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Subcommittee Membership

How Will We Support Faculty Throughout Their Careers to Provide High-Quality Learning
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Who Will Teach?

Subcommittee 4: Infrastructure and Resources

Subcommittee Charge

Subcommittee Membership

Preamble

How Do We Assess and Articulate the Resource Requirements of the Academic Master Plan?

How Do We Align Our Physical and Financial Resources to Support the AMP?

What Barriers May Impede the Campus from Delivering Adequate Physical and Financial Resources to Sustain the AMP, and How Do We Address Them?

Possible Ways to Respond to Challenges and How the Budget Is Impacted by These?
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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.
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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
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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.
Subcommittee 2: Students

Subcommittee 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? Thinking about whom we will teach could include a range of issues that perhaps generally relate to enrollment management but really pertain to the composition of the student body. Demographics play a role, as do other external factors such as SB 1440 and SB 850. There are additional considerations such as the balance between graduate and undergraduate students, the relative proportions of freshmen and upper-division transfers, resident and non-resident students, and international students. How many students we will teach is subject to certain external factors such as (but not limited to) the CSU Academic Sustainability Plan and the growing interest in outcomes-based funding; impaction and the importance of student success metrics also could figure in the analysis.
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Berenecea Johnson Eanes, Co-Chair
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Chief of Operations for Student Affairs
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Computer Engineering Associate Professor
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ASI Representative
Emmanuel Larney
Economics Associate Professor
Aimee Nelson
Interim Director for the Center for Careers in Teaching
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Graduate Student
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Director for the Office of Graduate Studies
May 17, 2016 Update of AMP2 Subcommittee Report
The Students Subcommittee has revised this document in light of the information received from the campus community and Academic Affairs/Academic Senate Retreat. 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]. This is still very much a working draft of our report and we appreciate your feedback.

The running admissions report for the fall 1959 semester. There were 452 students in 41 classes that semester. Source: The Fullerton Way: 50 Years of Memories at California State University, Fullerton

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.

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, enrollment has increased, and, as of fall 2015, the campus had almost 39,000 students enrolled in undergraduate and post-baccalaureate programs (e.g., credential, master’s, and doctoral) with 56 percent 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 2015, populations of graduate and undergraduate students differed somewhat in racial/ethnic diversity.

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

[Add 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 freshmen or transfer students.

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 freshmen.
The percentage of women being admitted has remained relatively constant, but the percentage of minority students being admitted has increased for transfer students and first-time freshmen.
Where Do They Come From?
CSUF undergraduates primarily come from Orange County 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.

As the overall enrollment of graduate students has increased, a greater proportion of students entered CSUF with a bachelor’s degree from another institution. Between 2009 and 2013, students possessing a CSUF bachelor’s degree represented 28–30 percent of all entering
master’s-degree-seeking students. Much of the change can be attributed to the concurrent increase in international graduate students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution/Location</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSUF</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other CSU</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private California university</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of state</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside the U.S.</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total incoming cohort</td>
<td>1728</td>
<td>100.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Graduate Student Admission Qualifications**
Based on admission data from 2009–13, only 28–30 percent 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 master’s students.
Percentage of Students

6 yr Graduation Rate - First Time Freshman
4 yr Graduation Rate - Upper Division Transfers
3 yr Graduation Rate - Master's Degree
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 percent). 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 parents’ education and ethnicity]

*the number of American Indian students is very small and thus their graduation rates vary a great deal enlarge y axis.
Four Year Graduation Rates for Upper Division Transfers by Parents Education

3 yr Graduation Rates for Masters Students by Ethnicity
Need data to make same format as above
The fall 2015 enrollment and program data for each of CSUF’s eight academic colleges is below.

<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 (HHD)</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>Total</td>
<td>31848</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>5490</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>890</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Add discussion on majors and programs; in particular changes through time in enrollments and demand]

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 levels. The significant diversity of our students and their career and personal goals mandate that CSUF continue to provide a pathway to vocations, careers, teaching credentials, advanced education in traditional research-intensive settings (e.g., Ph.D.-granting institutions), and 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, supporting student success, and 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 also 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, support, and services necessary to ensure that all admitted students 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.

CSUF also recognizes its larger responsibilities toward providing education not only for the private benefit of a few, but also 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 second-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 student population, especially during the first year of 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 post-baccalaureate and graduate students. Resources such as writing and research support, alternatives to traditional classroom programs, and 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 members 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 and quality of our programs and the facilities, support, and funds needed to ensure students’ success.

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 their 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

Against this backdrop, CSUF must be prepared to serve the needs of students at a more-decentralized level, so that CSUF students have access to information on the importance of
managing academic, employment, and personal workloads with the goal of attaining 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); peer-to-peer mentoring activities, which should be invaluable to a first-generation college student; and 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 balanced student body that includes first-time freshmen, transfer students, and post-baccalaureate students; all of these populations have unique needs.
- Increasing access for underserved 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 might influence a demographic change in our student population; we are not the CSUF of 1957.
- Competing financial and political priorities for the state and for the public.

How Many Students Will We Teach?

Based on the number of students who 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 who 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 percent 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 a 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
- We believe this question is very much interrelated to how we will 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 underrepresented in specific programs and campus-wide.
Subcommittee 3: Faculty and Pedagogy

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.
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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.

![Student FTE Instruction by Faculty Type and Course Level, Fall 2014](image)

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

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).

**Tenure Density: CSU Fullerton, Other Large CSU Institutions, and CSU System**

Source: CSU Academic Human Resources. 1/14/2015. Faculty Employment Trends (FTE and Tenure Density), Fall 2007-2014.
**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.

![Increasing Gender Diversity of Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty](image)

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.

![Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty by Gender, 2004-2014](image)

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.
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.

![Tenured/Tenure-Track Faculty Annual Gains and Losses, 2006-2015](chart)

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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Subcommittee Charge
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? How do we align our physical and financial resources to support the AMP? 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? What policies/procedures/practices/facilities would we need to have/change/adjust/modify to support/maintain/sustain the AMP? How can we respond to budget challenges?

The task of this subcommittee is to delineate strategies for identifying and delivering resources to support the AMP. The first step could be assessing and outlining the type and amount of resources that would be required. While the AMP may incorporate existing programs that are already fully funded other initiatives may require new or additional resources. Regardless of which side the various components of the AMP would fall under, the campus will need to develop the process and methodology to assess the financial and physical requirements of the AMP, as well as the process to subsequently deliver them. The latter will be particularly challenging given there likely will be limited funds and physical spaces, in terms both of quantity and quality. How do we make wise decisions in addressing the shortfall? The charge is not identifying specific resources per se, but rather defining the process and methodology by which the resource needs could be adequately articulated, gaps successfully identified, and existing and new resources smoothly aligned. Accountability and benchmarking are additional important considerations that need to be incorporated into this process.

Subcommittee Membership
Mark Stohs, Co-Chair
*Academic Senate Executive Committee Member, Finance Professor*

Danny C. Kim, Co-Chair
*Vice President for Administration and Finance*

Pat Balderas
*Business Manager for the College of Humanities and Social Sciences*

Erica Bowers
*Planning, Resource and Budget Committee Chair, Literacy and Reading Education Associate Professor*

Carol Creighton
*Associate Dean for University Extended Education*

Peter de Lijser
*Chemistry Professor*

Mike DeMars
*Associate Librarian*
Preamble

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 of 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 assessment, alignment, and consideration of 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. Hence, while 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’s 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:

1. 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.

2. When important plans originating with the AMP are likely to have a substantial impact on more than one unit, adjustments beyond normal operations might 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.

3. Collegial, shared governance serves as the foundation for any such design and implementation.

4. Items of broad interest include the issues listed below, which should be addressed by the campus prior to a complete and final version of the AMP.

5. 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.

6. In the absence of further information about future budgets for CSU or CSUF, initial assumptions include:
   a) Budgeting implications as a result of the AMP may require distribution of current resources;
   b) CSUF is in a zero-growth budgeting context, which means that there are no new funds available to support the AMP;
   c) Any new physical spaces will be clearly identified for consideration during the AMP budget analysis period;
   d) The process of resource identification and articulation should respect existing academic units and structures (e.g., college-based allocations of space);
   e) 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; and
   f) 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 the University rather than a reaction to external forces.

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 realigned 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 AMP, 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 of needs).

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.
How Do We Align Our Physical and 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:

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

B. **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. Trends in financial resources should also be analyzed to assist in proper budget forecasting and planning.

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

D. **INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY**: While technology continues to play an integral part in University-related activities, the 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” that is 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 (for full-time and part-time faculty), 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 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) realigning the current situation, (b) planning for growth, and (c) planning for stability. Details for each part follow.

- **Realign 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 rebalance 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 members 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 percent 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 and extending beyond the college. With a well-functioning AMP, such growth would be incorporated into action plans for colleges, the University, and the 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 “readjust.”

**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**

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

**Financial Resources (FR)**

1. Consider operational/financial impacts when determining strategic directions and possible conflicts of new initiatives, noting that potential solutions should be financially sustainable over time.
2. Reassess graduate programs to determine appropriate level of support required.
3. Evaluate facility needs, including deferred maintenance plans, to consider safety as well as 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).

Possible Ways to Respond to Challenges and How the Budget Is Impacted by These?

A designated committee focused 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” committee may be sent to the PRBC and then to the president for final approval. [Note: options would include that this committee be the PBRC itself or a subcommittee of the PRBC.]

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).