The Faculty and Pedagogy Subcommittee is charged with preparing responses to the following questions: Who will teach? How will we support faculty throughout their careers to provide high quality learning opportunities for our students?

Thinking about who will teach could include looking at issues of faculty diversity (e.g., international faculty, contingent faculty, and faculty of color); the role of graduate assistants; concerns about tenure-track density and hiring plans; and the relative proportion of tenure-track/tenured faculty and contingent faculty.

The analysis also could examine the fundamental question of what we mean by Teacher-Scholar at Cal State Fullerton. What should be the mix of teaching, scholarship, and service? How can we foster Teacher-Scholars at Cal State Fullerton?

As for how we will support faculty to provide evidence-based high quality learning opportunities for our students, the subcommittee could consider the delivery of teaching: mix of face-to-face, hybrid, and online courses; faculty development support; high-impact teaching practices; course redesign; and workloads, among many other issues.

These questions are addressed in two major sections. The first section makes the case for adopting the Teacher-Scholar model, and defines the necessary infrastructure support for the model. The second section is a quantitative analysis of current and future faculty recruitment and retention needs in order to build a faculty corps based on the Teacher-Scholar model.
**Section I: How will we support faculty throughout their careers to provide high quality learning opportunities for our students?**

“*Learning is preeminent at California State University, Fullerton. We aspire to combine the best qualities of teaching and research universities where actively engaged students, faculty and staff work in close collaboration to expand knowledge.*” – *University Mission Statement (para. 1)*

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

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

Boyer (1990) called for “need for a more inclusive view of what it means to be a scholar—a recognition that knowledge is acquired through research, through synthesis, through practice and through teaching” (p. 24). In the context of a large comprehensive university, scholarship is multifaceted. We, therefore, need to adopt an expanded, inclusive definition of scholarship adapted from Boyer’s framework. Our vision of scholarship is interconnected with teaching and service. It can be broadly defined to include pure research, integrative and collaborative research, applied studies, and the scholarship of teaching and learning.
Research has shown that engaged scholarship helps to create environments that attract faculty of color and women in underrepresented fields (Ellison & Eatman, 2008). This work clearly aligns with American Universities’ current movement toward becoming “stewards of place” (American Association of State Colleges and Universities -AASCU, 2002). According to the AASCU, “The publicly engaged institution is fully committed to direct, two-way interaction with communities and other external constituencies through the development, exchange, and application of knowledge, information, and expertise for mutual benefit” (2002, p. 9).

Scholarship of the Teacher-Scholar

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

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

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

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

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

Teacher-scholars implement teaching and learning practices that have a strong research base of supporting student success. Although other practices continue to arise from research, five core practices have decades of evidentiary support, regardless of instructional modality.

**Teacher-Scholars maintain positive affect and relationships with students.** They demonstrate passion for the subject matter and for learning. They develop and display respect and positive rapport with students, and they sustain frequent interactions within and outside of class. In this vein, Teacher-Scholars demonstrate faith in their students’ ability to learn by demonstrating high expectations and support to achieve those expectations. As a final example of their positive affect, Teacher-Scholars demonstrate immediacy via their instruction using strategies appropriate for varied instructional venues.

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

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

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

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

1. Support for – and expectations of – the Teacher-Scholar should be clearly and transparently defined in University, College and Department policies and procedures.

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

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

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

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

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

2a. Establish an undergraduate and graduate research opportunities center that promotes
student research/scholarship and develops student leadership, personal, and professional
skills (see CSUMB Undergraduate Research Opportunities Center and chapter by O’Donnell
et al., 2015, *Undergraduate Research and Its Impact on Student Success for
Underrepresented Students*). The center should be well staffed and have a prominent
physical presence on campus dedicated to students and be explicitly linked to other on-
campus resources. By establishing a committee of program directors from currently funded
undergraduate research programs, the center would reduce redundancy present across funded
programs, build resources, and provide a forum for cross-disciplinary communication and
community. The center would also help coordinate research events on campus (e.g., Research
Day, NSM ICC Research Symposium), again developing additional opportunities and
reducing redundancy on campus.
2b. Identify ways faculty can engage in scholarship that helps distribute workload—e.g., 
combine scholarship with teaching (supervising students as they develop their scholarly and 
creative activity skills).

2c. Maintain and expand internal support of seed grants (e.g., Junior, Senior Grants) used to 
generate preliminary data (usually required in order for proposals to be competitive for 
federal or philanthropic funding).

2d. Continue to develop and maintain efficient and easy to navigate guidelines in the grant 
support offices on campus (both pre- and post-award).

2e. Maintain and provide institutional data, granting histories, and facilities information for 
proposals.

2f. Expand mentoring and professional development for faculty in writing grants, and assistance 
in grant proposal review prior to submission.

2g. Encourage efforts rooted in the disciplines and those that encourage cross-disciplinary 
development of teaching expertise. Examples might include departments that share materials 
through digital communities, departments where faculty meet informally to discuss teaching 
strategies within certain courses, and departments where it is the norm for faculty to visit each 
other’s classes.

2h. Recognize the scholarship of teaching and learning through which faculty gather evidence 
related to their teaching effectiveness and analyze efforts that lead to continuous teaching 
 improvement. Department personnel standards should include options for faculty to experiment 
with new pedagogies without jeopardizing their performance evaluation.

2i. Maintain and expand evolving library collections and services to support faculty, staff and 
student teaching, learning and research needs.
3. **Course Schedules should increasingly offer flexibility in modality, scheduling, and location.**

Technology is a given, not a debate. “The Internet is a necessary component of our personal, educational, and professional lives” (OLC, UPCEA, & WCET, 2016). Over the last 50 years, changes in student characteristics (e.g., age, socioeconomic status, family responsibilities) and the use of educational technologies have altered the learning experience. For many of our students today, classroom-based learning creates scheduling and financial burdens that limit access and impede successful completion. Technology-mediated education greatly expands opportunities in higher education. Current middle and high school students use more technology in school. They expect technology to play an influential part in their educational experience and consider it essential for career success.

Online enrollment is growing faster than overall enrollment. Nationally, online enrollment is growing an estimated six times faster than higher education enrollment. One out of seven students enroll exclusively in online courses. At any one time, one out of four students is enrolled in an online course. In the last four years, CSUF’s enrollment has increased about eight percent while enrollment in online course sections has increased 73%. It is assumed that this growth will continue and that this growth impacts both faculty and student support services.

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

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

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

4. **Delivery of instruction should ensure equity of access.**

All students should have access to the same learning opportunities. Student learning experiences should be based on high-quality instructional principles. We should strive to ensure
the effectiveness of the experience across modalities. Learning should be social, humanistic, and connect the student to a larger community. Instruction should be well designed, student focused, and aesthetically pleasing (CSU Commission for Online Education, 2015)

We should be as agile as possible in providing support services. Students and faculty must have access to a set of intuitive, highly reliable, well-supported tools, while keeping costs to students as low as possible. Given the mobility expectations of our students, tools should be available on the broadest practical range of devices and make best use of evolving technologies. Students should have access to resources and support online comparable to what they receive face-to-face, such as library, advising, enrollment, and career-placement services. Support services must ensure accessibility to learning and teaching for all students and faculty, including those with disabilities.

5. Faculty development support for teaching needs to be provided.

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

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

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

**Cultural competency training needs to be available to faculty.** This training should provide reflection and appreciation of the complex relationships that various factors such as gender, ethnicity, race, sexual orientation, religion, and class bring to student learning experiences. It is important for faculty to understand the student populations they serve and how to adapt their teaching methods to meet the cultural needs of the students they teach. Strategies for intentional inclusion in a variety of modalities needs to be explored along with creating greater personal awareness of the faculty's own social-cultural location and identities and how these impact their teaching.
Ongoing training and support for use of technology in teaching is required. “The conversation has shifted from whether technology should be used in learning to how it can improve learning to ensure that all students have access to high-quality educational experiences” (U.S. Department of Education, 2016, p.5). Any teaching technology acquisition should be accompanied by a training and support plan that ensures faculty are prepared to integrate the technology effectively into their instruction. Trainings should provide faculty not only with experience using the technology, but also instruction in best practices.

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

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

The Role of Faculty in the Model Comprehensive Public University

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

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

Student Instruction

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

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

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

**Demographic Characteristics.** The tenured and tenure-track faculty included 335 (45%) women and 403 (55%) men in fall 2014 (CSUF Office of Institutional Research and Analytical Studies). In Fall 2014, our tenured and tenure-track faculty self-identified as 483 (65%) White, 164 (22%) Asian-American/Pacific Islander, 65 (9%) Hispanic, 22 (3%) Black, and 0 (0%) Native American; 4% did not identify and were classified as unknown. Among the tenured and tenure-track faculty, 37 were “International” faculty (defined as those with H1 visas).
Among lecturer faculty in fall 2014, 714 (53%) were women and 635 (47%) were men. Ethnic composition of lecturers was less than 1% American Indian, Pacific Islander, international, or multi-race; 2.7% of lecturer faculty identified as Black, 9.7% as Hispanic, 11.8% as Asian, and 67.4% as White.

Faculty Trends, 2004/05 – 2014/15

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

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

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

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

**Recommendations:**

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

**Rationale:** To maintain the faculty corps at a sufficient level, annual hiring must consistently replace annual faculty losses and adjust to student enrollment. How many hires are
needed each year? As shown in the next table, an average of 35 tenured and tenure-track faculty members left CSUF across the last decade.

In addition to replacing the faculty who leave CSUF, additional faculty members are needed to meet increasing student enrollment. Faculty recruitment beyond losses and growth will lead to improvement in the tenure density level. The chart below illustrates the number of successful faculty hires needed to replace faculty losses (blue), maintain tenure density at the current level (red), given growth in student enrollment. Faculty hires needed to improve tenure density to multiple levels are estimated for each growth scenario. Thus, to maintain tenure density at approximately 55% requires over 80 new hires next year, given that FTES has grown approximately 2% in 2015-16.
1. To set a target campus-wide tenure density level, a process should be developed involving deans and departments to establish optimal unit level tenure density goals. This will allow appropriate staffing flexibility based on college needs (instruction, service, scholarly/creative activities).

2. To improve tenure density, the university needs to have a clear understanding of factors (such as workload, salary, spousal hiring, etc.) related to both recruitment and retention of faculty. Retention of faculty is an important factor in increasing tenure density. We need to strengthen data collection and tracking of faculty demographics and status at the individual level so as to allow analysis of faculty recruitment and retention trends over time. Additionally, the specific faculty characteristics available for analysis should be reviewed to ensure that the numerous aspects of diversity are collected. In addition to gender and ethnicity, factors such as sexual orientation, first generation college status, and doctoral institution should be considered. Recent faculty recruits have increased the diversity of the faculty.
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