

AMP Feedback Report 1

Jan. 5, 2016

GENERAL COMMENTS

- 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. Best wishes, Heather Battaly, Philosophy, hbattaly@fullerton.edu
- 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, possibly 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.

STEERING COMMITTEE

- 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. Making curricular decisions by allowing faculty to post comments in an online form is, frankly, offensive.
- 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. Best wishes, Heather Battaly, Philosophy, hbattaly@fullerton.edu

SUBCOMMITTEE 1: Programs, Degrees, and Outcomes

- 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. Best wishes, Heather Battaly, Philosophy, hbattaly@fullerton.edu

SUBCOMMITTEE 2: Students

- 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.

SUBCOMMITTEE 3: Faculty and Pedagogy

- 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. Best wishes, Heather Battaly, Philosophy, hbattaly@fullerton.edu

SUBCOMMITTEE 4: Infrastructure and Resources

- No feedback