

AMP Subcommittee 3 (Faculty & Pedagogy)

09/22/15 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, Rohit Muraka, Su Swarat

Guest: Mary Ann Villareal

Whole group discussion:

- Minutes reviewed; Editorial changes suggested and will be made.
- New members were introduced.
- AMP steering committee meeting:
 - Shari reviewed the last steering committee meeting; Each subcommittee is handling the approach differently, and we are learning from each other.
 - Diana: All groups tweaked their charges - a dynamic process; A plan will come out of the provost's office on Friday to address how to keep the campus updated about the AMP progress; AMP timeline is now revised to push it a little later to allow for campus consultation, and to encourage transparency and communication
- AMP directions:
 - Shari and Diana were given the guideline of 15-20 double-spaced pages for each subcommittee; Need to be clear and succinct, and provide rationale; Need to be actionable (taking a "SWAT" analysis approach).
 - Maybe for our subcommittee, each subgroup will have about 10 pages.

Faculty subgroup discussion:

- Lori reviewed faculty separation data for instructional tenure/tenure-track faculty from 08/09 - 14/15; 113 terminations vs. 149 retirement; Primary reason listed is "other reason"; Only 1 marked "dissatisfaction".
 - Very few people were involuntarily released (n=8); Most people leave voluntarily.
 - Lori stated that it does not appear that turnover rate is high; Diana cautioned us that this may not be 100% accurate - it depends on how many we hire every year.
- Exit interview is voluntary; We are hoping to make the process more robust to get a better picture of why people are leaving.
- The "retention rate" table showed about 30% of people entered in 09/10 left by fall 2015; but on the year to year basis, the loss is not as high.
- The "current headcount by separation reason" table indicated that the biggest reason for leaving is "resignation" (n=26).
- **Lori will clarify whether the data table include counselors and librarians.**
- Lori reviewed the pie charts on gender and ethnicity faculty composition trend: Long-term trend indicated more female, and more diverse faculty population.
- The "age distribution of current faculty" chart showed a big proportion under 50.
- The "trend and headcount of retirement by age and by year of service" chart showed people are retiring at an older age.

- The "distribution of age and year of service of current faculty confirmed the pattern that more people are retiring at an older age.
- The "distribution of recent retired faculty and the eligible for retirement" showed that more people are eligible for retire than those who actually retire.
- Diana sent a request to IRAS on current faculty data by college/department.
- Paul asked to unpack the "no"s in the table on page 2 to see what the reasons for leaving are. Paul also asked for more years' data. **Lori will follow up on these.**
- **Diana: For next meeting, group members should think about key points we want to include in the AMP about the current faculty or faculty trend.**
- Lisa reviewed the definition of model comprehensive university: Need to have high quality programs, high quality faculty, high quality research, community engagement, and diverse student population; How can we rise to the top as a model comprehensive university??
- Paul suggested that we could look into the criteria of US News and Report to see how they judge things like "faculty resources"; Lisa said that things like high school counselors' reports go into the ranking as well.
- Diana should also add "accessibility"/"cost effectiveness"/"affordability" to the list; We believe we are already a model comprehensive university.
- We need to know how we define "high quality programs" or "high quality faculty".
- "Community engagement" refers to that how we as an institution impact the community, not just how faculty serve in leadership roles. We could define the specific ways faculty impact the community. We should also consider how the university can better support the things faculty excel at. What is valued? How to maintain a balance?
- DPS needs to be realistic, and not requiring faculty to accomplish it all; How does DPS balance the requirements while recognizing faculty's expertise? How to ensure that post-tenure research productivity does not decline due to increased service engagement?
- **Diana suggested that we should look at UPS 210 in a separate meeting to examine faculty personnel standards on teaching, research and service.**
- **Erualdo suggested that we may want to ask departments about their views on these issues; Lisa/Paul suggested that we could examine current personnel standards from the departments; Diana said that collection of information is possible with the extended timeline.**
- Lisa said that she had difficulty finding a specific example/"best practice" of model comprehensive university; Only example named was University of Wisconsin Madison.
- Rohit asked about the current faculty support systems are at the department level, e.g. assigned time, FDC, teaching load, etc.. **Diana will share an article on this topic.**
- Mary Ann commented that there are different examples of different kinds of "comprehensiveness", but not ONE model comprehensive university; We are in the position to define it - exciting!
- Diana discussed shared documents on tenure density; Typical formula is: "# of tenure/tenure-track"/ "# of faculty positions"; "# of faculty positions" = "# of students"/ "student-faculty ratio".
- Diana shared a chart showing trends of tenure density at CSU and CSUF, which declined over the years.
- What does tenure density mean in building a model comprehensive university? What is the variation across colleges? Should colleges set their own goals?

Subgroup report back:

- Pedagogy subgroup went through the materials in dropbox; The group decided to start a list of principles (e.g. all faculty need to have access to materials that support their professional development) that help guide the work.
- Faculty subgroup reviewed faculty separation/retention data, definition of model comprehensive university as it relates to faculty, and tenure density data.
- Shari: It may be of interest to differentiate research faculty vs. teaching faculty positions.