutions attended
7. Retention and Graduation rates
8. Achievement gaps (ethnicity, gender, parental education)
9. Degrees granted
10. Ethnic breakdown
11. Financial aid awards and average amounts (including Pell and State grants)
12. Characteristics of students
   a. Work hours
   b. Family commitments
      i. Children
      ii. Dependent parents/grandparents
   c. Student course enrollment patterns (i.e., class schedules)
13. Unit load patterns (full-time or part-time, specific unit loads, and patterns of enrollment over time for individual students).
Charge
The Students Subcommittee is charged with preparing responses to the following questions: **Who are we?** **Whom have we taught?** **Whom are we teaching?** **Whom will we teach?** **How many students will we teach?**

![Orange County State College admissions report for fall 1959 semester.](image_url) (The running admissions report for the fall 1959 semester. There were 452 students in 41 classes that semester. Taken from The Fullerton Way: 50 Years of Memories at California State University, Fullerton)

**Question 1: Who are we?**
Established in 1957, California State University, Fullerton is a public, regional comprehensive university that proudly serves a student body that is ethnically, culturally, and economically diverse. We are a Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI) and are also the destination for many first generation college students. We aspire to combine the best qualities of teaching and research to create a safe and welcoming environment where all students have the opportunity to succeed. Our actively engaged faculty and staff work in close collaboration to expand knowledge, promote learning, and guide students on their individual paths to degree.

CSUF's primary mission is to promote opportunity and social mobility by providing access to a high-quality affordable education to California residents. Through experiences in and out of the classroom, students develop the habits of intellectual inquiry and curiosity, prepare for challenging professions, strengthen relationships to their communities, and contribute meaningfully to campus life and society.

**Questions 2&3: Whom have we taught? Whom are we teaching?**
CSUF has 55 undergraduate and 54 graduate programs including two doctoral programs. As of January 2016 more than 250,000 students have graduated from CSUF. From 1985 to 2015, the enrollment has increased and, as of fall of 2015, the campus had almost 39,000 students enrolled in undergraduate and post-baccalaureate programs (e.g., credential, masters, and doctoral) with 56% being female, and 2,410 international students from 78 nations.
The racial/ethnic diversity of the campus has increased dramatically. The CSUF student population reflects our local service area and our mission to provide education to our local service area.

* American Indian Students are ~ 0.1% of the student body at CSUF in fall 2015

In fall of 2015, populations of graduate and undergraduate students differ somewhat in racial/ethnic diversity.

* American Indian Students are ~ 0.1% of graduate and undergraduate students CSUF in fall 2015

We NEED More Information About Student Characteristics Here:
- Type and amount of financial aid;
- On and off campus work/hours etc. The most current data are from NSSE and are old;
- Number of dependents (spouse, children, parents, grandparents);
- Number of units per semester;
- Distribution of units (e.g. Night, Day, Weekend);
- Probation, DQs, Good Standing;
- Number of students in self-support programs]
Incoming Students
The total number of students applying to our undergraduate programs has increased but we have not been able to steadily increase the number we admit for first time freshman or transfers.

The grade point averages and other indicators (e.g. SAT, Mathematics and English proficiency) of incoming undergraduates have steadily increased since fall of 2011. This trend is evident in both transfer students and incoming freshman.
The percentage of women being admitted has remained relatively constant but the percentage of minority students being admitted has increased for transfer and for first time freshman.
Where do they come from?
CSUF undergraduates primarily come from Orange and Los Angeles County, reflecting our service area. For first time freshmen the area includes all Orange County high schools and Chino, Corona/Norco, Walnut, Whittier, and Alvord school districts (see the map on the right). The local service area for upper-division transfers includes all orange county community colleges. CSUF’s graduate programs (data are from fall 2014) recruit from a much larger area and include a good number of out of state and international students.

Applications and Enrollments - Graduate Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Enrolled</th>
<th>Admitted Not Enrolled</th>
<th>Not Admitted, Enrolled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fall 09</td>
<td>2930</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>1385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fall 10</td>
<td>3745</td>
<td>1150</td>
<td>1672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fall 11</td>
<td>3158</td>
<td>1297</td>
<td>1416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fall 12</td>
<td>3336</td>
<td>1307</td>
<td>1533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fall 13</td>
<td>3258</td>
<td>1328</td>
<td>1702</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Location of Previous Institution - Undergraduates

- % Previous Inst. in Orange County (transfers)
- % High School in OC (FTF)
- % High School in LA (FTF)

As the overall enrollment of graduate students has increased, a greater portion of students entered CSUF with a bachelor’s degree from another institution. Between 2009-2013, CSUF bachelor’s degree was 28%-30% of entering master’s degree-seeking students. International students comprise much of the change.
Graduate Student Admission Qualifications

Based on admission data from 2009-13, only 28-30% of matriculated graduate students earned their bachelor’s degrees at CSUF, indicating that our graduate programs are broadly attractive within and outside the region. Most of our graduate programs utilize a comprehensive approach for evaluating applicants to their programs. Thus, undergraduate grade-point averages and performance on standardized tests often carry less weight in admissions decisions compared to other characteristics such as experience, accomplishments, or potential for contributions to the field. High-demand programs are necessarily more selective.

Graduation Rates

In recent years, our graduation rates have improved for first-time freshmen, upper-division transfer students and for master’s students.
Achievement Gaps
Achievement gaps in graduation rates have lessened in recent years as graduation rates have improved for undergraduates and for master’s students based on ethnicity. CSUF also has a persistent but shrinking gender gap. In particular, the 6-year graduation rates are persistently low for black males (fall 2009 cohort – 38.1%). In addition, there are also persistent gaps based on parents’ education. [Need to add information on SES/PELL Status to this information and interaction between parent’s education & ethnicity]

*the number of American Indian students is very small and thus their graduation rates vary a great deal .

enlarge y axis.
The fall 2015 enrollment and program data for each of the colleges is below and changes in enrollment for the colleges are below for graduate programs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Undergraduate Degree Programs</th>
<th>Undergraduate Students</th>
<th>Graduate Degree Programs</th>
<th>Graduate Students</th>
<th>Post-Baccalaureate, Credential, or Certificate Programs</th>
<th>Post-Baccalaureate, Credential, or Certificate Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering and Computer Science (ECS)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3455</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1445</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (EDUC)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and Human Development</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5510</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>898</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business and Economics (MCBE)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8249</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities and Social Sciences (HSS)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6458</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>780</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Sciences and Mathematics (NSM)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2571</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications (COMM)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3463</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts (ARTS)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2142</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>31848</strong></td>
<td><strong>53</strong></td>
<td><strong>5490</strong></td>
<td><strong>132</strong></td>
<td><strong>890</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 4: Whom will we teach?

Aspirational

We will continue to teach California residents seeking a high-quality degree that prepares them for flexible professional careers and/or advanced study, including an increasingly high percentage of historically underrepresented students, as well as both domestic non-resident students and international students. We work toward teaching the students of tomorrow, responsive to changing needs in careers, new technologies, and regional demands.

Our students are current and future leaders, who are and will be engaged socially, politically, and civically in our communities. Current students at CSUF are enrolled in a variety of programs at the undergraduate and graduate level. The significant diversity of our students and their career and personal goals mandates that CSUF continue to provide a pathway to a vocation, career, teaching credential, advanced education in traditional research-intensive settings (e.g., PhD-granting institutions), entry into professional programs (e.g. Ed.D.; J.D.; M.D.) as well as civic, community and political engagement.

CSUF will remain committed to ensuring broad access to higher education, to supporting student success and to maintaining high expectations for student academic performance. We must provide faculty and staff with the resources needed to sustain and improve faculty-student collaborative research, scholarship, and creative activities; high-quality and innovative instruction and pedagogy; and effective student affairs co-curricular programming and support. It will be increasingly important that CSUF ensures not only access to admission, but access to success. This should not be confused with any effort to narrow access to only or primarily those students who “fit” or who are likely to succeed based on the quality of their prior education. Instead, CSUF should ensure that it provides the curriculum, pedagogy, supports and services necessary to ensure that all students admitted can achieve the highest
possible academic outcomes. Further this means that CSUF recognizes the significant assets that a diverse student body brings to the educational environment and remains open to the cultural richness and change that will enhance our development and transformation into a truly multicultural institution.

Cal State Fullerton also recognizes its larger responsibilities toward providing education not only for the private benefit of a few, but for the public good of all. In this vein, CSUF recognizes the leading role we can play in ensuring increased equity in levels of education; increased equity in levels of income and wealth; and diminishment of poverty across all demographic groups in the communities we serve.

Access
As college going rates increase across the country, we strive to provide access to a diverse and ever-changing student body in order to effectively serve our community. At the same time, we must be mindful of potential students who may have previously been admitted but do not meet current admission thresholds. And finally, whatever plans are put in place must be dynamic and responsive to the changes in what will constitute a representative student body in the future (e.g., increase in 2nd generation and mixed ethnicity students). Lastly, we must be cognizant of how limitations in access impact the success and choices of students who could have come to CSUF.

Outreach, Recruitment, and Admissions
Admission decisions must adjust with each applicant pool and will be determined by variables which are often not necessarily within the control of our campus. Extraneous variables include the state budget, CSU Chancellor’s Office initiatives/goals, legislative programs, commitments to partner agencies, federal mandates, etc. Given that student demographics vary considerably across colleges, and given the potential for increasing accountability for these demographics, consideration should be given to colleges playing a more active role in student outreach, recruitment, and admissions.

Remediation/Preparedness
Although CSUF has experienced a recent increase in the proportion of students beginning the fall semester as college ready, retention rates of first-year students do not appear to be affected to the same degree. Thus, while we continue to address the need to ensure our students are college ready upon entry to CSUF, we must also continue to be aware of the factors that affect a student’s first year experience and beyond. Student orientations paired with first year experiences will provide the support network first year students need to safely explore college life and become successful second year students. CSUF will also be mindful of the needs of our transfer population, especially during the first year transition. Transfer students will be provided resources to meet their unique needs while respecting the college experience they possess when they enter CSUF. Preparedness must also be considered for the post-baccalaureate and graduate student. Resources such as writing and research support, alternatives to traditional classroom programs, professional and personal counseling will be provided as need is determined.

Expectations Student Performance & Quality Education
CSUF is committed to providing high-quality, rigorous, and transformational programs that include access to high impact practices such as faculty-student collaborative scholarship and creative activity, service learning and internships. Faculty are actively involved in maintaining and developing curriculum as well as assessing the outcomes of their programs. CSUF programs will elevate our communities and provide opportunities for students to engage with campus life and with the community locally and abroad. Providing access to as many students as possible should be balanced with maintaining the rigor
Acknowledging the Challenges Our Students Face

[We need to gather more data to verify portions of this section]

In discussions of student success, we must be aware of the challenges faced by our students and how those impact the decisions students make about the academic workload. These include:

- Off-Campus commitments such as work, dependents, commuting etc. that can take up to 20 or more hours per week
- The financial challenges students and their families face
- Student homelessness/hunger
- Being a first-generation college student
- Scheduling


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Total Enrolled</th>
<th>Enrolled with No Day Classes Scheduled (includes TBD courses)</th>
<th>Enrolled in Scheduled Evening Classes Only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UG Lower Div</td>
<td>10,774</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UG Upper Div</td>
<td>22,268</td>
<td>3023</td>
<td>1222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postbacc Cred</td>
<td>469</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postbacc other</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Against this backdrop, CSUF must be prepared to serve the needs of students at a more decentralized level, with access to information on the importance of managing academic, employment and personal workloads with the goal to attain a GPA of 3.0 or higher. In the same vein, the future CSUF student must have continued and possibly expanded access to student academic support services (e.g. tutoring, supplemental instruction) as well as peer-to-peer mentoring activities which should be invaluable to a first generation college student. Education on additional college “life skills” such as interacting with and utilizing professors as a resource, career planning, and networking. The future CSUF student will need spiritual, emotional and psychological support.

Opportunities and Challenges

- Local service area: Our local area is larger than most impacted if not all impacted CSU campuses.
- CSUF receives the least amount of funding per student from the CSU system.
- Maintaining a balance of a student body that contains first-time freshmen, transfer students, and post-baccalaureate students; all of these populations have unique needs.
- Increasing access to under-served and under-resourced student populations while maintaining academic rigor almost certainly will result in an increased need for student support and faculty and staff development, and the commensurate funding to support them.
- External conditions that may influence a demographic change in our student population; we are not the CSUF of 1957.
- Competing economic needs for the state and society’s priority for higher education.

Question 5: How many students will we teach?

Based on the number of students that apply, CSUF has become a destination campus within our region for many prospective students. However, as we become a “school of choice,” we should not neglect our mission as an engine of change for individual students, their families, and our society. We feel we can maintain our commitment to educational access by focusing resources to better support students and faculty in ways that focus on student and faculty success while maintaining, or even increasing, the rigor and perceived value of a CSUF degree. By leveraging innovative approaches to faculty-student scholarship and creative activity, teaching, and student and faculty support, including new instructional modalities and pedagogies, we can preserve both access to quality higher education and student success. Rather than viewing our student body statically, we will view it dynamically, with an emphasis on supporting students toward successful completion of their degrees, rather than on the number of students enrolled at any single moment or how long it takes them to get their degree.

Although our mission is clear, the resources to meet the mission are not readily available or forthcoming. Growing the undergraduate programs at CSUF, although desperately needed, is unlikely to be possible at a scale that will substantially reduce the number of CSU eligible students turned away.
without a much greater investment by the state or the students or both. Undergraduates that are turned away from CSUF are unlikely to go to an institution that has a higher graduation rate and lower cost of attendance.

Only 14% of Cal State Fullerton’s 38,950 current students are [verify post-bac and credential numbers] graduate/post-baccalaureate/credential students. There is growing demand for workers with a graduate-level education, authorizations by the State of California for CSU campuses to offer degrees in new fields, and the growing number of graduate programs delivered through hybrid and online formats. All of these will increase the number of students wishing to enter graduate programs at CSUF.

While growing the undergraduate and graduate programs is a priority, without increases in funding and staffing (faculty, staff, and administrators) and improvements to facilities, CSUF will not be able to increase access to a high-quality educational experience and meet the demands of our local service area and the needs of prospective graduate students from across the region and nationally.

Opportunities and Challenges

- With close to 39,000 students it appears to be we are at or a little over capacity for the facilities we have.
- We pride ourselves on being as inclusive as we can within the restrictions of the CO; however, our campus infrastructure has not kept up with the growth of our student populations. We need to find a manageable cap so that we can focus on improving our services and campus.
- Strategic enrollment management; increasingly becoming a first-choice campus and focusing on recruitment and yield in shaping our enrollment.
- Outcomes-based funding trends; how can we resist becoming a higher education mill of degrees vs. focusing on high-quality teaching? How can we increase the value of a CSUF degree and maintain or enhance our reputation as a rigorous institution?
- Changing state demographics, hiring trends and job market
- Increasing number of post-baccalaureate programs
- Lastly, we believe this question is very much interrelated to how will we teach (i.e., online education)
- We anticipate that enrollments in graduate programs will increase, especially in applied programs that use online or hybrid to offer courses to off-campus students. To the extent that these programs attract international students, programs must consider increased requirements for infrastructure, staff and support services for these students’ needs.
- There will be pressure to increase costs of attendance, which could potentially reduce access to students with fewer resources. CSUF must continue to be affordable and accessible to students across different demographic groups and explore ways to reach groups that are currently under-represented in specific programs and campus-wide.
Appendix E—Subcommittee 3: Faculty and Pedagogy

Note: In addition to the narrative below, the subcommittee wishes to include the following link to faculty data as compiled and updated by the Office of Institutional Research and Analytical Studies: http://www.fullerton.edu/analyticalstudies/faculty/

Subcommittee Charge
The Faculty and Pedagogy Subcommittee is charged with preparing responses to the following questions: Who will teach? How will we support faculty to provide high quality learning opportunities for our students throughout their careers? Thinking about who will teach could include looking at issues of faculty diversity, including international faculty, contingent faculty, and faculty of color; the role of graduate assistants; concerns about tenure-track density and hiring plans; and the relative proportion of tenure-track/tenured faculty and contingent faculty. The analysis also could examine the fundamental question of what we mean by teacher-scholar at Cal State Fullerton. What should be the mix of teaching, scholarship, and service? How can we foster teacher-scholars at Cal State Fullerton? As for how will we support faculty to provide evidence-based high quality learning opportunities for our students, the subcommittee could consider the delivery of teaching: mix of face-to-face, hybrid, and online courses; faculty development support; high-impact teaching practices; course redesign; and workloads, among many other issues.

How Will We Support Faculty Throughout Their Careers to Provide High-Quality Learning Opportunities for Our Students?
“Learning is preeminent at California State University, Fullerton. We aspire to combine the best qualities of teaching and research universities where actively engaged students, faculty and staff work in close collaboration to expand knowledge.” —University Mission Statement (para. 1)

California State University, Fullerton places a strong value on teaching and scholarly/creative activities as shared and worthy endeavors. These aspirations are founded in the belief that our institution should build and sustain opportunities for teaching and scholarly/creative activities to be developed and explored as a community effort. Furthermore, these efforts should include both those rooted in the disciplines and those that encourage cross-disciplinary development of expertise. Believing that the integration of teaching and scholarly engagement benefits students and faculty, we embrace the Teacher-Scholar model: “The dash between teacher and scholar is meant to be a link, not a line of demarcation. Scholarship and creative endeavors enrich our teaching and are essential to instruction of the highest quality. Participation in scholarly communities keeps us current, connects us to wider worlds, and reminds the teacher of the learner’s experience: mastering new material; meeting with resistance or rebuffs; receiving and responding to criticism; and finding ways to communicate effectively to different groups” (Ruscio, 2013, p.27). Adopting the Teacher-Scholar model in this document does
suggest that faculty must assume the title. They remain free to call themselves Professors, Instructors, Educators, Scholars, Lecturers, Librarians, Counselors, or any other appropriate title of choice. The term Teacher-Scholar represents our aspiration for a synergistic combination of teaching and scholarly activity. This will look very different depending on the role and responsibilities of an individual faculty member.

The Teacher-Scholar

Teacher-Scholars are engaged educators committed to providing equitable access to high-quality learning opportunities for all students by blending teaching and scholarship into practices that enhance student success. Scholarly and creative activity is fundamental in the life of an academic. Appropriate support for scholarly and creative activities from the University, at all levels, is essential in helping faculty achieve their intellectual goals, meet the requirements for promotion and tenure, and train students in and for their respective disciplines. Scholarly and creative activities, when appropriately supported and valued, synergistically inform and enrich teaching and service. The importance of scholarly and creative activities to student success should also inform the answer to the question asked in the next section of this document addressing “Who Should Teach?” As tenure-track faculty benefit from a stronger and more continuous level of support for scholarly and creative activities over the course of their careers at CSUF, increasing the percentage of faculty on the tenure-track would allow the University to better meet the needs of Teacher-Scholars, and to maximize the benefits that scholarly and creative activities hold for student success.

Boyer (1990) called for the “need for a more inclusive view of what it means to be a scholar—a recognition that knowledge is acquired through research, through synthesis, through practice and through teaching” (p. 24). In the context of a large comprehensive university, scholarship is multifaceted. We, therefore, need to adopt an expanded, inclusive definition of scholarship adapted from Boyer’s framework. Our vision of scholarship is interconnected with teaching and service. It can be broadly defined to include pure research, integrative and collaborative research, applied studies, and the scholarship of teaching and learning.

Research has shown that engaged scholarship helps to create environments that attract faculty of color and women in underrepresented fields (Ellison & Eatman, 2008). This work clearly aligns with American universities’ current movement toward becoming “stewards of place” [American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU), 2002]. According to the AASCU, “The publicly engaged institution is fully committed to direct, two-way interaction with communities and other external constituencies through the development, exchange, and application of knowledge, information, and expertise for mutual benefit” (2002, p. 9).

Scholarship of the Teacher-Scholar

Teacher-Scholars integrate the various aspects of their work into holistic endeavors. They combine a commitment to excellent teaching with scholarly/creative engagement so that each activity strengthens and supports the other. The specific ways teaching and scholarship/creative
activities are synergistically combined will be different for each faculty member and grounded in the development of his/her particular interests, abilities, and opportunities.

The scholarship of discovery encompasses the traditional definition of research and creative activities. It is the search for new knowledge, the discovery of new information and new models, and the sharing of discoveries through scholarly publication and creation. Some typical examples of this type of scholarship are an article published in peer-reviewed, ranked publications; books or book chapters authored or edited; original works of art created, produced, and exhibited; conference and symposia contributions and organization; and work produced for non-academic audiences.

The scholarship of integration synthesizes knowledge from different sources. It can present an overview of findings on a research topic. It can bring findings together from different disciplines in the search for convergence. It can identify trends and see knowledge in new ways. Examples of this type of scholarship include professional development workshops, literature reviews, presentations of research at conferences, non-academic publications that address discipline-related concerns, and meta-analyses (contrasting or combining results from different studies).

The scholarship of application discovers ways that new knowledge can solve real-world problems. It makes connections between research and practice and identifies new intellectual problems that arise from the act of application. In doing so, higher education serves the needs of the broader community. Examples of this type of scholarship include consulting activities in field or industry, support or development of community activities in the field, formal development and/or oversight of practice partnerships that connect students with the field/industry, the application of theory in the field to real-world problems, the development of centers for study or service, and media contributions. Examples from CSUF include a variety of types of community engagement (on or off campus): study away courses with community engagement impact, academic internship coordination, teaching service-learning courses, neighborhood-based participatory research, and reciprocal partnership development with the community that involve teaching/research/service to impact community.

The scholarship of teaching and learning uses discovery, reflection, and inquiry about student learning to advance the practice of teaching. It recognizes that teachers and scholars are learners and that teaching and learning is a communal activity. Examples of this type of scholarship include the development of new or substantial revision of courses; design of new programs; discovery of innovated teaching strategies; publication of teaching materials or textbooks; and technical, procedural, or practical innovations made clinically or professionally.

Pedagogy of the Teacher-Scholar
Teacher-Scholars implement teaching and learning practices that have a strong research base of supporting student success. Although other practices continue to arise from research, five core practices have decades of evidentiary support, regardless of instructional modality.
Teacher-Scholars maintain positive affect and relationships with students. They demonstrate passion for the subject matter and for learning. They develop and display respect and positive rapport with students, and they sustain frequent interactions within and outside of class. In this vein, Teacher-Scholars demonstrate faith in their students’ ability to learn by demonstrating high expectations and support to achieve those expectations. As a final example of their positive affect, Teacher-Scholars demonstrate immediacy via their instruction using strategies appropriate for varied instructional venues.

Teacher-Scholars focus pedagogical efforts on student learning outcomes. They provide clear and appropriate structure for the course and lessons, and center the structure based on the goal of maximizing student learning outcomes. They ensure that pedagogical activities are dedicated to provide students with feedback on their level of performance as related to the outcomes. They engage both formative (i.e., ongoing data gathering on student learning in a course aimed at guiding immediate pedagogical adjustments) and summative (i.e., data collection on student learning aimed at measuring student proficiency or mastery of knowledge and skills typically at the conclusion of a course) assessment methods to accurately gauge students’ grasp and challenges of the learning outcomes, and use the findings to improve instructional efforts.

Teacher-Scholars strive for clear instruction. They achieve instructional clarity with careful attention to their verbal and nonverbal messages. They actively employ signposting strategies such as preview, review, internal summaries, and transitions. They employ analogies and provide rich input using text, speech, images, stories, and other vehicles that support students’ interest and deep processing of the content.

Teacher-Scholars employ principles of active learning. Motivation and adult learning theory inform their practice. They seek to build the need to know and purpose for learning. They activate and support prior knowledge. They assist students in building metacognition, or awareness of and control over their own learning. They appeal to students’ sense of novelty and interest and seek immediate application of content. Finally, Teacher-Scholars encourage collaborative learning in service of students’ successful mastery of content and development.

Teacher-Scholars are committed to ensuring equitable access to high-quality learning opportunities for all students. They reflect “a commitment to the success of all students, including those from historically underrepresented groups” (CSUF Strategic Plan, Goal 2) and those with permanent or temporary disabilities. They design and deliver accessible instruction, employ multiple modalities, support appropriate levels of student autonomy, and encourage students to become responsible for their own learning. Teacher-Scholars recognize that culture is central to all learning and they employ culturally responsive teaching strategies (e.g., positive perspectives of parents and families, communication of high expectations, learning within the context of culture, and student-centered instruction). Through intentional reflection, Teacher-Scholars are committed to continuously improving the learning opportunities they design and deliver. They are always aware that they are preparing students for “participation in a global society” and need to be “responsive to workforce needs” (CSUF Strategic Plan, Goal 1). Lastly,
Teacher-Scholars value and solicit students’ perspectives about what and how they learn and use those perspectives to inform their work.

**Recommendations**

1. **Support for—and expectations of—the Teacher-Scholar should be clearly and transparently defined in University, college, and department policies and procedures.**

   Support for the Teacher-Scholar is a collective endeavor of the entire University, including the faculty members themselves. It is multifaceted and spans their entire professional life at our University. We should endeavor to incorporate the Teacher-Scholar model into the fabric of policies and procedures throughout our institution. The work of scholarship and creative activities varies across our colleges, departments, and programs. Colleges and departments need to define how the Teacher-Scholar model applies to instructors who serve in different capacities, such as lecturer (part-time and full-time), tenure-track, and tenured faculty.

   Expectations of the mix between teaching, scholarship, and service should be clear, transparent, and consistent with state legislation, system-negotiated contracts, and executive orders. The University, colleges, and departments need to publish the balance between teaching, scholarship, and service expected, and these expectations need to be consistent with each other and the Teacher-Scholar model. These expectations also need to be inclusive of the different facets of the role for each type of faculty. Evaluation, promotion, and retention criteria should be consistent with these expectations and support innovative pedagogy and taking instructional risks. These expectations need to include tenured faculty in regards not only to “keeping current” in their discipline but also to professional development that maintains their ability to provide high-quality learning opportunities to students.

   Support for the Teacher-Scholar starts with recruitment. Qualifications and selection criteria for faculty hiring should reflect the Teacher-Scholar model, and University, college, and department expectations. We should recruit and hire faculty who match our model of the Teacher-Scholar, including a philosophical commitment to teaching and continual development as instructors.

2. **Faculty development support for all types of scholarship and creative activities should be provided.**

   The University, colleges, and departments should offer both professional development and support that advance and recognize all types of scholarship in the Teacher-Scholar model (pure research, integrative and collaborative research, applied studies, and the scholarship of teaching and learning). In order to continue to effectively support scholarly and creative activities on campus, the committee recommends the following:

   - Establish an undergraduate and graduate research opportunities center that promotes student research/scholarship and develops student leadership, personal, and professional skills (see CSUMB Undergraduate Research Opportunities Center and chapter by O’Donnell et al., 2015, Undergraduate Research and Its Impact on Student Success for Underrepresented Students). The center should be well staffed and have a prominent physical presence on campus dedicated to students and be explicitly linked
to other on-campus resources. By establishing a committee of program directors from currently funded undergraduate research programs, the center would reduce redundancy present across funded programs, build resources, and provide a forum for cross-disciplinary communication and community. The center would also help coordinate research events on campus (e.g., Research Day, NSM ICC Research Symposium), again developing additional opportunities and reducing redundancy on campus.

- Identify ways faculty can engage in scholarship that helps distribute workload—e.g., combine scholarship with teaching (supervising students as they develop their scholarly and creative activity skills).
- Maintain and expand internal support of seed grants (e.g., Junior, Senior Grants) used to generate preliminary data (usually required in order for proposals to be competitive for federal or philanthropic funding).
- Continue to develop and maintain efficient and easy-to-navigate guidelines in the grant support offices on campus (both pre- and post-award).
- Maintain and provide institutional data, granting histories, and facilities information for proposals.
- Expand mentoring and professional development for faculty in writing grants, and expand assistance in grant proposal review prior to submission.
- Encourage efforts rooted in the disciplines and those that encourage cross-disciplinary development of teaching expertise. Examples might include departments that share materials through digital communities, departments where faculty meet informally to discuss teaching strategies within certain courses, and departments where it is the norm for faculty to visit each other’s classes.
- Recognize the scholarship of teaching and learning through which faculty gather evidence related to their teaching effectiveness and analyze efforts that lead to continuous teaching improvement. Department personnel standards should include options for faculty to experiment with new pedagogies without jeopardizing their performance evaluation.
- Maintain and expand evolving library collections and services to support faculty, staff, and student teaching, learning, and research needs.

3. Course schedules should increasingly offer flexibility in modality, scheduling, and location. *Technology is a given, not a debate.* “The Internet is a necessary component of our personal, educational, and professional lives” (OLC, UPCEA, & WCET, 2016). Over the last 50 years, changes in student characteristics (e.g., age, socioeconomic status, family responsibilities) and the use of educational technologies have altered the learning experience. For many of our students today, classroom-based learning creates scheduling and financial burdens that limit access and impede successful completion. Technology-mediated education greatly expands opportunities in higher education. Current middle school and high school students use more technology in school. They expect technology to play an influential part in their educational experience and consider it essential for career success.
Online enrollment is growing faster than overall enrollment. Nationally, online enrollment is growing an estimated six times faster than higher education enrollment. One out of seven students enroll exclusively in online courses. At any one time, one out of four students is enrolled in an online course. In the last four years, CSUF’s enrollment has increased about 8 percent while enrollment in online course sections has increased 73 percent. It is assumed that this growth will continue and that this growth impacts both faculty and student support services.

Online learning is a continuum. According to the U.S. Department of Education (2016), “online learning” refers to an instructional environment supported by the Internet. An online learning activity can be synchronous or asynchronous, independent or collaborative. It is generally assumed that online learning takes place with a physical separation between the instructor and student and that there is communication and interaction between the teacher and students and between students. Online learning can be used to supplement traditional face-to-face classroom instruction; can be blended with face-to-face classroom instruction into a hybrid format; or can be used exclusively in a fully (100 percent) online course or program. Faculty, departments, colleges, the University, and the CSU system have varying amounts of input into where on the continuum course sections, courses, and programs are positioned.

Flexibility is desirable. Prior to relatively recent technological developments, most teaching was performed either face-to-face, typically in a classroom (traditional), or orchestrated at a distance through prepackaged study materials students worked on independently (distance education). Students gained time and distance independence at the cost of interaction with their instructor and other students. The Internet and new educational technologies have made the traditional trade-off between independence and interaction no longer necessary. In the national educational technology plan (U.S. Department of Education, 2016), it was recommended that, “…colleges, and other post-secondary education institutions develop and implement learning resources that exploit the flexibility and power of technology to create equitable and accessible learning ecosystems that make all-the-time, everywhere learning possible” (p.83). Our delivery of instruction should not be constrained by the industrial model used 50 years ago.

When feasible, students should have options in learning modalities, scheduling, and locations. Ideally, different course sections (with the same student learning outcomes) scheduled in the same semester should offer a variety of scheduling options and modalities. Programs should offer flexibility in course offerings. This flexibility not only benefits students and faculty, but also increases efficiencies in the use of University physical facilities.

4. Delivery of instruction should ensure equity of access. All students should have access to the same learning opportunities. Student learning experiences should be based on high-quality instructional principles. We should strive to ensure the effectiveness of the experience across modalities. Learning should be social and humanistic, and connect the student to a larger community. Instruction should be well designed, student focused, and aesthetically pleasing (CSU Commission for Online Education, 2015).
We should be as agile as possible in providing support services. Students and faculty must have access to a set of intuitive, highly reliable, well-supported tools, while keeping costs to students as low as possible. Given the mobility expectations of our students, tools should be available on the broadest practical range of devices and make best use of evolving technologies. Students should have access to resources and support online comparable to what they receive face-to-face, such as library, advising, enrollment, and career-placement services. Support services must ensure accessibility to learning and teaching for all students and faculty, including those with disabilities.

5. Faculty development support for teaching needs to be provided.
As mentioned in the previous section addressing support for the Teacher-Scholar, all faculty need support for their personal and professional development including CSUF students who teach (e.g., GAs and TAs), lecturers (full-time and part-time), and tenured/tenure-track faculty. The needs are different at different stages in faculty career development, such as those who are new to the University, midcareer faculty, and instructors of long standing. In recognition of the strong value our institution places on teaching as a shared and worthy endeavor, this section addresses the vision of a faculty commons and its support for faculty in teaching. We envision a “faculty commons” as a destination designed to support all faculty in their professional growth and promoting exploration, innovation, and community.

Professional development needs to be flexible and personal. Faculty should be provided high-quality professional development opportunities in, among other topics, course design/redesign and pedagogy tailored to their needs. This professional development should consist of training, individual consulting, and support. Offerings should be flexible and allow faculty choices of modality and schedule. Training and support needs to include compliance with ever-changing federal, state, CSU, and CSUF policies concerning teaching. Best practice guides in all aspects of teaching should be made available to faculty. To ensure all students have access to engaging, effective learning opportunities, all professional development in teaching should incorporate high-impact practices (HIPs) and the best practices of instructional design, including Universal Design for Learning (UDL) and the use of open educational resources (OER).

Faculty require a neutral space to support collaboration, exploration, and innovation.
Teaching is most effective when it is a collaborative effort that supports experimentation, reflection, and continuous improvement. Faculty, regardless of rank and whether they are full- or part-time, require access to both physical and virtual spaces where collaboration can occur. Resources and services are needed to facilitate collaboration both within and across content areas.

Cultural competency training needs to be available to faculty. This training should provide reflection and appreciation of the complex relationships that various factors such as gender, ethnicity, race, sexual orientation, religion, and class bring to student learning experiences. It is important for faculty to understand the student populations they serve and how to adapt their teaching methods to meet the cultural needs of the students they teach. Strategies for
intentional inclusion in a variety of modalities needs to be explored along with creating greater personal awareness of the faculty’s own social cultural location and identities and how these impact their teaching.

**Ongoing training and support for use of technology in teaching is required.** “The conversation has shifted from whether technology should be used in learning to how it can improve learning to ensure that all students have access to high-quality educational experiences” (U.S. Department of Education, 2016, p.5). Any teaching technology acquisition should be accompanied by a training and support plan that ensures faculty are prepared to integrate the technology effectively into their instruction. Trainings should provide faculty not only with experience using the technology, but also instruction in best practices.

**Wrap-around services for teaching should be available 24/7.** Faculty should have access to a robust self-support capability backed up by phone, email, and in-person consulting. Since much of the teaching and learning occurs during evenings and weekends, CSUF should have LMS, communications, facilities, and other essential infrastructure support available seven days a week that extends into the evenings. Ideally, support is centralized so faculty have a single destination (in-person or online).

**Educational technology acquisition and support as well as physical teaching facilities should provide faculty maximum flexibility.** When acquired and configured, technologies used in teaching should maximize faculty choice in how they are integrated into instruction, enabling them to make efficient and effective use of their learning environments. Faculty shall have the central voice in the selection and configuration of the technologies and facilities used in teaching. In order for that voice to be informed, faculty shall have a way to experiment and try out different educational technologies and classroom innovations.

**Who Will Teach?**

**The Role of Faculty in the Model Comprehensive Public University**

The basic definition of a comprehensive university is an institution for higher learning that includes graduate and professional school and that awards master’s degrees and doctorates. These institutions are typically diverse in terms of student population and program offerings. In order to be a model comprehensive university, the university must offer high-quality programs coupled with high retention and high graduation rates for its diverse student population.

An adequate cadre of faculty is necessary to achieve the mission of the public comprehensive university. From the perspective of teaching and pedagogy, to achieve success, there must be structures in place to support faculty teaching, faculty research/scholarship/creative activities, and faculty service/community engagement. Tenured/tenure-track faculty members are required not only to provide instruction, but also to conduct research and participate in service, which are all crucial contributions of a comprehensive university.
Student Instruction

Currently, full- and part-time lecturer faculty play critical roles in meeting the instructional mission of CSU Fullerton. In fall 2014, 68 percent of the total instruction at CSUF in terms of full-time equivalent students (FTES) was provided by lecturer faculty, and 32 percent was provided tenure-tenure/track faculty, as shown in the following chart. Lecturer faculty taught all students enrolled in courses at the pre-collegiate level, and 83 percent, 61 percent, and 40 percent of lower-division, upper-division, and graduate courses, respectively. Tenured and tenure-track faculty taught 18 percent, 39 percent, and 60 percent of the FTES in lower-division, upper-division, and graduate courses, respectively.

Our Current Faculty

**Headcount.** According to our Office of Institutional Research and Analytical Studies, in 2014–15 our faculty consisted of 560 tenured, 178 tenure-track, 164 full-time lecturer (teaching 15 or more units in fall term), and 1,185 part-time lecturer faculty (teaching less than 15 units in fall term). Additionally, 28 administrators had retreat rights.

**Tenure Density.** Tenure density reflects the proportion of instructional faculty with tenure or with an appointment leading to tenure. According to CSU Academic Human Resources at the Chancellor’s Office, our campus faculty tenure density in 2014 was 52.7 percent; in 2015, it was 53.9 percent.

**Demographic Characteristics.** The tenured and tenure-track faculty included 335 (45 percent) women and 403 (55 percent) men in fall 2014 (CSUF Office of Institutional Research and Analytical Studies). In Fall 2014, our tenured and tenure-track faculty self-identified as 483 (65 percent) White, 164 (22 percent) Asian-American/Pacific Islander, 65 (9 percent) Hispanic, 22 (3 percent) Black, and 0 (0 percent) Native American; 4 percent did not identify and were classified as unknown. Among the tenured and tenure-track faculty, 37 were “International” faculty (defined as those with H1 visas).

Among lecturer faculty in fall 2014, 714 (53 percent) were women and 635 (47 percent) were men. Ethnic composition of lecturers was less than 1 percent American Indian, Pacific Islander,
international, or multi-race; 2.7 percent of lecturer faculty identified as Black, 9.7 percent as Hispanic, 11.8 percent as Asian, and 67.4 percent as White.

Faculty Trends from 2004–05 to 2014–15

**Headcount.** Over the past decade, the number of tenured and tenure-track faculty increased 30 percent, from 568 to 738. The number of full-time lecturers increased by 42 percent over this period, from 115 to 164 (CSUF Office of Institutional Research and Analytical Studies). These data are depicted in the bar chart below.

![Full-Time Faculty Headcount 2004/05-2014/15](chart.png)

Source: IRAS

**Tenure Density.** CSUF tenure density for fall 2004 was estimated at 52 percent (Vura & Guerin, 2005). CSU Academic Human Resources provided tenure density trends for the period from fall 2007–2014. The tenure density at CSUF was 53.5 percent in 2007 (the first year included in the report); CSUF tenure density was 52.7 percent in 2014. As shown in the following figure, faculty tenure density at CSUF lags that of the CSU system as a whole and also that of the other large CSU campuses (Long Beach, Northridge, Sacramento, San Diego, San Francisco, San Jose).
Demographic Characteristics. Faculty gender and ethnic diversity have both increased over the past decade. In Fall 2004, 39 percent of tenured and tenure-track faculty were women; in fall 2014, 45 percent were women.

As shown in the table below, among tenure-track faculty, the gender ratio is approximately 1:1. If the 1:1 gender ratio seen in 2004 and 2014 among tenure-track faculty continues, the tenured faculty will continue this trend toward greater gender equity as long as retention of women and men on tenure-track is approximately equal.
Likewise, over the decade from 2004 to 2014, the ethnic diversity of our faculty has increased. As shown in the following diagram, in Fall 2004, 28 percent of our tenured/tenure-track faculty self-identified as non-White; in 2014, 35 percent self-identified as non-White.

**Increasing Diversity of Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tenured</th>
<th>Tenure-Track</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Headcount</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Headcount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2004</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among tenure-track faculty, the trend toward increasing diversity is even more evident. As shown in the next graph, the percentages of tenure-track faculty self-identifying as Asian/Pacific Islander, Hispanic, or Black increased across the last decade, whereas those self-identifying as White decreased. The number of Native American faculty declined from 1 to 0 over the past decade.
These trends of increasing diversity are also evident among our lecturer faculty. In 2009, 77 percent self-identified as White, whereas in 2014 only 67 percent self-identified as White. Over the past 5 years, the percentage of lecturers self-identifying as Black, Hispanic, and Asian increased from 2 percent to 3 percent, 7 percent to 10 percent, and 9 percent to 12 percent, respectively. In terms of gender, 54 percent and 53 percent of lecturers were women in 2009 and 2014, respectively.

Recommendations
The current level of tenure density is too low, and concerted efforts to improve the campus-wide tenure density should be maintained. At a minimum, the University should strive to be at or above the CSU average tenure density level. Therefore, our first recommendation is to continue to implement the multi-year recruitment plan to improve tenure density and increase faculty diversity at the University level, based on needs assessments at the department level and college level. As shown above, faculty recruitment over the past decade has also increased the gender and ethnic diversity of the faculty.

Rationale: To maintain the faculty corps at a sufficient level, annual hiring must consistently replace annual faculty losses and adjust to student enrollment. How many hires are needed each year? As shown in the next table, an average of 35 tenured and tenure-track faculty members left CSUF across the last decade.
In addition to replacing the faculty who leave CSUF, additional faculty members are needed to meet increasing student enrollment. Faculty recruitment beyond losses and growth will lead to improvement in the tenure density level. The chart below illustrates the number of successful faculty hires needed to replace faculty losses (blue) and maintain tenure density at the current level (red), given growth in student enrollment. Faculty hires needed to improve tenure density to multiple levels are estimated for each growth scenario. Thus, to maintain tenure density at approximately 55 percent requires over 80 new hires next year, given that FTES has grown approximately 2 percent in 2015–16.

1. To set a target campus-wide tenure density level, a process should be developed involving deans and departments to establish optimal unit level tenure density goals. This will allow appropriate staffing flexibility based on college needs (instruction, service, scholarly/creative activities).
2. To improve tenure density, the University needs to have a clear understanding of factors (such as workload, salary, spousal hiring, etc.) related to both recruitment and retention of faculty. Retention of faculty is an important factor in increasing tenure density. We need to strengthen data collection and tracking of faculty demographics and status at the individual level so as to allow analysis of faculty recruitment and retention trends over time. Additionally, the specific faculty characteristics available for analysis should be reviewed to ensure that the numerous aspects of diversity are collected. In addition to gender and ethnicity, factors such as sexual orientation, first-generation college status, and doctoral institution should be considered. Recent faculty recruits have increased the diversity of the faculty.
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Appendix F—Subcommittee 4: Infrastructure and Resources

Charge for Subcommittee 4: Infrastructure and Resources
The Infrastructure and Resources Subcommittee is charged with preparing responses to the following questions:

- How do we assess and articulate the resource requirements of the AMP? (Team A)
- How do we align our physical and financial resources to support the AMP? (Team B)
- What are the barriers that may impede the campus from delivering adequate physical and financial resources to sustain the AMP, and how do we address them? (Team C)
- How can we respond to budget challenges? (Team B)

**Team A:** Mike DeMars, Sora Tanjasiri, Berhanu Tadesse, Matt Jarvis, and Greg Saks

**Team B:** Jeanne Tran, Mark Stohs, David Edwards, Joseph Nguyen, Steven Chan, Laleh Graylee, Willem van der Pol, Ukun Kim, Lisa Kopecky, and Peter de Lijsier

**Team C:** Mark Filowitz, Carol Creighton, Erica Bowers, Pat Balderas, Lisa Kopecky, and Laleh Graylee

Introduction
Given “normal” operations of the university, units (divisions/colleges, departments, etc.) tend to manage both their own physical space and their own budgets. It is thus their responsibility to manage and align all of those resources appropriately. The analyzing the physical and financial resources to support the Academic Master Plan (AMP) largely presupposes that the other elements of the AMP are already fully developed and functioning as the guide for the future of the university. In this respect, the assessing, aligning, considering the barriers, policies and challenges of CSUF’s physical and financial resources is the last logical step in the process of implementing the AMP. However, it is also the case that any serious plan for changing or creating academic units would naturally include careful consideration of such resources at the very beginning. Ideas for change or growth which ignore resources at the outset normally have little chance of success in the long run.

The primary intent of the AMP is to provide foresight into the way in which future growth or change occurs. In this way, all resources can be utilized more efficiently so that our students are able to earn the degrees they desire. While physical and financial resources are crucial to creative planning, human resources (i.e., faculty, staff and administrators) are obviously essential. If a plan calls for significant growth in subject area X, yet individuals are not earning academic credentials in area X, then that restriction is at least as important as the physical and financial constraints. The focus herein is on physical and financial resources, these comments presuppose that relevant and accurate planning has already occurred concerning human resources. The HR data would include benchmarks to support the campus at the appropriate levels.

The AMP does not necessarily aim to change the normal university operations. The primary goal of the AMP is for the University to become forward-looking. Normal university operations may need to be adjusted, however, as a result of the successful adoption of a long–term AMP and/or when plans for one unit have a substantial impact on other units or the whole University. The AMP is intended to be consistent with and guided by the University's Strategic Plan. The difference is that the Strategic Plan is at a “higher level” and does not provide substantial details in how to operationalize the Strategic Plan.
Further, the AMP focuses more directly on Academic Affairs, while recognizing that other University Divisions or units are also guided by the Strategic Plan. One might conceive of the AMP as the action plan for carrying out the Strategic Plan. The longer–run intention is to have a positive “feedback loop” in both directions between the Strategic Plan and the AMP, with each providing guidance for future Plans. In addition, priorities or procedures recommended by the AMP depend upon the campus’ conception of itself as a model public university.

Hence, when the AMP guides Academic Affairs and/or the broader university, normal operations should include the following provisions:

- An AMP is a university plan for a set time period such as five years, with successive plans guiding the university well into the future. Revisions to any given AMP shall be made as necessary. Appropriate forecasts for both physical and financial uses and resources should be essential elements of an AMP.
- When important plans originating with the AMP are likely to have a substantial impact on more than one unit, adjustments beyond normal operations may be necessary. Those responsible for designing the details of the AMP and implementing those details must decide what constitutes a substantial impact.
  - The AMP, may for instance, recommend that a given academic program is at its optimal size, that it should not grow any further nor shrink. A variety of rationales may be provided for such a decision, such as extremely high cost in permitting growth, or future projections at the state level that the demand for graduates of the program has peaked, etc. An AMP’s recommendations are significant, in that they would represent conceiving the future of the university as being planned, vs. merely happening. The university would no longer accept students who come to us, but would rather impose a thoughtful plan on future growth or decline of academic programs. Some of this planning already occurs, in the sense of impaction of some programs.
  - The justification or rationale for the overall AMP is similar to that for impaction. The difference is that the AMP attempts to guide the University in advance of external decisions that are often made for us. This is the intention of labelling it a master plan.
- Collegial, shared governance serves as the foundation for any such design and implementation.
- Items of broad interest include the following, which should be addressed by the campus prior to a complete and final version of the AMP.
- Multiple challenges exist for identifying the resource needs of any future academic plan, including most importantly, the fragmentary budget sources and costs relating to staffing (faculty, staff, students) at CSUF. Additionally, uncertainty exists regarding the role that performance based funding will play in determining future budgets. Currently CSUF also lacks information on existing standards and approaches at sister CSU campuses and other comparable universities across the nation.
- In the absence of further information about future budgets for CSU or CSUF, initial assumptions include:
  - Budgeting implications as a result of the AMP may require more creative distribution of current resources,
  - CSUF is in a zero–growth budgeting context, which means that there are no new funds available to support the AMP,
  - Any new physical spaces will be clearly identified for consideration during the AMP budget analysis period,
That the process of resource identification and articulation should respect existing academic units and structures (e.g., college–based allocations of space); and
That the resource planning process prioritizes input from both the academic/administrative units directly involved as well as associated groups to develop a holistic approach to planning, growth, stability and sustainability of the AMP. Shifts in resources may be needed periodically to support changes due to new or evolving programs,
The AMP must also articulate the resource requirements associated with it. If known, the types of resources (sources and nature, i.e. state baseline funding, grant–based one–time funds, full–time faculty course assignments, temporary staff resources, etc.) should be clearly indicated. This should be done both for increased resource needs and for projected resource savings from the AMP.

The AMP provides a more proactive approach for University rather than a reaction to external forces.

Question 1: How do we assess and articulate the resource requirements of the Academic Master Plan?

Generally, the AMP should establish principles and processes to ensure that resources are aligned or re–aligned in accordance with the evolving university priorities and programs (dramatic FTES shifts may result in changes in resources and spaces needed). Assessing and articulating resource requirements should be guided by these principles to provide consistent budget development across all program components of the Academic Master Plan, as well as to ensure all related needs and their ramifications have been considered. The principles could include, but are not limited to: methodologies for evaluating the costs of different budget categories such as staff, faculty FTE, and O&E; whether or not there would be differential methods to reflect natural cost differences among programs; and various benchmarks for a test of reasonableness.

Full costs of the programs should be captured, including indirect costs and those that are commonly covered at the campus level, such as employee benefits. The need for resources should be analyzed with an eye towards what funding should be, rather than what funding currently is, so that full baseline requirements may be identified to ensure appropriate consideration is given when deliberating or making decisions on the budgets (as will be covered in the next section).

In addition, campus units or subject matter experts directly responsible for the academic plans should be involved in the budget development taking into account both the short– and long–term goals of the AMP activity. Given the number of interdisciplinary programs (e.g., Freshmen Programs), there may be instances where multiple academic and administrative units (e.g., Student Affairs) could also be involved in a new or ongoing academic endeavor and thus it would be important to consider and cost out the impact on these secondary units. When multiple units are involved, processes should be utilized depending on the organizational structure and impact of the programs.

For example, to the extent that primary and secondary units are contained within existing academic structures (e.g., mainly within one college), the resource identification process can involve just these entities in estimating the budget and space needs and opportunities to support the AMP effort. In contrast, to the extent that primary and secondary units are relatively large in number, and the AMP efforts are more campus–wide than college–specific, the AMP should involve established entities with budget/resource responsibilities across campus, including at least the:
• Academic Senate (for vetting of AMP–related proposals that require campus–wide approval);
• Office of the Provost,
• Vice President for Administration and Finance Office (for detailed resource planning and analysis); and
• Planning, Resource, and Budget Committee (PRBC) (for broad resource planning and prioritization need).

Such considerations should be tied back into the other questions that the AMP addresses to ensure the AMP is feasible. Assessing resource requirements should incorporate benchmarks and outcome measures such as those in the anticipated performance based funding model.

Question 2: How do we align our physical & financial resources to support the AMP?

Alignment of Physical and Financial Resources
A fundamental recommendation is for CSUF to leverage the use of relevant data in making decisions about:

• **PHYSICAL RESOURCES**: Provide details about existing buildings/facilities, using a Space Allocation Model (i.e., software; sample pictures below) including such information as:
  o Total square feet,
  o Uses of the building or space, e.g., computer lab only, science lab only, or multi–purpose uses,
  o Total useable space that can be devoted to instructional purposes (number of classrooms, seats),
  o CSU Space Standards,
  o Comparisons of physical usage at CSUF to national averages; along with any recommendations based upon such comparisons,
  o Efficiencies for space usage should be considered. Such efficiencies include, but are not limited to the use of: (1) Friday and weekend classes, (2) on–line classes, and (3) scheduling classes to spread enrollment more evenly across available times during TTh and MW classes. Such considerations should also take account of trade–offs. For example, students who may normally enroll in Saturday classes are often the same students who take classes on–line.

• **FINANCIAL RESOURCES**: Provide and improve accessibility to information about all financial resources, including the total annual budget, and sources and uses of funds, with the aim of generating full transparency. This is especially important; given that we are a public university with responsibility to the citizens of California.
  o Trends in financial resources should also be analyzed to assist in proper budget forecasting and planning.

• **HUMAN RESOURCES DATA**: While this data is part of other AMP sub–committees, this data directly affects both physical and financial resources. The human resources data would include staffing formulas across all positions on campus.

• **INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY**: While technology continues to play an integral part in university related activities, AMP needs to create a technology infrastructure resources allocation methodology that helps to design, fund, acquire, and maintain infrastructure that can accommodate current and future administrative and academic technological computing needs of the university.
General Approach for Creating Five-Year AMP Physical and Financial Resources

- **Procedural Guidelines**: Procedural guidelines include those suggestions or principals which should guide all elements of the physical and financial resources elements of the AMP. They include the following:
  - Each College should have a “home,” clearly delineated from other Colleges on campus.
  - Some academic buildings are needed as “common access/resource,” without “ownership” by individual Colleges or Units. This also includes the consideration of having open office space for part–time faculty; along with the potential to take some current classrooms “offline” (i.e., convert them to other uses, such as student, research or other space as determined by the AMP). Some details are provided below.
  - A centralized (computer–based) scheduling of classes and all campus space should guide current and future decisions and should allow for improved planning and usage reporting.
  - A space analysis should be performed and kept current, using a well–designed Space Allocation Model.
  - **FTES–based needs** presumably guide most planning into the future. This approach is easy to measure and understand, including relationships to faculty office space (FT & PT), general classroom, equipped teaching classroom, teaching lab, and other facility usage as deemed necessary.
  - **Performance–based needs** may guide significant elements of the AMP. However, given that such needs may be difficult to measure and justify, such needs should drive the AMP only when the needs are clearly agreed upon by those who implement the AMP. Such needs may include areas related to research and creative activities, and other important activities such as faculty research space, student success center, tutoring center, college–specific required area, including non–academic performance–based needs and space.
  - High priority areas/units should be identified.
  - Consideration of classroom availability when planning.
  - Compliance of CSU space standards.
  - Student financial resources should be a vital element of any AMP. This requirement includes attention to the use and pricing of textbooks, insofar as such issues affect budgeting at CSUF.
  - Space allocation for students (e.g., student clubs and areas for socializing) should be a part of any AMP.

- **Practical Recommendations**: Practical recommendations are divided into three parts: (a) re-aligning the current situation, (b) planning for growth, and (c) planning for stability. Details for each part follow.
  - **Re-align current situation**: This is with respect to both space allocation and the distribution of financial resources. This, naturally, depends upon having an accurate inventory of the resources on hand. The goal of this step is to increase the efficiency of use of all campus resources; and to re–balance resources which are not aligned correctly.
    - The relationship of FTES and the allocation of facilities and financial resources should be clarified and transparent. Strategic decisions (performance based needs) deviating from FTES should be justified and transparent and be a part of the AMP.
    - University Faculty need a “social space/faculty club,” as at some other CSU campuses and at many universities nationwide.
- **Develop a Plan for Growth**: If growth, for example, is expected to be 17% within the next five years, then a well–developed plan will enable all members of the University community to understand decisions which are or will be made. Relevant parts of this plan would or should include:

  - Recent growth trends should be considered at Unit or College levels to project future growth. All such projections should also include current market trends (demand and supply for graduates of programs). The AMP five–year plan should incorporate growth projections (positive or negative) and recommend appropriate actions; whether that means impaction, or planning for significant positive or negative growth. Demographic trends, along with State and local needs should be considered.

  - For example, ECS growth based on enrollment UG/G headcount for FY 2011–12 = 5.4%, FY 2012–13 = 15.8%, FY 2013–14 = 26.4%%, FY 2014–15 = 27.5%%; with FY 2010 – Fall 2015 growth of approximately 119%. This growth was not planned and as a result, complications arose with implications both within extending beyond the college. With a well–functioning AMP, such growth would be incorporated into action plans for Colleges, the University, and Community.

- **Develop a Plan for Stability (after growth)**: Growth will almost never occur “as planned” – CSUF will always have to take account of actual student growth (in given academic areas and/or units) versus what the University “expects or plans” to occur. When the differences between the planned vs. actual growth become apparent, the University should have a plan for how to “re-adjust.”

**Question 3**: What barriers may impede the campus from delivering adequate physical and financial resources to sustain the AMP, and how do we address them?

Ways to address the potential barriers which may impede the campus from delivering adequate physical and financial resources to sustain the AMP include the following.

**Physical Considerations**

- Maximize utilization of classroom spaces using timely, transparent and accurate space utilization data.
- Revisit University scheduling patterns and formats to ensure optimum utilization of space.
- Determine priority and improve communication and planning for research, lab, classroom, student service, and support spaces and maintenance (lab equipment) of those spaces.
- The campus master plan needs to be updated.

**Financial Resources (FR)**

- Consider operational/financial impacts when determining strategic directions and possible conflicts of new initiatives, noting that potential solutions should be financially sustainable over time.
- Reassess graduate programs to determine appropriate level of support required.
- Evaluate facility needs, including deferred maintenance plans, to consider safety, practical and effective usage.
- Ensure financial resources are expended effectively and efficiently; conduct appropriate analyses such as cost benefits and return on investment as appropriate prior to making financial commitments and decisions (e.g., consultants versus using the expertise of campus personnel).
Question 4: Possible ways to respond to challenges and how the budget is impacted by these?

A designated sub-committee within PRBC to focus on budget and facilities shall conduct campus–wide surveys from campus constituents to assess urgent and current struggling issues for implementation of the AMP, with a focus on student success. Through an official review/approval process, this committee makes recommendations to devote CSUF resources to projects approved by the AMP. If necessary, an official decision–making procedure needs to be developed. Recommendations of this sub-committee will be shared with PRBC and then to the President for final approval.

Units need the University to provide updated/reliable data related to space inventory, classroom utilization, current space for research activities, etc. To support the approved projects, funding sources should be diversified (not only from state budget).
Sample Space Allocation Model for Use and Planning of All University Facilities

**ENTITLEMENT CALCULATION**

- **People Count**
  - 60 faculty

- **Guideline s.f.**
  - 160 s.f.

- **Buffer**
  - 1.15

- **Allocation Per s.f.**
  - $33/s.f.

= Unit Allocation

- $364,320

Vacancy: 5%
Inefficient spaces: 10%

**SPACE ALLOCATION TEMPLATE**

Space Charge Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Guideline s.f.</th>
<th>Buffer s.f.</th>
<th>Proposed s.f.</th>
<th>Total s.f.</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Staff</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>376</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Faculty</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>171</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Laboratory/Other Teaching</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>218</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Regular Staff</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Contingency Staff</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>182</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Visiting Faculty</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1,390</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Admin/Other</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>182</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Staff Directors</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>10% of total space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Active Students</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>10% of total space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Staff</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>100% of total space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Faculty</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>1,094</td>
<td>Long-term office for Associate Deans and Chairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. PhD Students</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>5,394</td>
<td>PhD students occupy spaces covered with 10% of FTEs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Regular Staff</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>1,420</td>
<td>Most regular offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Visitors/Other</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>Additional not for Program A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Visitors/Other</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>Additional not for Program B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total assigned SF</td>
<td>43,773</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>71,823</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total assigned office space SF</td>
<td>71,823</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>71,823</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference between of allocated and if assigned</td>
<td>5,892</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,892</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Charge (Credit)</td>
<td>$16,414</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$16,414</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Original source: [Academic Impressions](ai.academichomepage.com)
Common Access/Resource Issues // Facilities and Fiscal // All University Units, Especially Academic Affairs

Physical Resources
- Not enough research and office space to accommodate FT and PT faculty hires
- Growing demand for flexible space to accommodate evolving external research work
- Growing requests for more student success / advising spaces
- Requests for more and flexible classrooms to accommodate supplemental instruction, advising training, larger classes; more labs are also needed
- Growing demand for student–centered spaces
- Need surge space to accommodate big moves, renovations and strategic priorities
- Insufficient meeting and special events space

Fiscal Resources
- Insufficient funds to cover existing staff salaries and insufficient number of staff to accommodate current workloads
- Insufficient materials & supplies (OE & E) funds
- Limited and/or sporadic funding for space improvements / capital projects
- No computer lab and/or specialized equipment funding
- Limited funds for new or strategic initiatives
CSUF Sample Budget (2015–16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLANNED SOURCE OF FUNDS (REVENUE)</th>
<th>AMOUNT FY 15/16</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL</th>
<th>AMOUNT FY 14/15</th>
<th>% OF TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSU OPERATING FUND</td>
<td>$371,274,536</td>
<td>75.2%</td>
<td>$364,908,380</td>
<td>75.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTINUING EDUCATION (CERF)</td>
<td>28,693,009</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>28,000,000</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOUSING FUND</td>
<td>26,914,896</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>25,062,894</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARKING FUND</td>
<td>12,878,439</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>12,822,262</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL</td>
<td>$439,760,880</td>
<td>89.1%</td>
<td>$430,793,536</td>
<td>88.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUXILIARY FUNDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUXILIARY SERVICES CORPORATION</td>
<td>35,906,493</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>37,178,421</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHILANTHROPIC FOUNDATION</td>
<td>565,000</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>597,000</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSOCIATED STUDENTS INC.</td>
<td>8,876,397</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>8,086,231</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDENT UNION</td>
<td>8,601,436</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>7,933,717</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBTOTAL</td>
<td>53,949,326</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>53,795,369</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>