We are pleased to share the final Academic Master Plan, which was signed by President García on December 5, 2016. You may view or download a PDF of the signed document below. Download: Final AMP - December 2016 (PDF)

The third draft of the Academic Master Plan is now available for review and comment. The AMP will be on the agenda for the Academic Senate meeting on November 3rd and, if appropriate or necessary, on the 10th as well. We welcome discussion by and input from the campus community. You are also encouraged to share your thoughts by clicking the Join the Conversation tab or going directly to the survey: AMP Feedback Form. Download: AMP Third Draft - October 2016 (PDF)

We are pleased to announce that the second draft of the Academic Master Plan is available for review and comment. This document (PDF below) integrates the draft narratives prepared by the four AMP subcommittees following the Academic Affairs/Academic Senate spring retreat into a single complete narrative draft of the AMP. We invite you to review the draft and submit your comments, questions, and observations via a confidential, anonymous Qualtrics survey by clicking the Join the Conversation tab or going directly to the survey: AMP Feedback Form. Download: AMP Integrated Draft - August 2016 (PDF)

We are very pleased to share with the CSUF campus community the first draft of the Academic Master Plan. This tab provides access to draft outlines summarizing each subcommittee’s narrative as well as all feedback that has been received thus far, including comments submitted online and reflections from the Academic Affairs/Academic Senate retreat held in March 2016. The original source material for the comments from the retreat and the retreat documents can be found at the Academic Senate website. A full draft narrative of each subcommittee will be shared in May, and the AMP subcommittees will continue to revise these narratives based on the input received so far and any additional comments that come in the rest of the spring and during the summer. The second official draft of the Academic Master Plan will be a fully integrated document in narrative form and will be shared with the campus in the fall. We invite the campus community to read through the draft outlines and feedback below, and if you have additional thoughts to share, please use the links provided to submit your comments for specific subcommittees. To review general comments that have been provided regarding the AMP process as a whole, and to submit additional comments on the overall development of the AMP, please go to the General Comments section at the bottom of the page. Thank you for your engagement in this important process. Go to: AMP Subcommittee 1: Programs, Degrees, and Outcomes

Submit Additional Comments | Back to Top
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? Outline - Subcommittee 1 (PDF) | Draft Narrative - Subcommittee 1 - version 1 Feedback from Academic Senate / Academic Affairs Retreat

Well thought out document—one of the best of the four
What is meant by “exceptional education” go straight to CSUF will prepare students for….
Under Outcomes—the Knowledge bullet doesn’t make sense—clarify—it’s a run on sentence. “write, create and speak about” not just write and create—arts students (and probably others) make things—and analyze and critique
Don’t like the word “survival”—thrive or resilience will be better words
A lot of the language from subcommittee #1 should go into subcommittee #3—in particular the need for recognizing there is more to education than outcomes and professions—need to continue to recognize
the liberal arts and general education They should learn how to learn—be aware of the learning process. This is in addition to knowing the subject matter. Lifelong learning is vital. How does this reflect our graduate programs/graduate students? Should we note that we have different levels of students? Not just broad curriculum, there is also specialized curriculum (grad students and credential students) What resources do we use currently to track alumni success (Otis Report for the ARTS; SNAPP National Statistics on Arts careers and impact to the economy) Like that we are hiring a Director of Writing Across the Disciplines—to help with writing in our programs Things are changing in the world—it is a disadvantage if they specialize too early—analytical, verbal, writing, quantitative Commitment to the Liberal Arts—need to have a foundation Concerns about trying funding to jobs students get (this is happening in other states) Students need to be resilient about finding another career—try other programs We need partnerships with K-12 (and Community Colleges) are we preparing teachers? We need to balance early preparation and access with an understanding that college is where you explore How do we motivate students if they are just here to get a degree? Are we having part timers teach lower division classes and they are not motivating in the same way a tenure track faculty might be? Integration of teaching and research from an early point on in all programs, get the students involved in the professional aspect of the discipline Our best faculty/teachers should be teaching lower division—would need more money towards TAs to help with this. (concerns with infrastructure—no big class rooms) Where should we teach? Online—not for everyone. They need to be motivated. We need to look at our online pedagogy to improve it. Distance Ed is also embedded in our face-to-face classes. Need to invest in FDC. Need more TAs and Grad assistants to assist with our teaching Too much focus on learning in the classroom, need more emphasis on interacting with the instructors outside of the classroom setting. This would be especially helpful for students who are struggling. Students in the sciences need to know there are other programs/opportunities for them. Have a pre-science major and if students don’t succeed there they should not be allowed into the major. Define the word “success”—what does this mean—define it There is a lot of focus on workforce readiness; we need more focus on preparing students for a democracy; civic engagement Missing the values of social responsibility Context—classrooms needs to be pedagogically appropriate What outcomes will guide our work—don’t like survival—resilience Skills too much emphasis on skills that are transferrable to the workforce If we are a global community we are not just contributing to the local community Nothing in here about being a lifelong learner Need to be nimble and prepared for the future; students will have many different jobs; need to be able to evolve Under values—no mention of diversity, equity, inclusiveness and also should be reflected elsewhere What about context—it’s not just where it has to have a “why” behind it (why teach at a satellite campus?) What do you think about “awareness”—Students need to know why they are doing what their doing. Understand they are social beings. This section could be worded better. Clarify that this is not just about the workforce (some felt there was too much emphasis on the workforce elements) Outcomes—awareness—is this critical awareness/critical thinking? Does critical thinking need to be a separate goal from awareness (maybe “critical awareness”?) Student sense of control over their lives/self-determination Agree with a lot of it Feels like there is some criticism of programs/courses and then they are used as models University as a whole needs to support lower number of students if they want HIPs. Is this just rhetoric? Need to get more students through quicker—students complain that it is too much work; students haven’t heard about how great service learning is and then low enrollment happens and the class gets cancelled. This leads to faculty, community disillusionment Roadmaps should be part of this discussion—HIPs should be built in from the beginning of a student’s career. RTP process is broken.
Faculty are pressured to do things that are inconsistent: put a lot of time into service learning but that might not be recognized in RTP. Inconsistencies in AMP and RTP process. What’s the incentive in getting a grant (its better to just get a publication)? Putting roadblocks in the way of faculty. Do we need University level personnel committee?

General Education—We need to double count with the major Internship class is HIP and counts for the major—why should GE be different? Q3 point 2—include “non-profits” Overview: instrumentalism – moral good vs youth-bases good. Tone down the instrumentalism (just for educations sake). The broader aspect of quality of life. That is broad and not necessarily financially driven. Also consider knowledge per se. Not all education is skills driven. Knowledge as its own value. Outcomes read a bit strange. Expert top down. Struggling with the way it is worded. Information literacy – practical outcomes, life skills. Resilience vs survival, flexibility--- open to change. 2 Some of the ideas there might be reflected also in overview section. Seems disjointed with overview. Not sure first statement under GE (empty sentence). Could argue that GE does not need to be integrated into programs. Strong objective statements about GE. Having a high quality of life might not be measurable, non-overlapping with GE. Integration of GE but students are retained when GE courses are lined up. One way of looking at integration is looking at career path and GE. This works when students are prepared or in a professional track. Would they receive the breadth of education? How to make GE meaningful for students who are undecided…..not always a linear process or a consistent process for all. Changing a major or double major may not increase time to graduation. Depending upon type. No sentence about GE including about GE itself. Overview begins with strong liberal arts core. Support for flipped classrooms GE seems unfocused suutdents don’t know why they take it, why are some GE areas at CSUF upper division and lower division at another campus. Why will we teach what we teach more emphasis on discussing the workforce needs, need liberal arts based education Critical thinking can be taught in many areas Students could benefit from life skills courses like financial planning It’s an upper division course at fullerton, a GE part of lifelong learning More emphasis on the graduate programs in the AMP document Cal state master’s level education is high quality and can train students for a lot of professions let’s emphasize that if we don’t have MA programs and post bachs help recruit quality faculty Students need a broad-based education that stays with them throughout their curriculum, understand what the big issues and questions are GE should better help students to make sense of their responsibilities as citizens and citizens of the world Many students don’t have GE here, there degree is from CSUF, so they should have broad based regardless Maybe connect GE with these broad-based human questions Make sure they get educated not just graduated Getting them through, employers don’t want poorly trained students with degrees, there has to be quality and elements of what students should know so that they are strong candidates for employment What the students learn in getting the degree is what’s most important… Students should be provided with the opportunity to explore career/discipline options… make sure students can explore and try different fields Too much emphasis on pushing students through quickly jeopardizes their education Students should be well-rounded, students should have the time to find their niche We could do a better job earlier, of providing students with guidance early, more exploration, more reflection, help them set up goals HIPs, early on more exploring in a field so that they get a deeper experience rather than a push throughout What are the demographics of our student body and how does that impact our students to try and push them through… Will this AMP also include plans for the development of new programs, Create a mechanism by which initiatives can be created Create specific program plans and will the CSU let us create such programs Let’s be proactive, how specific Should we partner with other CSUs, is there any way
to leverage with other CSU needs a better mechanism to allow cross campus collaboration. More money for programs and program development. Who controls the what we teach? The department should be responsible for program development. Broader picture, continue to be an urban comprehensive university, suggests a comprehensive as opposed to a niche university, our charge is to offer a broad-based education all the fields present and supported. Expansion and development of programs with consideration to the budget, need to be strategic in terms of resources available when developing programs, space consideration. Holistic learning outcomes. Wide student outcomes, Emphasis on the idea that students need to be active participants in the learning process and they need to be responsible to the outcome. Citizenship and civic responsibility. Give support to faculty to facilitate learning outcomes (pay raises, as one example). Important to think strategically about what we’re going to do, growth doesn’t always equal success. What do we define as quality for our students, our programs our curriculum, what can we do with the resources available to us? Student learning outcomes, two tracks, for WASC and then what we really did, develop a student how do we do this and then also answer to WASC. We do this work implicitly and then how do we document that here’s our WASC stuff, but then here’s what we do... We’re trying to do this the department determines the student learning outcomes. Ask questions what do you want the students to know what kind of person do you want them to be we change because we want to do this and so we’re changing the program. Why will we teach what we teach? Not a whim of someone in charge not a budget decision why do we have the departments we have? How we decide should be able to articulate why we have the departments Th budget comes at a secondary supportive level rather than a determinative one. What does it mean to prepare students for an evolving workforce? We shouldn’t be a tech school, prepare students for a broad range of professions? A liberal arts education prepares students for a variety of occupations...further articulate in the document...there’s pressure to indicate incomes of students to better make decisions throughout level. Curricular changes within the department, can identify what to teach, but faculty have different opinions on how what we teach impacts faculty personal, faculty don’t want to change course content, what we teach, how we implement is another, faculty should determine curricular changes, if the changes are dictated from elsewhere they will resist. Tenured faculty are tenured, they work through so many years, they earn where they are, something that is created should be acceptable to others, there should be collegial, and consensus building HIPs, the problem is we’re putting lot of effort into HIPs but not very many resources. Undergrad research is built into the curriculum, but don’t have resources faculty are too often doing this with their own time. We say we want to do these HIPs but we’re not funding them or supporting faculty with those projects. Each college works independently, we have many distinctions and disagreements. Consistency in allocating budgets for HIP. The strong liberal arts core needs to be strengthened and more science and math incorporated in the liberal arts, critical thinking, more interdisciplinary cross-fertilization between science, math, humanities, social sciences, GE definition from many years ago is different from what students need now, ie students need more awareness of IT, science and engineering. We don’t have resources, Two things: President needs to get us more funding. FTES model, where colleges compete with each other, is no good, rethink how we do things. Major fundamental shifts in how we do the budgeting, We would have money to do those things. If we have no funding, we can’t innovate, Who is going to pay for these Support cross-campus, cross-college collaboration. Human resource is a resource, not just putting money, but a culture for people to advocate for. IT very important, comp sci very important, Start with ideas, then use the budget to support the ideas. Constraints: Funding, space, time, human resources, budget work in parallel with ideas, if we have an idea for how to
overcome the limitations, need to have the budget to sustained. Do we grow the doctoral programs, will we be funded for this if we’re delegated to a comprehensive university. We’re training the students to let them go somewhere else for PHD, if students have a choice to go to another school, choose other schools because we don’t support students (grad) they go somewhere else, we’re in an expensive area, we can’t pay students here, at grad level they are not being supported if SDSU can do better why can’t we? Does the Irvine campus affect what we’re teaching ABET controlled in engineering, equivalence for transferring quality of courses and teaching in Comm Coll for transfer students. Stem cell related programs Entertainment programs. Maybe take advantage of specialist occupations in the region to develop programs and then attract students, faculty, and community partnerships—perhaps supporting funding. Where we teach directly influences our educational programs in education, we need to be in partnership with community where we teach. Professional programs, prepare students for workforce through professional degree programs, possibly partner with private sector to support those programs. Keeping alumni engaged with the campus as learning resources, mentoring, fund raising. Why do we teach? To become critical thinkers, good writers, prepare them for an evolving workforce. We teach them what we teach them to be productive careers. We’re not a research one university, we’re comprehensive we train them for careers. Explain what we’re doing now but who do we envision ourselves to be? Identify areas for future growth and support exploration and innovation. What do we add what do we subtract? A thread through the entire AMP constantly looking at reviewing revising what we do and strengthening what we have. A constant thread of reviewing and evaluating. Engaging the alums in terms of what their interests, taking a survey of the pulse of where they are, build around and draw from their interests, possibly surveying them for their experience satisfaction levels. Alumni contributions to the region, state, global at every level, national international. Programs - sometimes best when 2 colleges are involved. Silos. Collaboration among disciplines and interdisciplinary involvement. Do not see that here. Required of students to take an interdisciplinary course. Becomes very narrow. How to meet the needs. Making it personal, understanding the community where we are based. Overview – don’t think that we currently do a very good job. Students don’t know what it going on in the world and how to prepare students for a global outlook. Wonder if this is even more predominant in STEM. Critical thinking should be imbedded in all courses. Hides in syllabus and is not expressed. Curriculum needs to evolve more. Refreshing the curriculum and organization. Cultural diversity option is too wide. It would be great to have one General Education course that multiple programs use. Racism as an institution rather than an act. Race and identity as conversations nationally but are we preparing our students to engage in those conversations and equip our students to deal with these realities. Some courses never provide the opportunity to engage in cultural conversations. Class size does not always facilitate these discussions. Bigger issues that do not get discussed if students do not feel safe in discussing these. How to get students to be engaged more in University. Tied to strong liberal arts core—not just one class that you check off. Relates to post-graduate outcomes. How to make it part of the University learning. Need more student voice. Focus groups. Cultural awareness – is it the same as intercultural awareness. Use a glossary. What will we teach? Does that have implications for the departments that we have? Is that a question that should be asked? Do we have the right structures? Our disciplinary structure and organizational structure would be familiar to someone from the 19th Century. Should they be? When does curating become self-replicating. Need to adapt to current workings of a disciplinary—are they in alignment. Should we have more cross disciplinary teaching? Education is incorporating art, but does this apply to other areas? Students see more things combined. Tearing down silos. What is the purpose
of the college structure and does the college structure facilitate what we need? Do they exist just because they have been there forever? Push to minimize but some programs have small resource needs. No new funding—how will we do this? How do we elevate our prominence? Highlight our faculty? Within the community and internally. Lots of faculty serve in professional organizations. Outcomes – keep track of what happens to alumni and how they influence the community. We can do a much better job with this. 
Big picture outcomes – data driven evaluation of the Universities. Academic plan does not articulate how we exist in a data driven environment. Something beyond graduation rates. Some fields are less able to be captured in quality outcomes. We need a position about where we stand with data-driven outcomes (qualitative vs quantitate). In context of what Governor wants vs what we want. The system may only narrowly define outcomes. Needs to be here in the AMP that includes date beyond graduation rates. Examples critical thinking, active citizen. Need to include statements by outside stakeholders. Need to know what community thinks so that the community voice is included. And includes more than corporate. Cultural awareness info in Q 1.1 might need to be more evident – it is a value. Too buried. Pull out and put at top. Informs what we teach, how we serve students. Student centered in several places but not defined – be more specific about what that means. (Does this info such as definitions need to go into a glossary (student-centered, cultural competence) Cultural competence as an outcome and under GE. Modernize GE–how it relates to today to be relevant. Under GE a goal for social-cultural relevance. Build on community engagement how to interact skillfully. Outcome: change to resilience from survival. Has a broader meaning than survival. Q1 what we will teach and the outcomes should be aligned—check on this. Experiential and collaborative: include interprofessional/interdisciplinary learning and collaboration. How do we implement the value of research with teaching load. Pull out community as a separate item to make clear that it is outside of University communities. Is 3.2 speaking to looking forward adequately? And the appropriateness of the types of spaces to the programs—multiuse collaborative spaces. Being intentional able those decisions to make sure there is flexibility. More conductive to high impact, collaborative spaces. Exit survey getting post-CSUF contact info. Alumni outreach. I appreciate the comment about many types of outcomes - that being said, if we use a broad definition of learning that includes holistic, developmental aspects of learning, then we can use the term "learning outcomes" - everything we do teaches something Under Q4.1. Main Outcomes, there is an unfortunate run-on sentence in bullet point "Knowledge," precisely in the portion that addresses written communication. In order CSUF to be globally visible, it is important that we have strong presence of on-line degree programs and also on-line classes. 1 i would swap the word "Survival" with "Resilience" as it is a more positive term, but still gets at the same notion. "Good start. Please don't hide the ""cultural awareness"" part in that complicated last sentence of Q1.1. Pull it out and put it in a more central place. Also this could be added in the ""Values"" part as well. We value diverse experiences and culturally sensitive teaching strategies." I think it's important to have a clear, connected, and scaffold GE that clearly prepares students for their degree programs. GE should not be disconnected "smorgasbord" of classes. Q3 - bullet point - community partnerships...businesses an government units - should also include nonprofits teach our students, whomever they may be, where they are. student success markers determined by the colleges will guide our work. we will focus on innovative teaching, collaboration internally and externally, and community engagement. Re: what outcomes will guide our work, perhaps use the term "Resilience" rather than "Survival". Would also perhaps use "Collaboration and Teamwork" rather than Pulling Your Weight which seems more limiting than the broader concept of teamwork. Aside from teaching the students subject knowledge, we should also help students achieve
meta-learning awareness. This is the awareness and understanding of the phenomenon of learning itself. "A student who has a high level of meta learning awareness is able to assess the effectiveness of her/his learning approach and regulate it according to the demands of the learning task." "Need to create more online programs to maximize space (both state and self support). Departments/programs need to create SLOs and assess to guide the work. We need to teach a broad range of programs, but also recognize what students want/need and what the community and the state want/need and have a mechanism for expanding those programs. We need a General Education PROGRAM (not a collection of 100's of classes)." "more courses & emphasis on majors/ concentrations than on general education. We need to prepare students in area of their emphasis so they can find job and are productive after they graduate. Students be given more flexibility to pick at least a few courses from other departments/ colleges, so they get benefit and graduate on time. Under question 2, I would like to see "educators" added to the last bullet (faculty/scholars/educators/cutting-edge research). I would like to see something about continue to keep alumni engaged in campus life added. We should offer courses that provide students with valuable skills to their future employers as they join the workforce in their field. The need to incorporate service learning or activities that promote awareness of diverse community in which we are located so students are engaged and ready to function in roles in the community. Agree with the group that the teaching environment also needs to be flexible and adaptable to promote access to students, which includes online learning; this also connects us to a greater external community. Regarding where will we teach, how do we verify student identity in online classes. How do we know that the person enrolled is actually the person doing the work? In our departmental meeting, Provost Cruz stated that the Academic Master Plan will help guide us in the emergence of a data-driven, outcome oriented university future that quantifies the results of teaching and learning, and potentially could reward certain types of teaching or content that can be more easily quantified. I suggest that we need to be transparent about our response to this context in California, so that maintaining the quality of what we teach and how we teach can be ensured, rather than lost as the data push influences our outcomes. "Where we teach - concerns regarding the continued investment of resources on satellite campuses and the appropriateness of those facilities to house projected programs What outcomes - the institution must provide the resources to collect/assess these data rather than add to existing faculty/departmental loads" In order to produce truly educated citizens, it is critical to emphasize diverse GE courses. They are basic tools for any intelligent person who will be able to make changes in the society. if resources are scarce, as they are, I continue to believe better coordination across CSU campuses is required. there are opportunities to rationalize delivery across campuses and reduce administrative overhead with resources redirected to faculty. Currently, we are often taken to task for programs that serve fewer students and give faculty teaching credit for serving a small number of students. Yet these are the very same programs that provide for high impact practices for our students. How do we create consistency within the system? I think we should consider general education courses as an opportunity to prepare students for their major program, but also to engage them in a way that their major program will not. Oftentimes, students immersed in a major program that is not based in the social sciences will be oblivious to what is happening around the world. If we are preparing students for a global society, this is something that we should consider. A strong liberal arts core can be strengthened and bound together with strong science and math education. Critical thinking and the scientific method compliment one another. Students will benefit by having greater integration between the liberal arts, humanities and sciences. I would think that another outcome, at least for our professional colleges might be student's success has practitioners. Are
they good teachers, nurses, managers.... "ADD THE WORD "CREATE":

• Knowledge: Students must know about their subject matter: its heritage, its nuances they must be able to write, create, and speak about what they've learned with authority and confidence.

• Question of the word Survival: "ADD THE WORD "CREATE": Students should be able to cope/learn from failure and adversity, understand the parameters of taking risks, and think creatively when responding to challenges. (Input: Perhaps "Overcome Challenges" or "Thrive" or "Ability to Thrive"; any word here that does not imply they "survived" their education."

"in the overview, should we include strong core programs which are grounded in research. I think outcomes could be revisited. Outcomes should be measurable. How do you know you've met what you intended to achieve?" Some programs require knowledge transfer from course offered by different colleges. Thus, any roadblocks between intra-college collaboration should be eliminated. Some writing and critical thinking should be taught across all classes. Students would be able to perform better on multiple choice questions if they were able to decipher the question in the first place. "What teach? Curriculum for ethical, educated, global citizens. Yes, the five core competencies, but integrate those concepts across all fields (e.g., communication in the sciences, quantitative reasoning in the humanities, critical thinking in engineering, and so on. Why? Obligation as educational institution to teach citizens of today and tomorrow. Where? on the CSUF campus, on its off-campus locations (e.g., Irvine, Tucker, Desert, Santa Ana, others), and online. Outcomes? Ability to speak and write correctly and effectively and to think and reason critically; additionally, each discipline has or formulates outcomes for that field." I would like to see more on teaching to address a global society. Overall well done. Where will we teach...online? I see it in something to support but not as where we teach. Not sure if this matters. Do we feel this falls under a different AMP...I think this is part of where. Outcomes that guide our work...I think impact on the community should be one of the outcomes that we should consider. We need standards for online teaching and learning if we are to continue to grow them. UPS needs to catch up to address online issues. CSUF should have a way to identify programs that are core competencies for the university. Programs that CSUF should highlight within and outside the campus. 0% Should include a section on what information sources informed the "what to teach" and "why we teach what we teach". How would you measure the outcomes to ensure that we have met our charge?" Teach the teachers to teach. "some majors do not provide any marketable skills needed for employment success after graduation remediation should take place at community colleges" "A strong focus on integration of teaching and research. Involve students in high impact practices early on (starting with freshman experiences). Learning through internships." "A great expression of values, but quantity of teaching shapes quality of teaching. Active scholar teachers need resources and time for their research. Also, let us celebrate and recommit to humanities within the liberal arts core." On question 2 regarding why we teach what we teach I believe there needs to be more of a connection to workforce preparation. Agree with the liberal arts model and the need to be student-centered, as well as community-centered. How will what our students are learning connect with and serve the community? This needs to be a part of our outcomes? On the question of where we will teach, although the temptation in a low budget climate may be to develop satellite campuses and increase (further) our online offerings, and to recruit out of state and international students, we should focus on the development of face-to-face, interactive, collaborative, community-based courses and programs that serve and are made up of California residents. The committee has done a nice job with this draft. Thank you for all of your work. One thing I noticed is that much of the focus seems to be primarily on undergraduate education (e.g., "liberal arts core," focus on "broad comprehensive education" and "general education"). These are important, and this makes
sense given the number of undergraduate students compared with graduate students on campus. However, I think it's going to be important for the campus to grapple effectively with what role and size graduate education should take on this campus and how it will be valued and resourced. Both types of programs have a place, and they should not be put into competition with one another. We should thoughtfully and proactively plan these roles and this balance going forward. "community needs addressed through q1 distance learning options q3" in a rapidly changing world, there is a danger of the students over specializing too early. since our students come with deficiencies, we should emphasize analytical, verbal and quantitative skills so they can excel and specialize later. We should follow the liberal arts model. The instrumentalist pretense---that we teach solely or mostly to ""prepare students for success in competitive environments""--is a problem. Higher education is non-instrumental. It may be put to instrumentalist ends later, but that's not the chief purpose. Include stem programs such as science, math, technology, engineering, etc. Add entertainment since there is a strong presence in southern California. resiliency and flexibility: teaching students to think broadly, creatively especially in response to failures and challenges. "This focuses on workforce readiness. Where is the focus on social responsibility? The word ""success"" has been coopted by the metrics industrial complex." Students must have a solid understanding of the fundamental concepts and gain the skills necessary to be successful in their careers. this calls for strong student-faculty engagement, hands-on experience, opportunities to work in a team, and express their understanding and work in a very coherent manner. i feel that the graduate education has been ignored. we have a good size of graduate student population and we should consider it seriously. "Culturally and linguistically responsive pedagogy defined as ""What: critical, self-reflexive practices embedded in our research and our teaching, Why: we can work against racial, cultural, linguistic, and socioeconomic inequalities by Where: creating humane classrooms where students and teachers learn to What outcomes: use language, [cultural] and literacy in critical and empowering ways"" http://www.ncte.org/cee/positions/diverselearnersinee" Outcomes needs to include professional success and jobs The "values that inform our work" section is rather weak. Can the points be stated in a strong, declarative manner? "We value research" is so limp.... create more honors classes to encourage the high achievers. We need to be cognizant of the need for a liberal education - all students need basic skills in communication, working within groups, critical thinking, scientific literacy, appreciation of history our students will be changing jobs many times during their careers. therefore, lifelong learning, nimbleness, and always being prepared for the future are critical to our students' success Should this be partially framed and related to GE learning outcomes and students recieving a liberal education from a diversity of colleges. We will teach diverse students and prepare them for a global work and social environment. The outcomes that guide our work are based on students ability to critically analyze and combine classroom and real world learning. "Good outline. i especially like the section on why we teach what we teach. In the rest, for this and other committees, the temptation is to write down what we are already doing. How is what we are going to do different from what we are currently doing?" "i am disappointed that there is very little related to diversity, inclusiveness, ajd educational equity. these concepts should be reflected in the values and throughout. Outcomes should include ability and disposition for civic engagement." In the fast changing world we now live in, the skills our students need to acquire will be different from what we have been teaching in the past. The AMP need to provide efficient processes to modify or establish new academic programs. "q1.1. overview: not sure why this privileges quantitative reasoning. it should not. if keep, then acknowledge and privilege other forms of reasoning. don't see the logic to existing emphasis. Saying ""high impact practices"" is too loaded. Simply list them and
if what you have addresses some of them, then delete. Social justice awareness should
compliment or add to the last bullet on professional and personal character. Question 2
talks about the public good and diverse communities. Some of this should go earlier in the
"overview." Question #4. "pulling weight" should be re-conceptualized. Survival? This
too should be re-conceptualize. The main outcomes seem rushed (or a bit out of touch)
and could use a lot more work. This list and the following paragraph sounds very top-
down, expert language." Should look at program sizes - are more better or should focus
be on fewer with higher and sustainable quality. Is there a methodical approach to evolving
programs as world trends and emerging priorities arise. 2 students should have a positive
attitude toward life and society, understand the common good values in different cultures
"consider flipped classes. also, there will be radical changes in education that will impact
the way education is delivered. GE seems unfocused and makes little sense to many
students, for example, critical thinking can and should be taught in many academic areas.
Why some areas of GE are upper division seems questionable." "1. A question about what
will we teach pertains to the extent to which we respond to student demand and also to
faculty interest and expertise? Which comes first? Also, what is the balance between job
prep, which politicians seem to think of universities doing, vs. educating students to adapt
to and create the changing future they will experience. what role do or did the university
learning goals play in the committee's discussions? also, the AAC&U LEAP framework."
"Q 1.2: definitions of student-centered, how to establish partnerships within and between
departmental and college? connection between broad comprehensive curriculum and workforce
preparedness? value research-- how to implement this value given the current teaching
load of 4? We need to teach students about career development. How to develop a
strong resume and portfolio that will make them competitive. How to create a brand for
themselves. Our students are lacking in this area. They need to establish connections with
practitioners in their profession. when considering what we will teach - how do we factor in
CSUF faculty workload? How does CSUF faculty workload appear relative to other CSUFs
with comparable amounts of students, faculty, course needs, etc? How does our workload
shape what and how we teach - especially if we consider the time integrating HIPs can
take? How is the CSUF 4-4 workload factored in to any decisions the university makes?
How can we support the relationship of faculty research/creative activities to foster better
teaching? If our outcomes are to better and more thoughtfully/deeply integrate HIPs, what
sort of support can CSUF provide to faculty that will make better teaching viable. Given
that good, substantive instruction requires time and attention - how might CSUF lower
the faculty instructional course load to assure faculty and students have the temporal
resources needed to do the work we aim to do? An elephant in the room is interdisciplinary
programming and collaboration. While over the last two decades the university has
declared its commitment to interdisciplinary teaching and scholarship, the policy and
financial infrastructure has not been shaped in ways to promote and sustain such efforts.
Ideas like cluster hiring, interdisciplinary centers, team teaching, research collaboratives
have been floated and sometimes initially supported, but have usually withered on the
vine due to administrative turnover and dean and faculty resistance to breaching their silos
(or cylindrical centers of excellence) and possible losing FTES to other programs. What
would be a big step forward for CSUF is a true plan to support interdisciplinary efforts
with hard funding and protection from vicissitudes of state funding and institutional inertia.
What will we teach? An addition to curriculum that would be beneficial to community and
students would be American Indian Studies, minor. For health or nursing, social work-
american indian studies could be a good fit as our graduates may eventually work with
a Native American community. I believe this document captures the ideals to which we
should aspire. "It is my hope that the AMP moves away from the creeping and perhaps
dominant language which equates higher education with job preparation. Yes, we do want students to be able to be gainfully employed upon graduation. But that is not the sole reason, and perhaps not even the main reason, why we teach. We are shaping the ability of citizens - of localities, states, nations, and the world - to critically and creatively engage the world around them. This is in part through the means by which they earn a living. But this also reflects through family life, civic institutions, the political sphere, various social domains, the physical and natural world, etc. My encouragement, then, is that we renew a notion of higher education in which the notion of ""higher"" also refers to ideals of educating the whole person and heightens her/his ability to engage the world around them. I also echo the point made by the subcommittee the need to help develop the moral and ethical faculties of students. Knowledge and skills without the appropriate moral and ethical sensitivities are dangerous. What we teach should recognize that we prepare students not simply with static knowledge but the skills and abilities to evolve, mature, recreate, and refashion themselves and their environments for progress. Just as important as deciding to teach these things is to heighten the awareness among students of the value of this perspective on learning and higher education and to get them out of the college-leads-to-job mindset. In terms of where we will teach, we should not lose sight of the value and uniqueness of interpersonal communication and interaction. Going online should not be seen as a substitute to in-person teaching. Thus we must invest in our physical infrastructure as much as our technological innovation and create adaptable, beautiful, functional physical spaces which are designed to communication and interaction. Design decisions matter, and those should be reflected in the spaces where teaching and learning occur." In addition to ""where"" will we teach, it may be useful to think about ""when"" we will teach - the campus is underutilized on Fridays. In ""Main Outcomes"", ""survival"" doesn't sound too appealing. Can we come up with a different term? Resilience? Also, missing a period in the description of the ""knowledge"" outcome. "Regarding Q4.1. Why is collaboration seen as central to learning outcomes? How is collaboration to be measured? Why is individual achievement not given equal consideration as an important learning outcome? Regarding Q.4.2. How Will we measure if students have a ""high quality life""? This assumes that there is one measure of high-quality. This measure is not the business of a university: we impact students' experiences here, but we do not determine their experiences after they leave the university. Indeed we shape and expand their opportunities in measurable ways, but measuring a ""high quality life"" is neither possible nor desirable; again, it is not our business." Based on comments which I have heard from a LOT of recruiters from many major corporations, there is a consistency in their discussion regarding 3 items, specifically regarding the Fullerton campus. (1.) Many say they are very frustrated with the poor quality of our students’ written communication skills; 2.) Many view that our students have inadequate critical and creative thinking skills; and, (3.) They view our students as having limited ability to actually ""apply"" their knowledge once they enter into the post-college career world. As a result, I have actually had a few recruiters tell me that they are becoming more focused on interviewing (especially for their really good jobs) at other universities. I believe these 3 items need to be a very strong priority. Where/how will we teach: in smaller classes (i.e., sections of 40-45, instead of 60) Chancellor White recently stated "The six touchstones for us are: diversity, quality, student success, public good, sustainability and innovation." While I see reference to diversity, quality, student success, public good, and innovation in Programs, Degrees, and Outcomes, I would like to see explicit inclusion of sustainability as well. Feedback from AMP website On learning outcomes, you need to include some language about accredited programs using their accreditation standards to help structure student learning outcomes in order to maintain accreditation. Assessment is
the spawn of Satan. Doing it is horrible enough. It is the ultimate administrative mandate that intrudes on faculty autonomy, removes power from faculty and centralizes it, crushes innovation, and biases resource decisions away from the arts and humanities. You are thinking "no, it doesn't do that." Yes, it does. Pay any attention to the vast literature critical of assessment and you'll quickly realize "that's not what we intend for it" is a mocking, hollow phrase. This is a Bush administration idea. Kill it. Nothing erodes faculty morale as swiftly or certainly. The AMP is described as follows: "This AMP—the first in CSUF history—will keep the University on track to achieve its strategic goals by answering, among other questions: What will we teach? Whom will we teach? Who will teach? How will we teach?" I have two comments, the first of which is general, and the second of which should be shared with the Steering Committee, the Sub-Committee on Programs, Degrees, and Outcomes, and the Sub-Committee on Faculty and Pedagogy. Comment 1: What problem is the AMP trying to solve? Why do we need it? It is clearly stated in the quote above, that this would be CSUF's first AMP. Academics have been humming along, and (arguably) flourishing, at CSUF for decades. We haven't needed an AMP in the past. So, what is the justification for having an AMP now? There doesn't seem to be a problem that would demand an AMP as its solution. If there is no problem which demands an AMP as its solution, then why is it being pursued? Comment 2: I fail to understand why committees, which are composed largely of administrators and non-teaching faculty, get to decide *what* faculty teach, and *how* we teach it. These questions are being asked at the wrong level. But, since they are being asked at this level, the answers should be obvious: encourage and support faculty in hiring other faculty, and then let the faculty—the experts about what and how to teach—make the decisions about what and how to teach. Perhaps, I have misconstrued the intent of the AMP, or misunderstood its scope or goals. I welcome feedback from those who read this. Seriously, are you cutting some programs and degrees through this process? Is this yet another back-door way to force assessment down our throats? AMP Subcommittee 2: Students Submit Additional Comments | Back to Top 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? Outline - Subcommittee 2 (PDF) | Draft Narrative - Subcommittee 2 - version 1 Feedback from Academic Senate / Academic Affairs Retreat Should have a discussion on "ideal" class size - what are our goals? Smaller classes presumably are beneficial for students, but how can we sustain it with the ever increasing student enrollment? How would you identify "CSU-eligible students that applied to CSUF going to institutions they are less likely to graduate from"? Why is it necessary for us to serve/recruit "CSU-eligible students that applied to CSUF going to more expensive institutions"? We need to know that the right person is admitted. College may not be the proper stage for everyone. "some colleges do not have enough full time faculty in lower division courses faculty need time to be effective in research and creative activity" "Incoming freshman have an average GPA of 3.57, yet 40% needs remediation; where is the disconnect? The main campus cannot keep up with a growing student population without a drastic increase in investment in infrastructure as well as faculty (instructors). Additional classrooms and laboratories (teaching and research) are needed to serve the growing student population." To respond to our diversity, continue to teach a history of challenge and inclusion. There is a need to create the space and resources on-campus to make us less of an online, commuter campus. We should serve the local community's students first and those in SoCal. Should reduce online distance learning in favor of enrolling and teaching face to face. Aggressive lobbying and PR to show how many CA students are missing out. "our students should match the local population demographics as the CSU was developed to serve the local
regions the community colleges have an important role for those that are underprepared" reduce student intake to teach better. quality over quantity. While the demographic data is interesting, it seems a provincial way to think about students. Is that the only way we understand them? Or can we also understand them in terms of academic potential, potential major, etc.? As we become more selective, it will be more important to really select, holistically, our incoming classes. Demography is but one way to do that. state, national, and international presence as a higher education institution that collaborates with diversified faculty and students. Continue to teach diverse, underrepresented, and first generation students and consider the resources needed to effectively teach them. If we are to serve diverse students, they need advisement, mentorship, and a smaller student to faculty ratio so that faculty/staff can effectively address student needs. With so many students, faculty and staff cannot adequately mentor all of their students. And our students deserve and need mentoring. CSUF is becoming more elitist. Access and equity should be paramount. the physical capacity of our buildings, classrooms and labs will place a cap on the the enrollment we can handle and the number of students we can service. with changing demographics in the region and country must be reflected in our student population as well. Opportunities provided must be based on the needs of this population. To attract and retain good students, we may need to think of expanding PhD in more disciplines, especially to STEM education. "Students bring with them rich and varied language and cultural experiences. All too often, these experiences remain unrecognized or undervalued as dominant mainstream discourses suppress students’ cultural capital (Bourdieu, 1990). When faculty successfully incorporate texts and pedagogical strategies that are culturally and linguistically responsive, they have been able to increase student efficacy, motivation, and academic achievement (Lee, 2001; Ladson-Billings, 1994). http:// www.ncte.org/cee/positions/diverselearnersinee" "Whom will we teach - Need to include international students out of state students Do we reach farther out of our service area - constraints on this? students interested in vocational background- how do we separate this from community college mission." Need to emphasize graduate programs more - see input from the Academic Senate Graduate committee. we have a tough choice between access and quality given our limited facilities and funds We must have a good idea about our facilities and capacity to answer the last question. We must also decide how committed we will be to access and to student in our service area. We teach students from the Orange county and Los Angeles area. Students are often first generation college students from working to lower middle class backgrounds. We will teach a reasonable number of students to allow for classroom engagement for student scholar development. A good summary of current state of affairs and issues to confront. The question of size is important but better to duck it for now. The emphasis on maintaining access our commitment to access -- while focusing resources to support student success-- is right on target. What is the impact of the economy on student enrollment? Is the enrollment of students coinciding with the economic cycles? As number and diversity of students expand, we do not have proper support resources and infrastructure to be all things to all students. What are the most important types of support that students need? our students reading skills need improvement and there is no "remedial reading" class offered. The emphasis that the governor and legislature places on getting a degree is, to a great extent, misplaced. it is not the degree that is important, but what our students learn in earning their degrees. that seems to be lost on some legislators in their attempts to underfund education "I think your point about what happens to the students we cannot admit is important, particularly the transfer students. this relates to our balance of freshmen and transfer students. I understand the need for freshman students, but transfer students have more limited options... Also, our students are place bound more so than those of
many other colleges. San Diego State's admissions policies have created political interest in solving access issues and also poor relationships with constituencies including p-12 schools and the public at large." Graduation rate is important, but what do they do with their education after graduate is important to monitor. The number of enrollment should be kept as is or even lower for quality of education. class size has grown. Most of our classes have 50 plus students per class. Not just local but global presence is important no comments There is a serious concern about how unprepared many students are when they enter the various programs in my department. The problem is magnified when they go through the program "successfully" (i.e. passing their courses) and arrive at the end of the program still under-prepared. Grade inflation is only one of the reasons for this situation. How can we change this? I have been hearing a lot about how csuf has not put much energy into recruitment in the past because we always have more students than we can accept. Now we are going to start shaping our student body with targeted recruitment. The plan should mention how the targets will be decided. targeted recruitment is needed across the colleges. Our diverse student body is a distinguishing feature of CSUF, and in order to achieve and facilitate progression and graduation rates, support services are particularly important. We want to maintain high academic standards while enabling our student population to succeed. "We are teaching the students of Orange County and California, as well as some international students. The physical campus is at its limit--we need to roll back our numbers or teach more online and at the Irvine campus" "I think it goes without saying but I would recommend that we reaffirm in each area that all of the recommendations are on the foundation of the commitment to high academic expectations. Students need to be challenged academically not just prepared to get a job. I find that many of our students do not come prepared to embrace a college student scholar role. I believe our students would benefit from a University 100 experience to understand the higher education rigor." we need to realize that most of students are working & their jobs are demanding. students need to travel to keep their jobs. the university & professors need to be flexible considering changing student needs. Faculty teach not only in the classroom during lecture, but also in their one to one meetings with students. This faculty role as mentors is very important for students. They often get more out of one to one meetings than during lecture time. The university should provide teaching release time and/or resources to help the faculty fulfill their role as mentors. I think we have over the years addressed the non-traditional student however more can be done: on-line/hybrid offerings; more weekend programs (not just courses). With that comes the need for more tech support for both faculty/students as well as mentor support, financial counseling, etc. for students to ensure they are able to meet their academic goals. "In this question, I didn't see information about how we support the students we teach. I think there needs to be information about the support services we provide to each student population, as well as how these support services help with addressing achievement gaps and quality of life for students across different identity communities on campus. In our departmental meeting, Provost Cruz stated that the Academic Master Plan will help guide us in the emergence of a data-driven, outcome oriented university future that quantifies the results of teaching and learning, and potentially could reward certain types of teaching or content that can be more easily quantified. I suggest that we need to be transparent about our response to this context in California, so that maintaining the quality of what we teach and how we teach can be ensured--and how our students are impacted by this quality, rather than lost as the data push influences our outcomes." "conflicting statements of "as many as possible" followed by "manageable cap"; is this eluding to establishing sub groups/quotas within the total? no mention of the non-traditional student model; is this no longer the case and if so, that message should be shared on a broader scale"
Realistically, we should not plan to increase enrollment any longer. We are already at the limit. I think we know the answers to these questions but might better utilize the information we have for student success initiatives, for example How do we address problems brought up by performance-based funding? For example, situations in which taking longer to graduate is better for student outcomes but the funding model is rewarding those who graduate students more quickly. "high quality in-person education for all Californians we must balance our mission to educate against how many students we can service effectively without raising the bar so high as to deter students from applying."

Emphasis should be on accessibility and affordability. "Q2.2. Demographics/Diversity CHANGE THE WORD BUT TO AND, ADD THE WORD EXCEPTIONAL: Fullerton’s ... Diversity provides us with a depth of experience and culture from which to continually benefit, AND it also provides the state with an EXCEPTIONAL example of a university campus that has succeeded at achieving goals for racial and ethnic diversity. 1. Who comes here? This list seems incomplete. Please include regional students, students well connected to our local communities, older students, non-traditional students, etc.

3. Who haven't we served? This list seems incomplete. Please include students outside our district who want to attend based on the strength of our programs. 1. EDIT/OMIT:• Students with an opinion 2. Aspirational: EDIT AND EXPAND: We will continue to teach California residents seeking a high-quality degree that prepares them for MULTIPLE CREATIVE AND PROFESSIONAL OPTIONS, flexible careers and/or advanced study," "I think there needs to be a concerted effort to conceptualize what online programs at CSUF should look like. Q3.1 is worded as, "’who comes here?’" this wording implies that all of our students are physically here. As the Chair of a department which is 100% online we sometimes experience issues with registration, bookstore, health services.... where the 100% online student population has not been considered; i.e., a student living in Abu Dhabi can't come to campus to with their driver's license to drop a class. In addition, it feels as though we very much work in silos and that a master plan for online instruction needs to be undertaken. We all started these up "’on the fly’". I think it might be time to regroup, see where we are, and what is needed." While successful matriculation into our undergraduate and graduate programs are becoming more competitive, we should still preserve a mindset of serving/accepting those who have compelling personal stories of perseverance through considerable hardships, but my not have the strongest grades and/or test scores. "Who? Regional, comprehensive, urban university. Whom have taught? Large portion of southern California workforce. Whom will teach? Continue to teach large portion of SoCal workforce. How many? Flexible. About 40,000 on current campus and off-campus sites, more if more build-out, even more online." I would love to see recommendations given all of this information. What is the max number of students that we enroll to be able to provide the services needed for these students? How do we ensure that we remain diverse if we primarily take from our region? WE need more support for online student's. We need to ensure that financial aid, admissions and records, etc. I would like to emphasize that international students who attend CSUF graduate program require stronger mentoring and counseling for both curriculum rigor and adjustment to US culture. Given the short time span they spend in the graduate program, a streamlined orientation about US educational system, assessment process and acclimatizing to the new environment will be helpful for their successful graduation from CSUF. I strongly recommend the committee to take a look at international students at the graduate level. Maintain access Have a commitment to the students in our community Maintain balance of freshmen, transfer and post bac students. What about grad students? Do we have a commitment to graduate study at CSUF Time to talk about strategically shaping our student body. How are the targets created? Colleges should have input on targeted
recruitment What is the appropriate number of students for CSUF? How does funding work if it doesn’t follow the feet of our students? Look at our service area and consider reducing its size. Make it a goal to diversify the graduate programs. Make it more of our role to provide graduate education for our students. Look at support services to support those targeted students that we want to bring in. Question 3 is incomplete. Doesn’t include range of students we teach in terms of age diversity, interests, can move in and out of programs and across programs. How do we address the need to bring in talented students outside our service area? Application timetables are not in sync with our competitor institutions. Long beach state recruits at Fullerton college, why? How do they have the mechanisms to recruit out of area? Could we have a more flexible admissions criteria set at the college level rather than at the institutional level? There is a hard limit to the number of students we can take in. There are competing interests when it comes to access. Access issue is difficult to balance. Raising of student fees over time hurts access. Question 3.3 highly qualified students who are not admitted and highly qualified students who cannot afford to attend CSUF. More expensive but less effective institutions. We need to highlight now low our students’ student loan debt is. Gather and report data. Need data on what students want in terms of age degree. Do they prefer to graduate in six years to be better able to balance family responsibilities? Question 5: admissions challenge. We don’t have room to grow. Doc should also address what the aspirational number is. Are we going to grow? The number never holds when we do set a max number. What will we do with 1000 more students this fall? Its not about trying to fit more into the existing facility, we cannot grow without more physical space. Match enrollment to our physical facilities. Push to have more internationals needs to balance with serving our local students. What is the rationale for setting what is the optimal student body? Same for undergrad to grad ratio. We draw faculty because we have a masters program. Also demands more resources. CSU is one of the few places where you can get a high quality masters program that is thesis based in the sciences. How can we work with K-12 to better prep students to be ready to come to csuf? Gap between ftes and head count is growing. We feel impact of headcount but funded by ftes. We are choked by headcount (ie parking) need to encourage students to take more credits and graduate sooner. Students that stay longer are losing income from years spent in school rather than working. Struggle for students to get classes when they want them. Also a problem with students taking too many units relative to their other commitments. Explosion in the graduation rates. Issues with calculating grad rate. If you switch major the major going to gets the credit. Does not account for spring admits. Could look at age. We need to give credits to our students who work. Let them space out and delay graduation to accommodate life circumstances. Is there a way to build in the intention of the student in terms of expected time to graduation. Some students intend to graduate in six years when they start. Too hard for students to be full time students and full time employees. The full time tuition rate causes students to take more units than they should. They think they should take more to get better value. Is graduation rate the only measure of academic success? Where do they go after graduation? We do not survey then after graduation. Need exit survey. We want to be everything: liberal arts, serving our community. We cannot do both. Maybe we should think about reducing our enrollment. We are low funded on a per student basis. We only care about FTE. We need to think about public-private partnerships. Create some high fee program that can subsidize other low fee programs. What about Irvine? We should focus on our masters programs as a competitive advantage. Focus on quality over quantity. Incorporate stats on first-generation students and low-income students, students with caregiving responsibilities, students with full-time and part-time jobs (on campus versus off campus work). How many students are eligible for federal work study and how many actually use it? (How can we promote
work study, so that students know about it and know how to apply?) More emphasis on nontraditional students and how that impacts the mission of the university. Maybe break out stats on gender and URM, so that we can track how URM men, in particular, are doing at CSUF. Incorporate retention and persistence rates. Be mindful about how 4-year graduation rates might not be realistic for our student body. What high schools do students come from? How do we handle the fact that high school GPA’s are not standardized? How do we balance our impaction with access? “Who are our students”—in this section, look at what our barriers are for current students? (example: parking, mental health needs [current limit of 8 sessions and wait times not cutting it], students with disabilities, veterans, adult reentry students) Non-retention—why do we lose students? More fully address mental health needs. 2.3: Doctoral degree calculation is incorrect. Who leaves and why? This will speak to student retention. Are there support services that we aren’t providing and could? What could we have done to keep students here? If we don’t currently have this information, we should suggest that, moving forward, we will try and gather it. Need data on international students. How do we provide for international students once they are here? How many students are we serving outside of our service area? Include data about how many students are transfers v. first-time students? How many students come in needing remediation? Why? How can the incoming GPA be so high, when so many students need remediation? GPAs are unreliable predictors for admission. Students seem less prepared now than they were 4-7 years ago. Graduate education – the Graduate Studies Academic Master Plan should be integrated into the larger AMP. Make sure post baccalaureate students are included. Students would benefit from a year of skills development—how do you become a college student? Campus designed for 18,000 students. We are twice the capacity of what we can handle. How do balance access with sustainability? Need to stop growing. Being the best institution doesn’t mean you have to be the biggest. What is our capacity? We should not resort to more online classes to solve this problem. We don’t want to be that kind of institution. Smaller class sizes are needed to better serve students. This will help graduation rates. Are our current incoming students college ready? The “Whom Will We Teach” section might be too limiting—concerns that it will set up “quotas”. It’s clear from our GPA trend that access is problem. We’re becoming more elitist. We need to focus on access as being important. More about who we are turning away and why. Access is determined by GPA and SAT/ACT scores. Maybe we need to have more holistic measures for admission. We need to keep the emphasis on access not opportunity. Graduation rates began rising before student success initiatives. Check assumptions about what’s contributing to better graduation rates. Be wary of making ad hoc fallacies about the correlation between student success initiatives and better graduation rates. First generation student data Major breakdown of incoming students, including dual degrees, double majors, and minors Existing data broken down by college How many of our local students get turned away and what happens to the students who don’t get admitted to CSUF. Many students in California won’t go to college if they don’t get in to their local CSU. (Are they going to for profit schools?) How many out of region, out of state, and international students? What are first-year and transfer students coming in with, in terms of AP, transfer credit, etc…? How do we provide the support students need to support them once they’re here, especially in terms of faculty mentorship of students? This is a question about SFR. Need to have sufficient number of faculty to handle the number of students that we admit. We have a lot of data about our students—we may not be using this as much as we can when making decisions about the University. In the “who are we” section, we need to clarify if we are a master’s comprehensive University or an R-3. Are we aspiring to be a research university, or not? A student mentioned being taught only by adjunct faculty, and she’s
about to graduate. She said this contributes to the feeling of students not being supported on campus. They don’t have the opportunity to work on research with faculty, etc… She said it feels like adjunct faculty are not as invested in students here. University should be engaged with the colleges and departments to make sure there is more gender equity in STEM disciplines. Students need to have career information infused into classes, so that they have a better sense of the options available to them. This could also be better built into advising. The student in the group suggested that it helps when students know their advisor. Capacity is a big issue: we are at 39,000 students. We cannot offer more classes, as there are no rooms. We need to be able to properly serve the students, including teaching and advising them. The AMP is aspirational, as the document says: as many as possible is noted in the Q2 statement but…. We have space issue and fiscal issues—these continue to be challenges that govern size and growth. So “as many as possible” is logical and rationale Support services for students: was this discussed within any AMP Question by any Subcommittee? This is critical topic for an AMP. Support such as CAPS, health, mentoring, tutoring, etc., tailored for specific student groups, such as int’l students. Noted: there is an increasing number of int’l students, especially in grad programs in one college = they pay more, this might be a reason for the growth, but not enough support for these students. Perhaps, if we see a growth in any one group, we need to monitor those trends and support those students. We need to be flexible to do so. CAPS serves are not satisfactory for the current student body. Closes at 5pm: student crises do not occur only before 5pm. Some students are never on campus before 5pm. Quality education: are we rewarded in getting out students in 4 years? This is not practical for the students themselves. That isn’t necessarily the best outcome for the students themselves. Students say that they’ve been told to take 15 units, but the say that they are not prepared and go on probation. Therefore, time to degree is important, but not realistic for many current students. Students say that they have mixed messages on time-to-degree. The message needs to be tailored for the students—students need to know that they have a choice and how to chose for themselves. Question number 4. Graduate students need to be mentioned Noted that nothing in the Q2’s answer on Students says anything about the support services that we provide to the student groups, and how they address the quality of student life and address achievement gaps among various groups of students. We need to be sure that LGBTQ research is vital for the students, for example. We need to identify if some support services are missing, and assess those services so they continue to improve. We need to provide professional development for staff to improve their work and provide faculty development opportunities to support our students. Will continue to be an HSI, and continue to improve Question raised about the 11, 000 student impacted that are csu eligible whom we cannot serve? How does this affect our AMP? Does it? We acknowledge that: 18 million people living in this area. CSUF is landlocked. What is needed is another CSU campus to meet the current and future need. Perhaps ensure that the transfer support services are adequate and well functioning so that the student who go to com college can transfer successfully. Use of technology: need to continue to support our students to use technology for academic reasons. To continue to support our students’ development in that area. Teach them how to evaluate the use of the technology, ex. social media as a source of information. Need to continue to support the library and courses they take for improving this area. Online: we could use this more? Concern voiced about online education: corporate controlling the curriculum, etc. And, so many of our students work, work more, support families, etc. Therefore the 4-year degree is a myth = they cannot successfully handle 15 units. Need more scholarship funds so that students can spend more time studying rather than working. Find a better balance between hours spent on each. Will enrollment continue to grow? Question
re: Common core: if students are being prepared by this, how do we learn to better establish and engage the learning process? Incoming GPA for Undergrads is very high. High quality faculty being hired. Question: Do we serve the students well? Very healthy in grad population—more resources are needed for grad students. We need to consider providing them different resources—grad and UGs. Advising for UG’s is now streamlined with technological resources. However, not for grad students, and there are few resources for grad student advising. The grad advising is more work than teaching a class. Need to have policies and practices and technology for advising grad students. Incoming FTF: noted that the GPA of the incoming FTF is going up, but the teaching experience of the students’ math and writing skills is deteriorating. How can that be? Is it our job to prepare students who are need remedial education? Or is this the job of community colleges? Discussion of GPA standards under impaction and state standards. Discussion of tests required for FTF: SAT, math, etc. We should re-evaluate the summer bridge programs. Common core might help with the preparation. Perhaps tests could be used to determine if the FTF is eligible to enter CSU? Then perhaps they are required to attend a community college? Need to have improved coordination between CSU and community colleges so that the transfer students are better advised. Arts students often take incorrect courses in community college and do not progress well; also, many courses do not transfer. Need better articulation with community colleges and/or better implementation of the articulation, as well as better advisement. For transfer students: need to involve departments with the incoming transfer students: Wish that there were consultation with the department of the new major for the admission process of the transfer student. How do we honor and support the differences of our specific student groups, without becoming exclusionary to others? The more that we recognize various student populations, and the more that we focus on these various populations, there could be a danger that we isolate these populations. The silo: we need to avoid this. How to celebrate differences among our students while building commonality? Important to provide opportunities for varying demographics so that students feel safe and feel are supported. But also create opportunities for the whole at the same time. Commonality: what is ours? Is being a titan a commonality? (What is a Titan?) Support for students: how do we support them, their research, etc.? Problem: HIPs are costly.... And this cost can price the students out of the ability to participate. Are we funding these HIP’s appropriately? Are we failing by trying to give everyone $5 when they really need $20? Shall we instead give only a students $20? What is appropriate? Concern that we are diluting the pool by giving everyone too little money to fund the activity. Also, we need to recognize the invisible costs and view the cost of the activity from a student viewpoint. $25 for parking to attend a conference is a lot to some students but can be a forgotten expense. Need to remember that not everything is about quantity, but quality is important. Some small programs boutique is okay. comparing faculty workload: teach 30 students vs. mentor 6 students in research: Both are valued. (Discussion of faculty buyout.) We are differentiated from other universities, including R1s: we are a research university because we are a student research university and, our student research is often with undergrad students and undergraduate resources. Students attending conferences: They need to go twice: once to see what it is and the next time to present. We need to do better job at finding the funding: off campus partners UGs vs. grads: how do we help our UG’s go to grad school? How do we harness the resource of graduate education and graduate students to help our UG’s as well. We need to recognize the role of the grad education and graduate students: important role for UG education: peer, mentors, informal and formal We need grad education. We need to do a better job of educating and helping our community understand the role of education—parents, families, etc. Perhaps we can improve the crafting of messages, branding, communication, modes,
delivery, audiences…. Need support for overall messages, communications, to help our various audiences—Community Colleges, high schools, parents—beyond university to understand our message…. Website can be improved, all college website, department. We are an institution that is educating the children of the working class. Many of our students are first generation college students and they need more institutional support to have a sense of belonging and persist. when considering who we are as teachers - how do we factor in CSUF faculty workload? How does CSUF faculty workload appear relative to other CSUFs with comparable amounts of students, faculty, course needs, etc? How does our workload shape who we are as teachers - and especially when thinking about our effectiveness and capacity? How is the CSUF 4-4 workload factored in to any decisions the university makes? How can we support faculty research/creative activities in ways that bolster and foster better teaching? why doesn't every college get to include students in the instructional process as teacher assistants - how might that be supported across disciplines by the university? We? President Garcia calls us all "Educators". As educators, we have taught and are teaching students, co-workers and community. There is no limit to how many an educator will teach. The challenges sections are useful for identifying issues we are either already facing or will be in the near future, but for a forward looking master plan, it seems to be missing potential solutions to these challenges. For example, it is difficult to imagine how we maintain an annual increase in student body unless we greatly expand either physically or as an online presence. It also seems difficult to maintain our activities if we remain the lowest funded of the 23 campuses so action to remedy this situation should be proposed. If the university wants more graduate programs, it seems changes need to be made that provide incentive to departments for creating and maintaining those programs (classes capped at 15 or 18 are expensive to staff). Lastly, apparently we have a pretty good idea of what outcome based funding the governor is/ has proposed so an explicit plan to counter negative outcomes from the funding plan while maximizing funding CSUF receives should be proposed. "This question is simple: We are the future, and we are teaching the future. I don't limit this to the notion of the "future workforce." Our campus is teaching a microcosm of what Orange County, Southern California, California and the United States will be. Everyone else will be catching up to who we are and what we do. As such, innovation should be at the heart of what we do. We should not follow or imitate, we should be breaking the mold. Our campus should be a laboratory where ideas of the future are tested and refined. But we can't do this teaching a volume of students that outstrips our resources. So, either get more or cut down the number of students we serve. Access is a central value of our university, but there are resource limits. If the volume of students outweighs our resources, we will not be able to do anything well let along innovate in education. I addition, who we are should not be an organization that constrains the creativity of those doing the educating. Faculty and staff should be freed from the shackles of administration, administrative structures, and bureaucracy which stifle innovation and creativity. Let the components in Academic Affairs lead and reform other portions of the university to support that leadership." To support student diversity, the plan might include a comment on how the university can help support, retain, and ensure the success of historically under-represented minorities or disadvantaged students. Why does table/figure 2.3. have year ranges (in the left-most column) that "jump" - e.g. it is not instantly apparent how many degrees we awarded from 2011 to 2013. Under section 5.3., I feel that one of the challenges for students is related to the fact that CSUF is a commuter campus. Another challenge: so many of my student indicate that CSUF is not their first choice. Can we do some research into this? What factors make other institutions more desirable? I disagree with the statement that we are at or a little bit overcapacity on their campus. We are terribly
overcrowded, and we do not have sufficient classrooms. Faculty cannot teach effectively and students cannot learn effectively under these circumstances. Again, lower the class size and students' access to instructors will vastly improve. Feedback from AMP website I believe students should make up a significant portion of the student subcommittee. This doesn't mean students involved with Associated Students Incorporated (ASI) which report directly to campus administration and therefore have a conflict of interests in sitting on this subcommittee. Students demand to have a real voice on these matters.

AMP Subcommittee 3: Faculty and Pedagogy Submit Additional Comments | Back to Top 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 students throughout their careers? Outline - Subcommittee 3 (PDF) | Draft Narrative - Subcommittee 3 - version 1 Feedback from Academic Senate / Academic Affairs Retreat Need to provide strong support to secure and support high quality diverse faculty. If we are serious about research and creative activity then more time and money are needed. Recognize and respect the talents of faculty. More assigned time for revisions and new technology. The NIH now views those who are a first generation college graduate as "underrepresented" regardless of race or ethnicity. This should be considered when recruiting faculty as well. "The data in the report regarding faculty racial diversity are unclear and inconsistent from data that have been reviewed before. We have a SERIOUS problem with regard to faculty diversity that remains unsolved, despite rhetorical commitments. We need clear quantitative goals to drive our recruitment, development, and retention of a much more diverse TT faculty. Otherwise, we are just talking about it, while faculty of color (and female faculty in underrepresented fields) continue to face the same challenges, discrimination, exclusion, and inordinate service demands, and are more likely to leave. Our students seek them out, and they are hard to find. Faculty diversity wise, we also need an analysis done of each College, each department. Having one faculty member of color in a department is a serious problem, and should be addressed too, in addition to the need to at least move aggressively towards mirroring the diversity in California and/or our student body. The Teacher Scholar model is okay, but fails to push the envelope in terms of what types of interactions faculty need to have with students. The emphasis on online, technology as the future is very problematic. Students may "choose" to do online course, but that is a direct result of increasing financial pressures, a result of the continuing raise of fees. The argument that these types of teaching increase equity is false. Online offerings are never as productive as face to face, and never will be. So, as student fees go up, we offer a less effective method as a solution. Last, to develop our faculty effectively, we must move funding away from IT, and towards the types of programs that have been offered recently at the FDC on a shoestring budget. Development of the faculty themselves as people, as scholars, as teachers is more important than investing exorbitantly in tools that will come and go." Faculty interactions with students outside the classrooms should in general significantly. Placing good professors at lower division required courses is very important for retention. Students sometimes completely turn away from the major if they lose interest early in the program. This will in turn, delay student graduation. Provide a high level education by providing learning in a variety of settings, whether it be in person, online, or through other means to accomplish the best education possible for all CSUF students. "Faculty are represented as "content deliverers."" Focus on the role of faculty in transformative instructional and mentoring relationships with students. Focus on critical pedagogies that are essential to participatory democracy. Teach beyond the metrics and outcomes." Adequate research space and support are needed for faculty to engage students in their research and bring their research to classrooms. More focus should be
paid in supporting faculty development and boosting faculty morale. Faculty hiring may not be an issue. But we may end up losing our good faculty if we do not provide them support. Must make sure faculty are compensated for "supervisory" courses. Faculty put an incredible amount of effort into supervising students in very, very high impact practice research and creative activities. Teacher scholars are active researchers committed to the advancement of knowledge. They bring this knowledge into the classroom to ensure that our students receive the most current educational experience. At some point in the document, it should say that Curriculum and Student Success are faculty-driven. Think the recommendations should also address the reality of lecturers teaching courses given resource constraints, and specifically how to best utilize as well as support them.

Recommendation - the number of TT faculty required indicated to sustain current density ratio seems high. "Tenure track density should be considered in relation to the instructional delivery--engaged scholarship attracts all good faculty perhaps we should think, too, about the scholar teacher not just the teacher scholar how are the characteristics of the "pedagogy of the teacher-Scholar" not just characteristics of effective pedagogy in general?" Faculty research and scholarly and creative activities (RSCA) must be more prominent - especially starting with Q2.2 - there is a conspicuous absence of RSCA in the document. A teacher-scholar uses RSCA to engage students in learning the methods, paradigms of the field and also integrating and applying theory to practice. This needs to be acknowledged, supported, and financed. It is critical for attracting high-quality, student-centered faculty and retaining them. Given the cost asymmetries and differences in the number of students taught is it even really possible to increase the number of tenured and tenure track faculty without a recalibration in funding for the CSU and a recalibration of how FTES translate to FTEF. In addition, the emphasis on high-impact practices (which is good) requires lower SFR than we typically aspire to and, if the impact of HIPS is to be meaningful, it will need to be at least partially in the lower division. How do we do that without radically rethinking how we pay for faculty. Faculty who are teacher scholars will provide learning opportunities for students by combining high impact practices which include research. Providing forums for both faculty and students to present research based on classroom assignments and foster this. A good summary of current conditions, as in other committees. but it skirts the issue of how to fund the increase faculty density and support it. without that recognition, the goal of higher TT density will be hard to meet. Not sure if Teacher-Scholar term has a specific meaning (Boyer's definition?) or is being used generically. hope it is the latter. the emphasis on teacher-scholar is very appropriate. the document appropriately refers to Boyer's model, but should also reflect more recent conceptions of community engaged scholarship (including Boyer', 1996).

Since scholarly/creative activities is not recognized as part of faculty workload, it will be important to ensure that released time is available for these activities throughout the probationary period. this will enable faculty to fully develop a research program that will be sustainable throughout their careers. Is the designation of teacher-scholar apply only to tenured/tenure track faculty? In a perfect world would all faculty be tenured/TT? Are there some disciplines where the highest tenure/TT ratio are not appropriate or realistic? There is a huge disconnect here between what is desired and what is possible given resources available. Staffing levels and support they provide to faculty, operations and instruction clearly missing. Do not have proper or sufficient infrastructures in place to provide proper support for faculty. educational delivery should be tailored to our students skillsets. online education may work well for high performing and disciplined students, but not too well in remedial classes. the future will have dramatic changes in educational delivery. virtual reality will probably the next "big thing". it is not unrealistic to have master professors teach (using technology) many students with faculty being more like TA's to
handle student questions. This can reduce educational costs, but may not be satisfying to many faculty. The CSU is getting a bad rep for faculty and staff salary and working conditions. We lose too many faculty before tenure. “I am concerned about faculty burnout with heavy teaching loads and large class sizes. I had a conversation with one adjunct faculty who has taught for 8 years for our program while she maintains her full-time job outside. She expressed her frustration with the quality of the students she has taught and the class sizes. Do we have data on the reasons leaving the CSU?” Lecturers, they teach 2/3 of our classes yet are hardly mentioned. Is the aspiration essentially not to have any lecturers? A class system perpetuated. The haves and the have-nots. Yet these professionals often bring the real world into the classroom where professors who have spent their entire careers in academia may not have the necessary perspective one of the most important! We must aggressively diversify our faculty - once hired, most will be with us a long time. Thus, hiring just 50% faculty of color in a year is far short of what we need. Also, there must be incentives for faculty to lean into teaching equity and deconstructing western teaching models. Although it may be assumed from the context, I suggest that the multi-year recruitment plan described on pg. 4 specify in the bullet points that annual hiring be for tenure-track lines. Also, it might make sense to add that these tenure lines are needed not just to sustain/increase the quality of instruction, but also to provide the necessary infrastructure to carry out the University’s operations (committee work, advising, etc.). Training in cultural competency should be more emphasized. “Great start! Diversity of faculty is important, but also the cultural competence of the faculty is vital. My key questions are: How can we support faculty in engaging diverse students in face to face interactions? How can we ensure our faculty are open to learning and “being students of students”? We need to further emphasize the absolute IMPORTANCE of faculty training in understanding the student populations they serve, adapting the teaching methods to meet the cultures/needs of the students they teach, and also creating greater personal awareness of the faculty’s own social cultural location and identities and how this impacts their teaching. The equitable part of the statement in Q2.1 should not be buried under the “Furthermore” statement. It should be more central, and include a list of bullet points underneath. Please see the following which was drafted for the GE outcomes for students awhile ago that could be adapted as bullet points: Demonstrate an understanding of the ways in which culture, difference, and otherness are socially constructed and fundamental to social interaction in an inter-connected world. Demonstrate reflection and appreciation of the complex relationships that various factors such as gender, ethnicity, race, sexual orientation, religion, class, and exceptionality bring to a discussion of society and culture. Demonstrate a critical understanding of how power, privilege, and oppression play out across a range of cultures, human experiences, and intersecting social locations and historical experiences, including but not limited to one’s own experiences. Recognize how one’s own cultural histories and practices mediate one’s own sense of self and relationships to others. Describe and understand how to enact ethical and transformative frameworks, modes of exchange and communication that promote social justice, equity, and inclusiveness. Could we not be optimistic and HOPE, strive towards a similar sort of education for our faculty members? Clearly some disciplines DO not offer training in these areas and this impacts the teaching and education of our student body. Our university NEEDS to offer training in these new fields to ALL instructors in an appropriate level. When expanding this section in this subcommittee, please MAKE SURE that the committee include some of the campus experts who are well trained and versed in areas of diversity. For example, a new subcommittee has just been formed by the President’s office including the leadership of “campus affinity” subcommittee including R.A.C.E., faculty associations of various groups of people of color, veterans center, GLBTQ center, etc. How about
consulting this "campus affinity group" specifically and including them in this process? Also this will require additional support for the FDC to continue the new training in this vital area for effective teaching. Please consider ways to support this type of programing. Again in conclusion, how can we support faculty in engaging diverse students in face to face interactions? How can we ensure our faculty are open to learning and "being students of students"? The steady increase in research and administrative demands that we have experimented over the years should be reflected in a more equitable teaching load. A 3/3 teaching load is long overdue. Shoring up tenure-line faculty is important as well as robust faculty support for teaching and scholarship. "The term "adequate" is used to describe the cadre of faculty necessary to achieve the mission. Unless we believe that we cannot recruit, develop, and maintain an excellent cadre of faculty, I recommend the use of a different term. Continue to build structures to support the development online pedagogy that is ongoing and responsive to emerging technologies, disciplinary knowledge and practices, and learners' needs. Increase the invest in tenure-track faculty lines. Tenure-track faculty are essential the the health and growth of a department and its programs. We need to prepare ourselves for the large number of tenured faculty that will be retiring and (FERP) in the next 3, 5, 7 years. expanded access to technology is not just a given but an imperative. We will need to not only offer professional development to faculty, but require it. As an example, some CSU campuses are requiring that faculty have demonstrated expertise to teach online. This has been a requirement at the Community College level for some time. "We need to recognize the important role adjunct faculty play on campus and ensure they feel connected to their departments and the campus. This includes financial support for workshops and professional development. We need to do better at training the faculty who teach in our General Education program. New/junior faculty need to be given more of a voice in campus governance (support in the tenure process for serving on committees that are important committees)" Please don't forget the staff who directly or indirectly support teaching such as academic advisors college success teams, supplemental instruction as well as others who teach academic integrity expectations. I understand faculty are the "teachers" on campus, but it seems like there should be some mention of the other "educators" on campus (our staff, especially in Student Affairs, educate/develop our students in ways that compliment what they're learning in the classroom). None of the sub-committees really address the benefit and/ or needs of staff on campus as related to our growth, student development/learning or needs. Obtaining quality diverse faculty, especially in disciplines where persons' salaries are higher in private sector than what can be made in academic setting, is an ongoing challenge.Strides have been made, however more needs to be done so we can be at least competitive with community colleges, for example. The need for FT faculty is a must; to reduce that high percentage of PT faculty that teach undergraduate courses. "I want to echo the importance of opening more tenure-line faculty positions, and ensuring that eligible part time faculty are supported in their application for those positions. Recruiting diverse faculty means ensuring diversity of thought, and that faculty hold the values of ensuring just, equitable and inclusive education JEIE for all students. This means looking at and beyond the demographic identities of applicants, to include their dispositions and work in this JEIE area. We need to continue ensuring that faculty professional development and academic technology support is offered to ensure we can meet the goal of building teacher scholars. In our departmental meeting, Provost Cruz stated that the Academic Master Plan will help guide us in the emergence of a data-driven, outcome oriented university future that quantifies the results of teaching and learning, and potentially could reward certain types of teaching or content that can be more easily quantified. I suggest that we need to be transparent about our response to this context
in California, so that maintaining the quality of what we teach and how we teach can be ensured, rather than lost as the data push influences our outcomes." Develop and commit to institutional target for TT density; this point has changed over the past years and conflicting messages have been delivered. "Faculty salary needs to be included when you discuss support for faculty. How are faculty supposed to be effective teacher-scholars when the salary is less than those of community college faculty? By contract, PT faculty are asked to just teach, without duty of research. Thus, all the faculty cannot be teacher-scholars." we need fundamental reform of the up or out RTP system. This year we will deny tenure to many talented teachers for failure to meet research standards while awarding tenure to good researchers who may be poor teachers who are unengaged in service. One solution is to create two classes of specialty faculty, one focused on research and one on teaching. Other universities have done this, why can't we? Will departments with a large proportion of part-time faculty teaching courses be punished or penalized? This is often out of departmental control, if there are a large number of majors, but the Provost only allows one hire or less per year. In terms of providing high-quality learning opportunities for students, I believe that students suffer when there are less full-time faculty for them to interact with. Adjunct faculty often teach at different institutions and as a result, there are less opportunities for students to engage with their professors. For students, a disconnect from their faculty can perpetuate the feeling that they are not being fully supported at our institution. “the faculty should endeavours to reflect the demographic makeup of California and the student population when possible but not jeopardize the university’s ability to provide high quality education we must seek a balance between teaching and the drive to do more research are we a predominantly teaching university or a university that aspires to become an R2 university?” It seems that tenure track/tenured has been conflated with full time faculty. There is no discussion of full time lectures. Perhaps we should be talking not about tenure density but about full time faculty density EDIT TO ADD THE WORD GREATER (as we have not reached gender equity): Faculty Diversity. Faculty recruitment is leading to an increasingly diverse faculty in terms of gender and ethnicity. In terms of gender, CSUF reached GREATER equity in tenure-track recruitment in the past decade; across all tenured/tenure-track faculty in 2014, 45% are women and 55% are male If all faculty are teacher-scholars, will we also consider temporary faculty in this way and reward them for their research- which could be action based? I like the bullet point under "Teacher-Scholar" that states the combination of teaching,scholarship, and creative activities will be different for each faculty member. It makes sense when creating a team to take advantage of the different strengths each team member brings. Best practices and training regarding how to infuse critical thinking and writing in their coursework would be beneficial. "Who teach? High school grads and returning and older students, all of whom meet admissions standards. Support faculty? Continue to make case to state for importance of investment in higher ed; continue both gift (CSFPF) and grant (ASC) solicitation and acquisition; analyze budget allocations across campus annually for possible reallocation where new or shifting needs arise." I love the idea of expanding the teacher scholar notion. I would also like more of an explanations for what happens to teaching and learning if we fall below a particular density level. Do we know what happens? Is there research? The question includes faculty support for students throughout their careers. The committee should make case to support that faculty can provide to students after their graduation. Areas such as career guidance, creating alumni networks, brining alumni back into campus for lectures are ways students can be supported throughout their career and adequate support for faculty is needed for it. Diversity in faculty is important Clear and transparent expectation is important Teacher-scholar model is appreciated but it need to be individulizable because everyone has
different strengths. Consistency expectations is also important. At the CSU we need to be “good enough” in all three but then can excel in one. Is it possible to increase tenure density? How are we going to recruit and retain faculty? Should tenure-track density be the all important priority at the exclusion of all other priorities. We have to work on retention. Especially for our diverse faculty. How do we balance the individual teaching capabilities of different faculty? We need to ensure we hire faculty that are going to teach 3-4 classes a semester. Part-time faculty hinder the students making a connection to campus, college. Students don’t feel they are well supported. Student in her third year has had nothing but part-time faculty. How do we make faculty take PD and reflect on and improve their faculty to work on teaching. Full-time is much more important than tenure-track. Should look at full-time vs part-time. Tenured professors are reluctant to change and address teaching weaknesses. Have to be open to change. Hire for change. This subcommittee has done great work – data rich, right on the issue. The efforts named in the document would be difficult to sustain given limited resources. FDC need to identify what they can really focus on, not name everything under the sun. For example, personalized support to all faculty is unrealistic. Tenure density: Need to establish a tenure density goal – track it every year; Need to identify how much increase we want every year. The important thing is to set a number we can achieve in small steps. We are below system average – maybe set the goal of system average, aiming for 5% increase every year (for instance). Tenure density is the most critical issue in the AMP. The credibility of the whole AMP depends on this. This must be transparently linked to SFR. Maybe should look graduate tenure density vs. undergrad tenure density separately. Need to ensure that students interact with different types of faculty – need tenure-track faculty to teach GE courses, and have small class size. Funding needs to incentivize putting tenure track faculty in GE courses. Good job of summarizing current state of affairs. Faculty density is really a resource issue. Goal is laudable but is it sustainable? Clarify that replacement includes attrition. Need to address non-faculty professionals teaching. Need to leverage TAs. Student/faculty ratio needs to be addressed. Should we have an honors track to help leverage sources. Need longer term assignments in faculty development. Or perhaps college oriented/assigned faculty developers. To make learning more sustainable. Need to talk about lecturers. What are our goals and support if we have to hire lecturers. Need to encourage the use of Titanium for all classes. Provide all materials so even if students miss class they have materials. Use grade book for transparency. Critical early classes – need to have very best TT professors teach critical early classes to engage early. Helps establish long time connections. New faculty should have to teach first semester program classes. Our part-time faculty are very important professionals that provide the real world experience. Make link to outside businesses. How do we deal with critical courses in other departments/colleges (i.e. Calculus). Need to train new faculty in pedagogy especially new part-time faculty. When you think about faculty and pedagogy, faculty need time and resources to do it well. Teaching load is high, yet research demands are ever increasing. 4-4 load is way too much. Need to look at work load – what’s reasonable? Quantity of teaching is compromising quality of teaching. Research with students needs to be properly compensated. What about the idea of research faculty vs. teaching faculty? Maybe a continuum? Need to develop good parameters? Recruitment and retention of high quality faculty is a challenge. Research productive faculty need to be separated from non-productive faculty. Need consistent policy in the university to recognize research productive faculty, otherwise they feel “exploited”. Office of research is working to provide support to reduce the amount of administrative/logistic work involved in research. Maybe helpful? The university needs to figure out how much we value research. Release time has increased a lot. Also too many students. Research on assigned time vs. research done above and beyond are treated
the same way. Is this fair? How to judge the “productivity” of research – paper published? $ of grant? Etc. “Cost match” could be calculated between the $ of hiring someone to teach a class vs. the $ brought in in research grant. One of the motivations for faculty to write grants is IDC distribution. PIs should get a good trunk of the grant – also there needs to have some consistency between colleges. Huge inconsistency in terms of fund distribution between colleges right now. The size of lecturers depends on demand on research. Tenure density – is there an ideal number? CSU has used 75%. Our number is low – mostly due to budgetary issues and administrative cut. Number of students in each class needs to be considered in considering faculty workload. Part-time faculty can’t include them in relation to teacher-scholar and expanding the notion. In current CBA can’t ask for that. Not just research. Can we do this? How does this include them? Who is held accountable if we have low number tenure track? Is no one accountable? No one is now. We need approval from Provost. So the Provost needs to change this? Sometimes we have part time because we try to search but can’t get people to come here. Also in part based on numbers. It is a challenge. Not anyone’s fault. System-wide tenure density and decreased. If we keep growing at 3% we will need 70-80 per year to keep up. We have a lot of retirement loses. We can’t hire enough because provost says no you can only hire one and not two. Why isn’t the salary issue in this? We should not be below community college level but we are. Salary need to be addressed to keep up retention rates. These is a disparity between administrator and faculty. Salaries are in part based on enrollment in their class in community college. They also teach many more classes. College of Arts is 3:3 because studio courses run 6 hours a day. Sounds like we are supporting after graduation…question 2. Is this in fact that case? How will we support faculty to support high quality opportunities for student throughout their careers. This is an alumni association issue. Does the scope include this? Should be on the College level? Outreach? Some colleges are trying to embed some of the career development in their courses. They can find out where advising has failed. They are making the career center visits a must. Should students be required? Mandatory advising is working. Maybe a strong nudge is enough…when do you want to sign up instead of a must….. Must consider that different departments have different needs. Some need labs and some don’t. We can’t all be held to the same standard. While it is focused on faculty, we can’t forget staff who support teachers. Advisors, SSI. Faculty are the teachers but all are educators. We need the data on how staff impact education. We need to think about tenure line positions we need to support part time faculty that are eligible. In fact it feels like part time are not even considered for tenure line positions. Consider examining why we only offer certain position to part time…why is the associate direct for honors program that is only for tenure track. Part time are very capable. This is is similar for staff…they could be eligible for the position. Focus on the qualities and qualification not the default of tenure track. In fact we need more tenure track teaching…this would help. How do we support tenure track teaching while still supporting their research and other interest? We need equitable teaching loads…2/1 4/1 depending on college. Need research on why and is this correct? What is the recommendation of max load. Some Colleges have polies on max buy out to ensure we have tenure track teaching. How about salaries for faculty? We have a retention challenge in our region given our salaries. Research looking at the year we lose tenure track (year 2 and 3) why do we lose them? What supports are needed. Should we fund a named distinguished faculty position as an incentive? We want to support the faculty professional development in the area of diversity. This could even be expanded. Can we have modules on diversity and technology that are required if we are committed to this…orientation, on-going, like the sexual harassment. Maybe included in UPS 210. Include knowledge about the resources. Helps with retentions. Online pedagogy
needs support. It is always changing we need this. Tenure is making it difficult to improve teaching. Tenured professors just refuse. This needs to be addressed. Getting different message regarding tenure-density. The idea of who should be teaching...no real goals. Matching available pools is not specific. Do we want faculty that match student body? Diversity numbers should be reviewed. Do not match understanding. Full time versus part time needs to be explored. Does it matter that we are behind system average? Isn't full-time and diversity more important than tt/t? Hard to get faculty to come. Diversity and service are marginalized. Personal support for service and diversity is needed. Diversity brings on extra burden and a larger service commitment. Needs to be acknowledge. Is tenure density really the goal? Shouldn’t it be student learning. More support for teaching and a commitment to teaching needs to be recognized. We celebrate scholarship but not teaching. Equity and technology is a concern. Need a way to make people develop their teaching and need to make sure we offer pd for teaching both online and face-to-face. Online ed can take away from research with students on campus. How do we offer it online. Online is taught with part-time, need engage faculty. PD needs to be more personal and more individualized. Face-to-face instruction needs to be addressed. Goals and numbers – diversity match students or match pools Pay raise needed. Faculty as teachers scholars is excellent….move to concept of community engaged scholarship. The College of Education has a model that should be considered. This is a movement nationally. We need to better align our goals with RTP. How can we make a difference in schools? How to elevate community engagement? College-wide effort. Any place around academic freedom? Need to be included. Need a statement. What does this mean? Let’s get in front of it instead of reacting to it. It can be toxic nationally. The math department is an example on our campus. Continue to support advancement efforts to support faculty and courses. Advancement has to be part of supporting faculty. There is nothing that calls out service or scholarship in the call. We need more. We need to take this further. Can we have teacher or healthcare based practices that are considered? The practice of teaching has to be considered. Health care has a specific focus. We need to think about the discipline and what is needed. Need HIP….to have out of classroom experience but where is that in the RTP. Faculty roles and concerns are not reflected in RTP. Need changes to 210. What is a teaching activity? What is scholarship? Where does that work count? Faculty shy away from important work due to the RTP process. Online teaching…we need a stance? What is pedagogy that is required? Standards? We need to address preparing all of our faculty in technology and online teaching. Can’t just throw up a PowerPoint. We have to make sure our students are engaged when they are taking online classes. Shouldn’t they have to take a module at least? Online readiness for students and faculty needed. Questions about is it faculty lines missing impacting tenure density. Want to highlight the importance of teaching our faculty about the diversity on campus (e.g. diversity awareness, cultural awareness). We want our faculty to be open to learn about our student body. Faculty training in this regard would be important. “Equitability” needs to be more central, not just as a bullet point under Q2.2. Curricular changes need to reflect the diversity of our students. Faculty need training on this – they need to learn how to do this. This issue needs to be more primary. How to make the curriculum meaningful and relevant to the students? This may require release time and/or incentives. Content or discipline specific training is needed, in addition to general training. Are we encouraging diverse student body to go on and become diverse faculty? The “pipeline” issue needs to be addressed. Need to use the terms such as “cultural competence”, “strategies for inclusion, equity”, “intentional inclusion”. Expand the awareness of “what diversity means” – pass race/ethnicity and gender to include other things such as age, sexual orientation, gender identities, etc. Need to have an environment where diverse
faculty/staff are valued. Needs to have diverse AND high-quality faculty, not just diverse. Add: Flexible study abroad programs, field trips, field learning, skype seminars with other countries, etc. These are the ways to bring diversity and different perspectives to our students. Teaching is going to be very different tomorrow than it is today. Technology is going to change the way we teach dramatically. Need to add fip classes to pedagogy. A lot of faculty feel overwhelmed. Class sizes are so large. Dealing with Titanium, emails. We have decreased TT/T so many jobs that require TT/T are hard to fill. Titanium is good for students gives them access to instructional materials. Large learning curve for new faculty and not many mentors. Faculty are stressed, their attitude, service suffer. Advising is almost total service load. Teaching suffers because faculty cut corners because they are so overwhelmed. Maybe we need professional staff to replace some faculty duties (advising? Supervising). We need online advising, online support services. How do we help students change directions when they need to? Do you train faculty or hire staff? How do you recruit faculty in this environment? Faculty that want to balance research and teaching come, but they may not be happy. We invest a lot in TT/T but then we lose them. Need to concentrate on retention for faculty who don’t come with a CUF connection. We have a 4/4 teaching load but also have scholarship requirements of an R1. Its just reasonable. TT/T come with expense that we may not be able to afford at recommended levels. Labs, travel, conference fees.....less teaching. Where are all the resources going to come from? Fund raising going to play a very important role. Where is the money going? It needs to be targeted. How much funds are unrestricted? More transparency needed. Most donors do not want to pay for maintenance. Until we change the funding goals can not be reached. Tenure/tenure-track vs. Lecturer: So many lecturers teach lower division courses – shocking; Lecturers often are left out of distribution list, department meetings, and other faculty events. They need to be included in the decision-making processes. They also need to be trained and supported in terms of professional development. Resources should be allocated to this purpose (e.g. training $, travel $). There is an attempt to create separate lists for different types of faculty (per IT), but not sure where this effort has evolved to. The “unspoken” tone of the draft seems to say that the lecturers are undervalued. Faculty data on the IRAS need to be made transparent. We need data on faculty publically. Is there a road map for part-time lecturers to become tenured etc.? No. Really need professional development on issues such as “how to stay in academia”, etc.. Only 15% (+/1 3%) CSU-wide makes it from lecturers to tenure-track. Diversity needs to go beyond gender, ethnicity to include first-generation, SES, etc.. Developing a campus-wide lecturer survey Would be interesting to know how many part-time lecturers want to become full-time faculty. Research and office space; Research support; Lower teaching load; We lose 30-40% before faculty reach tenure. Can we ever become a research university? We are supposed to be the teaching institution, but is it still the case? More and more students… Can we stop taking in students? Framing…Need more than the word adequate faculty. Don’t like the wording. More significantly talk about what number we want? What is the number? The higher the better. 2 recommendations.....The sentence is issues....needs assessment? Let’s figure out where it is needed....is that really the argument. Does this mean it is not needed in some areas? It seems like we are saying that when enrollment grows we will do this but do but it assumes or density is ok. Need a better break down in terms ethnic diversity. Need to be broken down. What specifically has changed. Disaggregate the data. Ethnic diversity should be a goal. Jenny Foust had data presented. This is just not enough. Other kinds diversity need to be considered. 1. Teacher scholar. But need more on research. But we don’t do research because we attract faculty of color. Research period. University do this period. I would strike reference to Boyer. It is explicit. No one is getting turned down for tenure due to research
on teaching. 2 Material support of the scholarship. Release time. Count is part of the teaching load. What makes the teacher scholar. Need more on Teacher scholarships. We are more than content delivery. We need to do more than speak clearly. No mention of mentoring. Critical pedagogy. Maintain positive affect need to be removed. Object to the effort on student learning outcomes. We do more than teaching to the bar. Look at whole learning. Could be informed by the learning out comings. Don't use the word focus. Concerned about relation to assessment. It is debatable. Delete assessment. On-going assessment is a given. 5 need a section on scholarship recommendations. Nothing on that. Need it. 4 Aesthetically need to be removed. Faculty need options based on pedagogical needs. 3 Support academic freedom need to be included. Curriculum should be faculty controlled. We should welcome practitioners to also teach our students in order for the students to be current in the professional skills that are required by their industry. "This document makes it sound like the university values scholarship only insofar as it is ""blended"" with instruction. Real scholarship is about pursuing truth, advancing knowledge, following a line of investigation wherever it may lead. I would prefer to work at a university that respects the advancement of knowledge as an end in itself. I'm sure I'm not alone in this. "Technology is a given, not a debate."" Is this combative attitude necessary? In articulating our principles, shouldn't our tone be loftier? Besides, we're in the business of interrogating things--nothing is off limits, not even technology! How could online enrollment not be growing faster than overall enrollment? Instruction should be ""aesthetically pleasing""? When studies show that teacher evaluations vary based on the race and gender of the instructor, do we really want to bring something as subjective (and, frankly, disturbing) as appearances into the equation? Do we want to stress this as one of our key principles? Moreover, some topics and subjects just aren't pretty. Again, truth and knowledge should be our guiding principles..." when considering how we teach - how do we factor in CSUF faculty workload? How does CSUF faculty workload appear relative to other CSUFs with comparable amounts of students, faculty, course needs, etc? How is the general CSUF faculty 4-4 workload factored in to any decisions the university makes regarding the provision of high-quality learning opportunities - especially if we want our faculty to be wonderful teachers who make a difference as well as active and productive in their respective fields, etc? How can we support faculty research/creative activities in ways that bolster and foster better teaching? To recruit and retain high-quality faculty, we must improve faculty salary, which is currently lower than that for community college faculty I am glad to see the commitment to supporting teaching. I am equally disheartened about the lack of commitment to support scholarship, especially research of all kinds. Integrating scholarship with teaching does not occur without an administrative and financial infrastructure that is consistent over time. While the consolidation of the research offices is a start, it is crucial to realize that CSUF has lost innumerable opportunities for PI-initiated funding because of the lack of cohesive structure across the colleges and within Academic Affairs, and because of the inefficiency of ASC. And this is the case even though the Strategic Plan has a target of increasing PI-initiated funding by 25%. Where does that fit in here? Many of the issues raised not only by this subcommittee but also subcommittees 1 and 4 would be ameliorated by a consistent resource flow from PI-initiated funding, but that will not happen if it is viewed as a stochastic "soft" money source rather than as a consistent and sustainable resource that can be incorporated into planning. But for that to happen, the university needs to invest resources in greater support. Invest resources to generate resources. Also, how are the subcommittees communicating with each other? Much of what is written by subcommittees 1,3, and 4 is contradictory. For an american indian studies minor (or major) it would be awesome for authorities to have strong ties with Native American tribal/community
by either having the strong credentials and/or drawing on personal experiences of the Native American person—that is the instructors should be native american. There is much description of recruiting, retaining, and supporting faculty and improving tenure density in this report, but nowhere does it address the most obvious mechanism for doing this, provide competitive salaries for faculty! "Quite simply, we need more tenure track faculty. The university and all of higher education has relied on and taken advantage of part time faculty for too long. To attract more tenure track faculty, INCREASE SALARIES. It's that simple. Other than that, it would be helpful to find ways to (a) reduce teaching loads for those interested in scholarship, (b) reduce service load, and (c) foster an aspirational environment for faculty to feel that the university supports its faculty and does not just view an instrument to educate students. With respect to supporting faculty, the saying is simple: happy faculty are better educators. The subcommittee's notion of the teacher-scholar seems to imply that scholars come to campus and become teachers. There is insufficient discussion on supporting the scholarship component. It is important to realize that our ability to teach and be good teachers is enhanced by our research. Thus, support conference attendance, professional development, research, creative activity. All of those aspects of the intellectual life of faculty must be supported for the teacher-scholar to exist. In fact, I would suggest that we are scholar-teachers not teacher-scholars. We teach and are excellent teachers based on our excellence as scholars." "1. Evaluation of faculty teaching should ideally include objective measures, e.g., performance in future (more advanced-level courses), related employment, etc. -- currently, there is a strong emphasis on subjective measures (e.g., student evaluations), when there is empirical evidence suggesting that students are poor evaluators of effective pedagogy. 2. Effective recruitment and retention of faculty requires the provision of competitive salary and support for all three types of activities (teaching, scholarship, service). 3. In order to ensure high-quality instructional practices, consideration should be given to student-to-faculty ratio in the classroom (and in advising). It is important to limit the number of students enrolled at the classroom as well as the program level." "This document completely neglects support for a faculty research. This is unacceptable and must be revised. The language of this subcommittee is unclear and implies a restricted assumption about pedagogical methods. For instance, in Q.2.1 there is an implied value for holistic approaches but what is meant by that term is unexplained. In Q.2.2 the requirement that teaching be accompanied with a "positive affect" needs to be clarified. What is that? How would it possibly be measured? In Q.2.4 the doc states that "technology is a given"; can you clarify your vision of technology? Into in Q.2.4 the requirement that teaching be "aesthetically pleasing" is confounding and suggests some kind of standardization that is not achievable. Also, aesthetically pleasing to whom, exactly? In Q.2.5 please define "wrap-around 24/7" and explain the need for a "neutral space." Finally the statement has defined quality teaching by standards that have little to do with actual classroom instruction and more to do with measuring instruction." Somehow this issue needs to be included into this subcommittee's project. We need to increasingly focus on finding ways to motivate faculty to "give it their all" when it comes to teaching. I am continually amazed at how many faculty tell me that they are either losing, or have lost their motivation to do the best teaching job possible. This DOES NOT mean more administrative nightmares, nor marching orders - that would just make it worse. One thing which I have seen in life in the corporate world is that one of the most important characteristics of a good leader, is their ability to motivate people to achieve the goal and mission. My impression in the classroom is that the reduction of faculty's motivation seems to be reducing students' motivation to learn. Smaller class sizes allow much greater interaction with the instructor and other students, facilitating dialogue and discussion "RTP MUST be aligned with campus goals
to increase high impact practices. There is not currently any incentive for faculty to accept a leadership role coordinating high impact practices outside traditional research, despite the tremendous value to both students, faculty, and campus, and lower cost per capita of campus community partnerships, campus as a living lab, etc. In order to make any initiatives re: student success effective the first priority must be alignment with faculty incentives, career development, and progression.” Feedback from AMP website I’m concerned about advice on hiring practices that discriminate based upon race/ethnicity. While it’s important that we make our pool as diverse as possible, and that we make our committees as diverse as possible, it’s discriminatory to make guesses about candidates' race/ethnicity based upon their name, skin color, or other factors. I hope we can have language that shows caution about non-discriminatory hiring practices. Tenure density is the #1 issue that the AMP can address, and is for me a litmus test. If we are actually going to address this issue -- and its been more than 3 years since the Strategic Plan promised it would -- the time is NOW. The AMP is described as follows: “This AMP—the first in CSUF history—will keep the University on track to achieve its strategic goals by answering, among other questions: What will we teach? Whom will we teach? Who will teach? How will we teach?” I have two comments, the first of which is general, and the second of which should be shared with the Steering Committee, the Sub-Committee on Programs, Degrees, and Outcomes, and the Sub-Committee on Faculty and Pedagogy. Comment 1: What problem is the AMP trying to solve? Why do we need it? It is clearly stated in the quote above, that this would be CSUF’s first AMP. Academics have been humming along, and (arguably) flourishing, at CSUF for decades. We haven’t needed an AMP in the past. So, what is the justification for having an AMP now? There doesn’t seem to be a problem that would demand an AMP as its solution. If there is no problem which demands an AMP as its solution, then why is it being pursued? Comment 2: I fail to understand why committees, which are composed largely of administrators and non-teaching faculty, get to decide *what* faculty teach, and *how* we teach it. These questions are being asked at the wrong level. But, since they are being asked at this level, the answers should be obvious: encourage and support faculty in hiring other faculty, and then let the faculty--the experts about what and how to teach--make the decisions about what and how to teach. Perhaps, I have misconstrued the intent of the AMP, or misunderstood its scope or goals. I welcome feedback from those who read this. On the AMP website, why are there only two questions that concern Faculty and Pedagogy? Why are they only concerned with who will teach and how will faculty be supported to create learning opportunities? What about other very important questions, such as how will faculty research be supported to advance KNOWLEDGE? How will the teacher-scholar model be supported? Unless I’m very wrong, pedagogical choices are fundamentally questions of academic freedom. Not everyone teaches the same way, not any one approach is best of any instructor. I don’t get how this is even remotely a university-wide question. AMP Subcommittee 4: Infrastructure and Resources Submit Additional Comments | Back to Top 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? Outline - Subcommittee 4 (PDF) - (Updated to reflect comments received by 4/13/16) | Draft Narrative - Subcommittee 4 - version 1 Feedback from Academic Senate / Academic Affairs Retreat it's time to embrace PBF models - it is not socially just to not spend dollars in ways that do not
mirror our values and goals. students have a right to know that the mission of csuf - which they have bought into with their time, dollars, and energy - is achieved by them personally. that means assessment and budgeting that mirrors mission and this amp. No comments. Add support for faculty training (particularly around teaching strategies and understanding the student population we serve). Give funds, rewards for training, and appropriate physical space for these activities. Has the campus explored a more extensive decentralization of classroom space to see if that would allow more flexibility in scheduling? 1. physical considerations, 2nd bullet point - in addition to accommodating evolving external research, we should also include other forms of engagement with the community as we get more involved in off campus settings. An example of this is evident in the new position of assistant vice president for academic and community partnerships. We are moving forward in our endeavor to become stewards of place. clearer guidelines on how performance-based funding will affect college allocations. In tight economic times, we may need guidance about essential programs and services. Some objective means of making these decisions would be helpful guidance to include in the AMP. This goes beyond needs based and is more focused on value based. "We need better data on the efficient use of resources across campus. What are course/classroom fill rates each semester? Knowing this will allow us to plan more efficiently for our limited space. Can't continue to build the schedule "the way its always been done" need to realize where we are wasting resources and shift them to areas of need. This would include more planning (course rotation plan) and the need to not offer low enrolled classes." implications for fund raising efforts outside funding not more tuition I appreciate that this sub-committee prefaced their outline with the statement that this committee should be the last step and that the infrastructure and resources need to be constantly reviewed and adjusted. I hope more will be added regarding human resource needs (not just faculty). "We need to address the inequitable distribution of course load that exists across colleges and departments. We need to address limited parking, and increase sustainable energy use on campus. In our departmental meeting, Provost Cruz stated that the Academic Master Plan will help guide us in the emergence of a data-driven, outcome oriented university future that quantifies the results of teaching and learning, and potentially could reward certain types of teaching or content that can be more easily quantified. I suggest that we need to be transparent about our response to this context in California, so that maintaining the quality of what we teach and how we teach can be ensured, rather than lost as the data push influences our outcomes." Multifunctional spaces are essential but presents significant challenges as individual units become "possessive" due to expense of maintaining such spaces "What are decided as priorities will certainly dictate the future spending. If all the space is allocated by the university, each department cannot plan its future TT search etc." Who will decide how resources are allocated (i.e. who decides whether one department had too much space or too little)? Some departments require lab space while others do not, for example. will all stakeholders be included in decision making? Who makes the final decisions? "the university and the system must reach out to donors to find funds to grow the campus. we need more buildings. the AMP should provide a framework of how much space is allocated for or instructional mission and how much space is set aside for the research mission of the campus. Much of our instructional space doubles as research space. the campus at times looks neglected and i wish there was more money spent on maintenance. SC4 mentions textbooks and their cost. There is no incentive in the RTP proces for jr. faculty to produce modern online interactive textbooks. there is a trend amongst some tenured faculty at R1 universities to produce self published high quality online texts. CSU faculty are well positioned to do the same if this sort of work was valued at the campus or system level we can make an impact on changing the textbook business model." It
would seem that having college "homes" should not extend to classrooms if we want to be able to maximize flexibility in scheduling. NO SPECIFIC EDITS HERE: I have a concern that whatever metrics we use to analyze spaces, please include "unusual" space needs, such as graduate studio spaces in the arts. Such needs were not included in the previous space analysis done in 2014-14. It would be important to leverage the resources we may have access to, through our relationships with other organizations and universities. It would also be helpful to make the processes as easy as possible to collaborate with other organizations. By doing so, we would increase our capacity to best serve students.

"Assess and articulate? Pre and post surveys. Report out via convocation, town hall, email. Align? Conduct needs assessment of all campus units, then implement findings. Barriers? The usual: low funding from state, lowest-funded CSU campus per student capita, fundraising for a public institution that many perceive is or should be fully state-funded, land-locked by 57 freeway and surface streets - no room for horizontal expansion. Policies and procedures? Use Academic Senate and its committee structure to work on this. Respond to budget? Messaging for need to invest in higher ed to governor, legislature and public, solicit and acquire gifts and grants, use large alumni network for assistance, networking, and solicitation." Recommendations included maximize utilization of classroom space...but what data sources will you use. Need to make sure you consider individual college needs. We need research space. Happy faculty means happy students. We need allocate resources in the most efficient way to assure the desired outcome. Faculty recognition and support is the key. "we hire too many consultants who are expensive and ineffective. consummables are not taken into account in assessing cost of running a class. there seems to be little understanding in finance division of operations in running programs in academic affairs. the campus needs to assess staff needs in the colleges and provide more positions seriously need to expand pre and post grant infrastructure to bring in more external funding" Old infrastructure, a library under construction, over emphasis on measures and assessment rather than actual LEARNING. "We need to more aggressively appeal to the public of California to show what our conditions are, truly. We need to show how many students are being left out, excluded. We are always trying to show what a good job we are doing. So what is the motivation for political will if we are doing so great? Need to focus on the development of more classroom space, more student-focused spaces to gather and collaborate, and on parking (a serious issue that affects students ability to get to class on time and to work off-campus and to spend the time they need to with their family, partners, children." Thank you for your work on addressing these questions. I think that any discussion, or actions, regarding reallocation of resources or space will be challenging and politically charged. However, I believe it is crucial that the university leadership be willing to facilitate such discussions and make these difficult decisions if the campus is going to move forward to become the best university it can be. Not being willing to potentially reallocate resources (budget or space) will automatically limit any positive changes that might be made as a result of this academic master plan. it appears that many of our staff are one-time positions. can we baseline those? emphasize online teaching only for students who need it and when it works for them. Do not make online available for all students. provide students with the necessary tools to learn and get the most out of their leaning experience at csuf. This extends to administrators, faculty, and staff to have the necessary resources to oerform their job which enables them to focus on a offering and engaging more with students.

"Resources and infrastructure should always support the Academic mission as being primary. New resources and infrastructure should never be adopted without conducting a needs assessment first. Technology must be appropriate to needs and work. This app is a good example of wasteful, inappropriate resource use. It does not facilitate the work and
is unnecessarily burdensome and glithcy." private public partnership need if we need to make any enhancement in this category. faculty supporting student research, which is one among the high impact practices should be provided with assigned time or other types of support. must make sure to include staff increases New technologies should be purchased and implemented thoughtfully with a clear understanding of how they will impact different units and programs. "We definitelly need to address the issue of adequate infrastructure to be able to meet our goals, but it is unclear how we will find the funding to do so in a timely manner. Why are we continuing to plan to grow when we outdrew our space years ago? We cannot continue ot do more with less - it is a completely unsustainable way of operating. Everyone needs to understand what it takes to execute all the added things we are continually being asked to do on top of the core mission of educating our students." different units have different equipment needs. different units have different rates of inflation on their ongoing expenses - library journals and database costs go up 6 percent per year. given state deinvestment, obtaining external funding is crucial - grants, increasing endowments, ... FTES based models do not account for differences in cost among programs and will underfund programs (which we currently do) - While there might be issues with performance based funding, we really do have to adequately fund programs based on their needs not their FTES. While the infrastructure part is there, the maintence part is not. We have to take care of our campus facilities or we'll end up in deep trouble! This committee's work seems to be most realistic in listing issues beyond what we are currently doing. Provides food for thought about what problems we need to solve. More questions than can be answered but a good start. need to ensure equitable facilities for all academic colleges/departments. What is the cost teaching a student for a particular discipline? How does the economy of scale affect the cost of teaching a student? Need to take care with not eroding entrepreneurial spirit in regards to resource management. Need big push on automating manually intensive processes to relieve heavy processing burdens. More transparency in resource use important. one of the issues that negatively impacts resources is CSU policy. the way we charge tuition impacts the number of units a student takes. if a student should take 9 units (due to work or other commitments) they may enroll in only 6 units or enroll in 15 units (since they pay the fee for this). We should also consider demand pricing so our resources are unilized 7 days a week rather than only 4.5 days a week. "what is not clear to me is which factors we can change on our own independent of the CSU. For example, it seems like CSU controls our FTES targets. in terms of using our facilities more efficiently, such as classrooms and parking, students have to be able and willing to use alternate schedules --like Friday classes." The other committees are dependent upon the budget – pedagogy, retention, success, etc. As we develop our values, what is the role of acknowledging the outcome measures – since is it the outcomes that drive the resource decisions. So we should think about what the metrics should look like – otherwise we will have to respond to others' metrics. We have a plan to help us succeed, but how will we know if we succeed? It's the folks that develop the curriculum who understand the spirit of the ideas, but the assessors have to interpret for the big picture This relates to performance vs. FTES funding – how much are we going toward performance? How would it work, especially since we don't have good outcome measures? If we put more funds somewhere, what is our return on investment? Relatedly, what happens to those who are not performing as highly as compared to others? How do we be fair to everyone? How do we have those conversations? In other states, decisions can come down and folks do not understand – similar to the experience of common core. The concern is particular for smaller departments who can feel disenfranchised by the conversation. We are always adding, but we rarely give stuff up. So how do we have the conversations to discuss how to give something up? Needs to be at college and
department level – e.g., some courses (e.g., labs) have costs that other courses do not have (e.g., computers for larger GE classes). Since all equipment funding has gone away, we don’t have those resources to support faculty. We need an intentional analysis that assesses all these costs. We should also base funding on our mission and priorities – e.g., ethnic studies is a good example of a CSU-wide priority that should be funded. As a new chair, I would love to have more conversations about the budget and how to be strategic. How much is available, by when, and how to be wise and creative to allocate to needs. And then a new chair comes in 3 years and then the conversations have to happen again. Can do Chairs brown bag discussions or trainings to talk about the process, and try to get the information that chairs need, given that it is a complicated analysis. What is the method for allocating resources for classes? Right now every college does their own thing – does it help to develop more tools to assist? Sometimes cannot be consistent because different disciplines need different things – but would be helpful to identify and share best practices. Communication on this campus feels like it needs to happen face-to-face – our culture does not spread information through top-down processes. How do we disseminate information that could be useful for allocating (and for planning for) resources? Capital campaign – with faculty and staff input and involvement. Endowed Chairs- pursue avenues to fund these. How do we assess campus needs to meet current times- connecting the disciplines with what the current needs are (humanities now needs labs) we have available or what we can secure- find ways to circumvent state rules- i.e., Mihaylo has rooms which exceed space- but were funded by private sources so it was allowed. We are a campus designed to hold 18,000 students- we now serve 40,000, do we have classroom, parking, bathrooms… (i.e., MH needs significant repair) Faculty/ staff input to better equip rooms, i.e., dimming switches, dual monitors. Technology to match current pedagogy in the field. Red tape to get anything done- physical plant… CSU policies are a problem—how students are charged per course load. Operate 7 days per week-be more creative in how we operate. Different cost needs in different colleges and divisions. Share library and other resources across CSU campuses. Campus student fees not equitable across colleges. Technology equipment not funded sufficiently to keep up with need. Create space. Create parking spaces. Define needs. Lowest funded CSU. High cost location in SOCAL. No reward for efficiency in operations or physical plant work. Share resources across colleges. Demand pricing. No efficient scheduling as both faculty and students resist. Disconnect between admin and operations like changes in admissions with departments not ready. Combine admin of UC/CSU/CC’s. Research support is inconsistent and deficient across campus. Lowest funded CSU per FTES. State does not fund research at the CSU/cannibalize teaching funds. Lack of institutional support for grant/strategic plan calls for more outside funding. HIPs underfunded. Course based fees would help/fee allocations need to be reviewed/should it be college/course specific. Lab is restricted in enrollment but has high consumables fees. RTP requires grants but note enough campus support to lay the groundwork. Public/private partnerships –internal barriers. No good policy on intellectual property. Graduate studies not supported enough. Faculty not rewarded. Grad assistants not adequately funded and tuition too high. Academic mission is missing – the decision-making does not make academic mission primary. Detail specific but no guiding statement. True, but AMP is supposed to be a little more concrete – because unless we know what the answers are to the first three questions, difficult to make decisions. Not enough conversation between the committees. Disconnect because no metric for how AMP will translate to resources. Therefore meta critique is that the process is not connected. Need to have needs assessment to drive purchases. But tech apps are glitchy – needs to have a grounded needs assessment to drive what we purchase. Need to know at what level do we need a needs assessment. What level, who does it impact,
Question #1-3 about needs, #4 gets to the needs – but no mechanism for how addressing this. The plan is not a plan yet Is it the plan that once everything is pulled together that the algorithm will be developed. The Fullerton way – we need a new committee! 1 – is human data limited to employees? If so we might need student generated resources – e.g., fees for SSI, tuition dollars 2 – like that the provost is thinking about what we are currently dealing with (e.g., FTES) even though we also need to think about the future (e.g., performance based funding). Would like to see more thinking around current issues. What does student financial resources regarding textbooks mean? This sounds like an expenditure not an input (like IRA) SHOULD TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THE QUALITY OF TEXTBOOKS, NOT JUST COST LOOK AT AFFORDABILITY FOR STUDENTS – NOT JUST TEXTBOOK LOOK AT CONSIDERATION OF SPENDING NOT JUST ALOLOCATIONS FOR PROCEDURAL GUIDELINES SECTION 2. should be more focused on procedures What about role of advancement/non-state monies? There are ways to get money to build a lab, so should be considered for the future. Move from one-time money to baseline funding for staff. Training on how the University-wide budget funding is allocated-works- both within campus (departments, students) and external to campus (constituencies)- such as a citizens’ guide to federal budget Public/private partnerships to expand space- research facilities, buildings…. Prioritize University needs (lab space, research space, seminar space) which could be shared- funding would not be by department but university oversight i.e., bio, nursing, chem- need labs- one space where these labs exist and space is shared- and funded by one source- not by each dept. Capital campaigns- with faculty input/involvement Emergency preparedness budget- library earthquake- budget set aside university-wide to cover these. There needs to be refurbishing of new buildings – what are the constraints? What is the timeline?? Library – students are disappointed that our library is not fully functional with no place to sit and study, all the time but especially during exam time. How can the campus accommodate student needs for this – e.g., more space in TSU, SSCs. Unfortunately TSU is always reserved for events during exam times, but students have need for study space too. Include greater student voice in the resource decisions of the AMP, including but not limited to representatives from ASI. How do we cut down red tape to facilitate better use of our resources? For example, to make a room reservation must go through scheduling – but tried to get a room on a Friday but told there is no space. But in reality the building was open on that day, so why does scheduling show the space is reserved? What are the restrictions, and how do faculty and students get access for creative or last minute needs? There may be time restrictions (e.g., 11-2) when students have difficulty-getting rooms for organizations. What are the processes for people to get access to needed space? Need to have more of a student lens on the AMP report – need more than one student (John Nguyen). Need to include students for the other AMP 4 subcommittees to ensure a voice on all aspects. Mental health services needed funding- services end at 5- recourse is to call the police- provide services to online students (virtual services- Skype) Holistic advising Communication of resources- to faculty and students How do we consider faculty/ staff space when we renovate- MH renovation move folks to Langsdorf Faculty/student collaborative spaces & research spaces- limits faculty search options Conceptualize spaces outside campus in the communities for collaborative space Is the same effort going on at other CSU’s-can we better coordinate across campuses to reduce overhead? Humanities --need to put our money where our mouth is on these to be consistent with our strategic plan-we cannot be everything to everybody Programs without funding support Need shift SFR Too many new initiatives without funding and unfunded initiatives Should be settling 1,2,3 before we decide how to allocate Dilution problem --too many things can’t do it all well Need best ethnic studies department in country is achievable Grant support
structure is weak/need to support new structure Basic FTES baseline funding problem is core of problem More resources for diversity training through FDC- cultural competence training and inclusionary competence, updating existing faculties knowledge- incentives for faculty to pursue deeper understanding of their fields Connecting to resources on campus- including library... More faculty development support- faculty club, communal space Communicating to faculty about infrastructure limitations Support faculty when they serve in leadership roles related to supporting diverse faculty on campus, including faculty infinity groups Forward planning on what spaces may look like in the future- or what disciplines may look like in the future- assess trends Unite spaces that are currently disparate (i.e., College of Education, HSS) 2- consideration of specialized populations (art studios, labs) More faculty input on what goes into classrooms- furniture- more spaces for high impact practices Not enough state money Parking Landlocked Tools to get funding/external Faculty loses most of IDC University facilities chargebacks defeats purpose of work Evaluate campus spaces for 100% physical accessibility Unfunded initiatives Infrastructure not major league Multiuse spaces are usually are-assigned to department for upkeep/ defeats purpose Off campus sites take resources but open opportunities/evaluate cost/ benefit Prioritize colocation of similar services should be prioritized in the infrastructure decision-making. We should be considering the meaning of the widgets (e.g., health professions office) and consider non-monetary resource issues like how to maximize the HPO mission by moving or supporting. Space decision-making must be prioritized beyond a space assessment every few years. How can we make space decisions that are better tied to and inform the current and future budget needs? How do space needs of a department get elevated up through the admin? Beyond the three-five year AMP, we need to think about a broad survey of who are using spaces, fit of space with needs, and future needs. E.g., writing-heavy courses would be ideal in labs, but there are no labs available for this because of assumptions that labs go to research/tech-heavy courses. How can we elevate that consideration to future space allocations? Space allocation software – should not only inventory and facilitate allocation of the physical space but also what makes most sense regarding the class purpose. We also need a dynamic system to be able to facilitate when space needs have to be brokered. We need the human-factor to facilitate these conversations. Lastly, need a plan for how to communicate when decisions are made regarding resource allocations Budget challenges may be alleviated by creating strong relationships with industries that need our diverse talent. when considering any changes - such as, how we might increase external research grant applications - how do we factor in CSUF faculty workload? How does CSUF faculty workload appear relative to other CSUFs with comparable amounts of students, faculty, grant solicitation, etc? How is the general CSUF faculty 4-4 workload factored in to any decisions the university makes regarding hiring of faculty. administrators, or the funding of intramural grants, support for external funding efforts, etc? "A centralized (computer-based) scheduling of classes and all campus spaces" may seem ideal in theory, but departments (rather than the university) would be most appropriate and qualified to determine teaching courses, teaching schedules, and lab spaces. I am concerned here with the implication that graduate programs are a problem regarding space and should be cut. Is that a correct interpretation? If so, that will need to be stated far more clearly with justification in terms of history and the mission of CSUF. If not, that should be clarified because the rumor mill is going. "It appears that money will cure all issues with the AMP. Where can we get some? In coordination with tribal entities of CA it's possible that Indian gaming monies could provide some support for an American Indian studies program at CSUF, (possibly other native american activities at CSUF). Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on aspects of the AMP." Related to the report on students (AMP subcommittee 1), use/allocation of space requires
more than just an attempt to more efficiently use the space we have (of course, improved efficiency is a good goal, but will not make-up for the ever-growing enrollment). Either a clear plan to move more online or acquisition of more physical space must occur. A second issue with this notion is that not all space can be allocated by a centralized system in a manner that supports needs of faculty and students who are engaged in exactly the types of high impact practices that are so frequently promoted. For example, running experiments. Space requirements for running subjects varies depending on the whims of volunteer sign-ups, unexpected issues with research design, need for a follow-up experiment, when a study receives IRB approval - I could go on for a long time. The point is, all space being allocated by a central system to maximize efficiency (thereby requiring a rigid and predetermined allocation of space) may work for scheduling classes, but is problematic for other, less rigid, education practices. I personally already struggle to get the space I need when I need it, especially going through university scheduling. If our departmental space were also centralized I would find myself scheduling space I hoped to use rather than what I need when I need it. Centralizing space allocation won't solve the space problem and will likely create several unforeseen problems. "The physical space is too small for the number of students we teach and the amount of non-teaching activity that goes on. So expand the space we have or find ways to maximize what we have. As mentioned in previous comments, design matter. Not only in terms of aesthetics, but in functionality as well. We need smart space as much as we need more space. Our infrastructure problems will not be solved with technology along, though continued improvements in the function of technology are needed. To increase financial resources, the campus community needs to be mobilized for greater advocacy to the CSU for more funds. This requires a coordinated plan among constituent groups and a surge in advocacy that results in a social movement for higher education and not just elite politics." "In order to ensure adequate support for and retention of faculty, departments should be given some decision-making capacities. In particular: 1. Assignment of teaching schedule for faculty -- this has been managed effectively by departments, to ensure a good match between faculty availability and student needs. If a centralized university system were to assign teaching schedules, faculty members with scheduling constraints (e.g., public transportation schedule; family needs) would have difficulty assuming their teaching responsibilities. 2. Assignment of lab space and equipment -- in order for there to be effective faculty recruitment and retention, it is important that the department has some control over space allocation and assignment. In my discipline, assignment of lab space is expected of tenure-track faculty. To not have guaranteed lab space and resources means that desirable candidates will not accept faculty positions at CSUF. Additionally, it would be helpful if graduate programs could be re-assessed with regard to student outcomes (relative to resources). Recruitment and enrollment in graduate programs would ideally allow for a reasonably selective admissions process. Pressure for graduate programs to recruit more students than are qualified, for financial reasons, would ultimately lead to inefficiencies (e.g., attrition; loss of faculty time; decreased quality of instruction) -- I hope that there will be plans in place to help prevent the recruitment of less-than-qualified graduate students and to make the admissions decisions adequately competitive." AMP Sub 1, 2, and 3 cite faculty research as an important part of the AMP. However, physical space is the only shortcoming of the Univ by AMP sub 4. This is certainly not the only impediment to increased research activities. Faculty have only 24 hrs in a day and if research is to be an integral part of the AMP, resources need to be provided to release faculty from other responsibilities. Otherwise, the Univ is asking to "have cake and eat it too". Cut administrators' ridiculously high salaries to enable hiring of more instructor with smaller class sizes Absolutely agree that a new campus master plan
is needed, to be developed using current and projected enrollment and utilization data. Would also like to see mention of Life Cycle Analysis, design for flexibility, and building maintenance estimates incorporated into project design for new construction and major renovations as we frequently utilize our buildings well beyond the average tenure of a standard commercial tenant. Also, state mandates re: Net zero buildings and ongoing reduction of resource use. The physical and operational environment of campus can be an immersive educational experience in addition to providing functional, inspiring, and aspirational spaces, if we frame it in that way. Feedback from the AMP website Dear God, improve tenure density and do something to improve the lives of adjuncts. General Comments Submit Additional Comments Feedback from University Graduate Education Committee (PDF) Feedback from the AMP website Look, "what we teach" and "how we teach" are questions for FACULTY, not a committee appointed by the administration. I like some of this stuff, but these recommendations MUST come to the Senate committees and then the full Senate for approval. The AMP is described as follows: "This AMP—the first in CSUF history—will keep the University on track to achieve its strategic goals by answering, among other questions: What will we teach? Whom will we teach? Who will teach? How will we teach?" I have two comments, the first of which is general, and the second of which should be shared with the Steering Committee, the Sub-Committee on Programs, Degrees, and Outcomes, and the Sub-Committee on Faculty and Pedagogy. Comment 1: What problem is the AMP trying to solve? Why do we need it? It is clearly stated in the quote above, that this would be CSUF’s first AMP. Academics have been humming along, and (arguably) flourishing, at CSUF for decades. We haven’t needed an AMP in the past. So, what is the justification for having an AMP now? There doesn’t seem to be a problem that would demand an AMP as its solution. If there is no problem which demands an AMP as its solution, then why is it being pursued? Comment 2: I fail to understand why committees, which are composed largely of administrators and non-teaching faculty, get to decide *what* faculty teach, and *how* we teach it. These questions are being asked at the wrong level. But, since they are being asked at this level, the answers should be obvious: encourage and support faculty in hiring other faculty, and then let the faculty—the experts about what and how to teach—make the decisions about what and how to teach. Perhaps, I have misconstrued the intent of the AMP, or misunderstood its scope or goals. I welcome feedback from those who read this. I fail to comprehend why we need an "academic master plan." Our university, like all higher education, holds as first principles, after the advancement and dissemination of knowledge, faculty governance and academic freedom. How can a committee, especially one in which faculty are a minority, possible tell faculty "what" they should teach or "how" they should teach? And it seems to me that the students who choose to attend this institution from year to year are "who we teach." I do not understand how a committee, or a subcommittee, can tell the campus what degrees, programs, or outcomes we should have. Faculty should decide that, on the basis of what courses, degrees, programs, and outcomes they think best to develop. I do not understand the rationale or need for this "top-down" style of university governance. It seems to me that the goal here is to impose on this campus a kind of "orderly" and "managed" approach to education that is in fact anathema to the creative, innovative, multi-directional, constantly changing and faculty and student-driven learning that constitutes the best form of education. Faculty morale is low on this campus precisely because we feel that not only, to put it diplomatically, does the administration hold a radically different understanding of the meaning of faculty governance than do the faculty, but that all the creativity and passion that comes from faculty experimenting and themselves deciding what students should learn, what faculty should teach, what programs we should create, and why, is being "managed" out of use.
We’re being turned into cogs in a machine (or employees in a corporation) and corporate-style education is an oxymoron. "Managed learning" may work for "training," but it doesn’t work for higher education. Analysis 1. After reading the proposed words relating to the Academic Master Plan, I suggest some question should be raised as to whether or not members of the committee are clear to what is AMP, its purpose and what shall be it’s function? 2. How will the comments about "INFORGRAPHICS" be examined and used as a central premise for understanding relationships between curriculum, job duties and functions, plans, programs and activities at Cal State Fullerton. The AMP link should be advertised from the TitanOnline Portal. This is where all the students must go through in order to register for classes. The AMP process is a performance of shared governance. It reflects top-down decision-making pretending to come from the "bottom." AMP marketing claims that the PBRC requested an AMP, as if the idea came from the CSUF community. There is no public acknowledgment of WASC’s role and other external actors putting into place AMP expectations. The AMP process attempts to legitimize what so far has been an illegitimate decision-making process. The committees were appointed, and the AMP will be finalized through gathering comments, feedback, and endorsements from select groups. These are not examples of shared governance. The committees should have been elected, and the campus community should be asked to approve the AMP through a vote. Drafts should encompass all the ideas-conflicting as well as agreed upon ideas-discussed among committee members, rather than edited for uniformity and conformity. Diversity, disagreement, and respect for process should be reflected in the AMP. These anonymous comments should be posted anonymously and publicly for the campus community to read. What we teach...how we teach....these are DEPARTMENT level decisions. I don't get how these decisions can be made at a university-wide level that will trash some departments without them having representation on these committees...or even if they do. This smells like yet another way to throw yet more money at STEM fields and de-fund the humanities.