

AMP Subcommittee 3 (Faculty & Pedagogy)

09/08/15 Meeting Minutes

Attendees:

Shari McMahan, Anthony Davis, Lisa Kirtman, Dawn Macy, Lori Gentles, Paul Levesque, Diana Guerin, Alvin Rangel-Alvarado, Bill Hoese, Jeff Kuo, Andrea Guillaume, Laura Lohman, Susan Glassett-Farrelly, John Carroll, Ashley Le-Pham, Rohit Muraka, Su Swarat, Michael Lewitter

Whole group discussion:

- Diana reviewed the first part of the AMP charge: Is this reasonable? Possible to achieve within this semester? Are we comfortable with this charge? What you hope to come out of this process?
- Shari reviewed the second part of the AMP charge: Want to ensure that research intersect with teaching; Consider the role of online, hybrid, f2f instruction in the big picture; Also consider community service ; What about HIP - how to evaluate, communicate, etc..; Faculty teaching load, etc..
 - We are talking at a higher level, not at a localized level.
 - What is the intersection between university and department level decisions? May want to address that.
- Diana asked for thoughts on the charge, particularly in terms of top-down vs. bottom-up approaches. No one commented.
- Diana distributed the "tweaked" charge based on conversation between Diana, Shari and Su.
 - Focus on "how we will build/support faculty to better teach our students" instead of simply "how we will teach".
 - Diana introduced the suggested framework for draft development, taking a developmental approach and looking at individual vs. institutional level.
 - Lisa: Like the change in charge; Want to add in "delivery" more in the framework; Add "Modality" component to the framework.
 - Shari: Support to faculty can come from all venues, including online and f2f, or other modalities.
 - Laura: Change "tenure" to incorporate lecturers as well; Think about faculty evaluation for lecturers
 - Andrea: Need to add "pedagogy" to the mix
- John asked why the original charge was "tweaked". Shari/Diana commented that we want to recognize that faculty are the ones that are in charge of pedagogy. We need to support their endeavors as they work to meet our students' needs. If a department wants to move into the online direction, it is the department's decision, not the university decision. The university should not determine how faculty teach.
- Susan: Our students should have a voice in how we teach; We need to think about how to get their voice - at the institutional level.
- Shari reviewed the timeline - very tight. Suggesting splitting the subcommittee to 2 sub-groups - faculty/pedagogy, with Diana and Shari each leading one group.

- Pedagogy group: Shari, Andrea, Susan, Alvin, Laura, Jeff, Bill, Dawn, Michael, Ashley
- Faculty group: Diana, Paul, Lisa, Lori, John, Anthony, Rohit, Su
- Shari/Diana: Ask the people to think about what it means to be a "model comprehensive public university"

Faculty subgroup:

- Diana: What do we want to recommend - who are the faculty; Is there a benchmark we should achieve - in relation to model comprehensive public university; How to balance teaching, research, service, community, etc.;
- Diana: want a guideline - hope to have the next time we meet; ask whether the framework is useful;
 - Paul: a good place to start;
- Diana: Start from tenure-track density and institutional expectations; Will try to get some numbers for next meeting
 - Diana: CSU wants to "increase % of tenured and probationary faculty"; CSU board goal is to increase diversity of faculty; Tenure-track density used to be above 80% in the 70s, and the 2001 report recommended 75%, and we are now only about 50%.
 - John: A 80/20 rule used to be the case for department;
 - Diana: Will write a summary of the history, context, etc.
 - Paul: Could reflect the pros/cons of hiring higher/lower %
 - John: Is resource an issue?
 - Paul: Pro - Stable faculty who are committed; A question of equity - should we acknowledge the injustice done to part-time faculty; Should we model a just living wage for people; High % is good, but no flexibility in a budget cut year
 - Lisa: Limited flexibility in terms of expertise if high %
 - Diana: To increase diversity of faculty, we need to intentionally do so during tenure track hiring
 - Paul: We want to model diversity in our faculty
 - Lori: Do we need as an institution to have an ambitious goal in terms of tenure-track density - to reach stability/justice, but also recognize our university will continue to change so we need to remain flexible; Should we be nimble?
 - Diana: We think of faculty as a stable body, but it is not; We would like to know who we have, and guess there are a lot of people who will retire soon.
 - Paul: More faculty on the younger (years of service) right now
 - Lori: Predictive analysis to determine whether we need to continue our hiring model; When will the next "bubble" be?
 - Paul: Would the retirement cause the department to have enough make directional changes
 - John: Also want to know how many people leave, not retire; 8.5%??
 - Lori: lower than 10% is good
 - Diana: we lose 30-40% of people before reaching tenure.
 - Lisa: Why do we lose them? Is it related to the RTP process? Is it support?
 - Paul: Does the leave take place before the terminal year?
 - John: salary vs living cost
 - Paul: Our location is challenging for us to be a model comprehensive university; We need a more comparable payscale.

- Lisa: The expectations of RTP are not in line with salary; Traditional RTP does not work with ed college faculty context - need to adjust to reflect the k-12 involvement
- Paul: Challenge department to reflect on personnel standards the specific context of their faculty
- Lisa: How do you prove it is "peer reviewed" publication? What about lack of service - does it really matter? We don't get paid a lot, and we don't get the credit for what we do.
- Lori: The resource issue needs to be considered
- Diana: 15-18% of CSU faculty comes from lecturer pool
- John: Not every lecturer wants to become full-time; Depends on discipline - industry experts want to teach, but not full time; But how many are these people? How many are looking to teach full time?
- Anthony: think about how to encourage collaboration among faculty in a department, to encourage retention? mentorship; support network; not just individual scholars
 - Lori: the diversity action plan is helping address this
- John: Need to encourage the social interactions between faculty; Would help with retention;
 - Paul: Some faculty only come on certain days; Ties to service;
 - John: Need to give them reasons to engage
- Diana: What to do next meeting?
 - Lori: Will share data on retirement, retention, diversity, when/why people are leaving before tenure - terminal year or not ---> Need 1-2 days before meeting
 - Diana: Will gather IRAS data and system-wide data; Provide link to papers;
 - Paul: What data should we capture? "wish list" for the future; How many are teaching GE courses - part-time/full-time? (Provost's report: 3/4 taught by part-timers)
 - Diana: Goal for tenure-density; Role of faculty in building a model comprehensive university
 - Lori: Are there best practices and next practices in terms of tenure-track density? Best formula? Need to know before we pick a number
 - Diana: Community colleges use 75%
 - Lisa: What is a model comprehensive public university? ---> Lisa will look up.
 - All: This is what we are trying to define in this AMP.
- **Sub-group report back:**
- Diana (Faculty):
 - Look at data on tenure density, define best/next practice
 - Look at existing faculty data; understand why they leave
 - Talk about the role of faculty in model comprehensive university --> Will research definition
- Shari (Pedagogy):
 - How we recruit - based on qualifications?
 - Look at the idea of continuous improvement, not just RTP --> A new revised framework
 - What are good pedagogical practices? --> Will look at literature, student perspectives.
 - Not focusing on specific modality
 - Intentional support to faculty

- Conversations on campus about effective teaching, culture of faculty peer review
- What we assess when we teach

Pedagogy subgroup:

The group began by looking at the 3-column framework for draft development provided to use. The columns are labeled: Recruitment, Tenure and Retention. The group began trying to decide what should be added, questioned, clarified or changed within the framework. The following ideas and questions came into play.

- When recruiting instructors, should we be looking for faculty with experience using diverse modalities in teaching?
- Should there be a needs assessment on of diverse teaching experiences of current instructors before a department recruits for a new hire?
- We need to make sure that instructors are provided with necessary supports and opportunities for development. What does that look like? What does support for programs look like?
- Provide intentionality when assigning courses and match instructor skills/expertise to how the students want the course to be taught. Provide a match between instructors, students and course.
- How can we get students to have a voice in what is taught?
- We know that relationships between instructors and students can be high quality and high impact for students. Research indicates there are 5 clear ingredients to high quality teaching: (this list is by memory, the actual research will be presented at the next meeting by Andrea)
 - Relationships with students
 - Clear outcomes
 - Frequent and continuous feedback
 - Knowing what motivates students
 - Student to student communication.
- The group was not content with relying on the 3 column framework originally provided and decided to make some changes to the document to include ideas that didn't seem to naturally fit into the original documents. The adjusted form follows this page.

Members of the group requested that the following information be provided at the next meeting.

- How many departments require peer reviews AND how many departments follow through?
- Who used FDC resources?

	Recruitment	Tenure/ Evaluation	Retention
Individual Level	- Prior experience with diversity - Qualification for tenure-track/tenured & contingent faculty - Qualification of graduate assistants	- RTP criteria and process - Balance between teaching, scholarship, and service - Needs assessment	- Expectations for professional development - Expectations for “keeping current” to provide high quality learning for students - Provide need supports for instructor development
Institutional Level Space Platforms Technologies	- Diversity among faculty - Recruitment plan of tenure-track/tenured & contingent faculty - Proportion of tenure-track/tenured and contingent faculty - Role and percentage of graduate assistants	- Tenure-track density - Institutional expectation of teaching, scholarship, and service - what types of supports are needed for instructors to progress?	- Workload expectations - Institutional support to promote scholarship - Institutional support to motivate faculty to “keep current”
Collaboration			- Create and maintain infrastructure - Provide department level discussions on best practices