

AMP Subcommittee 3 (Faculty & Pedagogy)

10/08/15 Meeting Minutes

Attendees:

Shari McMahan, Anthony Davis, Lisa Kirtman, Dawn Macy, Lori Gentles, Diana Guerin, Bill Hoese, Jeff Kuo, Andrea Guillaume, Laura Lohman, Susan Glassett-Farrelly, John Carroll, Rohit Murarka, Su Swarat

Whole group discussion:

- Minutes reviewed and approved (Lisa moved; John second; Unanimously approved with no changes).
- Phone made available for Rebecca Sheehan (new member) to call in.
- Diana: Proposed to have a joint meeting with leaders of faculty development to learn PD opportunities for faculty; We have all the leaders of the faculty commons in our subcommittee.
 - Shari: A lot of changes have taken place in FDC; Getting everybody up to speed would be important.
- Diana: Would like some data on faculty development – How much do we spend on faculty development? What space do we have? How much usage is there?
 - Diana: What kinds of data do we want to include in the report? What types of data should we request to be included on university website? This could be a recommendation in the report. We might want to generate a list and have a discussion on this issue.
- Diana: Asked the other subgroup whether they've had a discussion on the definition of "model comprehensive university". Would like to see the notes on the discussion so there is a shared understanding.
- Shari: New calendar/schedule of the AMP will be provided at the next steering committee meeting.

Faculty subgroup discussion:

- Diana introduced the senate forum articles; Would like to see more data on tenured/tenure-track faculty annual gains/losses (similar to Table 1 in Graboyes, Guerin & Sullivan, 2010).
 - It is unclear who has the data now. We only can find data up until 2011.
 - **Diana will follow up with the provost for data of recent years.**
 - Question for the group: Do we want to have a target for tenure density?
 - CSUF and CSU system tenure density from 2007-2014 is shared and graphed, neither of which is close to 75%. CSU campus with the highest density is San Luis Obispo. We are below the system average, and should hope to reach or go beyond system average.
 - Anthony asked whether 75% is realistic; Diana and John confirmed that this was the case at one time. The question is whether we should set 75% as a goal for the near future.
- Rohit asked how online teaching may have affected tenure-track density; Diana commented that online courses and f2f course should be staffed the same way – there is no difference.
- In our report, should we make a recommendation of overall campus TTD (tenure track density), and/or college-specific or department-specific TTD?

- Su: It would be good to have a concrete recommendation in the report.
- Lisa: Our recommendation needs to be justified – why do we want 75%? What outcomes does this TTD tie to?
- John: Do tenure/tenure-track faculty have better SOQ than part-time faculty? Diana suggested that data are forthcoming.
- Diana: HIPs need tenure/tenure-track faculty, e.g. student research.
- Anthony: How would TTD affect resources and cost at the university?
- Su: Would be helpful to have more data on variables related to TTD, e.g. research grant \$, # of publications, amount of release time for service, SOQ, student learning, etc.
- Diana: Over the last 10 years, diversity of faculty has increased 50%. Are there other characteristics we should be looking at?
- Anthony: If we do not have a concrete number of TTD in the report, would it harm the report/university? Does it naturally fluctuate within the departments? Maybe it should be a range? Maybe recommend a minimum?
- Lisa: We need to be able to justify how different TTD tied to different university outcomes? How to tie back to “model comprehensive university”?
- Lisa/John: Advantages for contingent faculty – cost of effectiveness; specialty/practitioners; scheduling flexibility (undesirable or hyper-desirable).
- John: There is a UPS on minimum # of faculty to start a department; What is the critical mass?
- Lisa: Really need 6 tenured faculty to keep the department running. Minimum # is not the same as minimum %.
- **Diana will start a draft based on the previous 75% TTD recommendation from CSU.**

Subgroup report back:

- Pedagogy group: Have a working draft in the dropbox; Developed 6 principles to improve pedagogy; Had good discussions from multiple perspectives (hiring, faculty willingness to take risk; etc.); Discussed how *aspirational* we want to be – need to get directions from the steering committee.
- Faculty group: Had a stimulating conversation on how to justify a TTD – what’s the right number; who can tell us the right number; is there a best practice, etc.. The group agreed that the current TTD is too low, and we need to have a minimum recommendation in the report. But the group is not close to come to a conclusion – we need to have justifications for the recommendation.
- Both subgroups would like to know the time period for the AMP – 5yrs, 10yrs, etc..?
- FDC presentation to whole group will be scheduled in November.

Pedagogy Subgroup Discussion:

- Working from a document that developed from previous meeting discussions, the group agreed that the plan that is developed should be guided by the following 6 guiding principals.
 1. Be aspirational
 2. Be clearly directed toward the goal of providing high quality learning experiences for our students
 3. Be grounded in a commitment to both conceptually sound and evidence-based practices for continuous improvement
 4. Offer support and development to all instructors in ways that meet varied needs

5. Include a commitment to teaching as a communal effort
6. Consider the varied roles that faculty have as “teacher scholars” in our comprehensive university

In reviewing the principal document, the following thoughts, ideas and considerations were brought up:

- The theme of equitable access was brought up again, but this time in relation to student access to supplemental instruction, previously it was faculty access to teaching support
- When discussing #2, the group wanted to make sure that HIPS and their “outcomes” be included in the plan, AND that students have a voice in the assessment process
- The plan should include the development of teacher outcomes, and the information needs to come from faculty input on what they need and how they want it delivered
- When discussing the concept of “teacher scholars” a concern was brought up around the idea of creating more definitions of who and what people do, and questions around the value balance between teaching/scholarship
- Although the balance between teaching load, research and workload is different for individuals, should and how that be standardized in departments
- Faculty come with different interests and capabilities, as such we need to ensure that they are given credit for the different variables and types of activities they participate in
- How will we get to curriculum that is aspirational? It was voiced that the teachers need to be rewarded for it. This is not as common as being rewarded for research and grant writing. Curriculum needs to be competitively valued if we want faculty to focus on it. One way of doing this is to provide assessment of curriculum without resulting in negatives towards evaluation. When SOQs and feedback are weighted negatively then teachers are not encouraged to take risks or even progress because they can get dinged
- When hiring faculty, what do we look for and what works with our school/department
- The plan and the university need to value development and feedback to develop aspirational goals
- Since 2/3s of classes are taught by lecturers we need to focus on developing them and their teaching. We need to keep in mind that some of our full-time lecturers weren’t “chosen”, they rose to their position through time and circumstances. If we spend the energy on developing them, to what end do we do this if they don’t have a chance of becoming faculty? We need to develop better models for bridging lectures into the fold of development and feedback.
- Will the steering committee define aspirational? Do they mean without limitations from budgets or do we need to be realistic? One suggestion to frame the answer to this question is for us to look at the CSU campus’ funding figures per student and determine the difference in dollars between the CSU with the highest budget and ours. From there we could determine what could get done with more funding.
- What years should we cover in the AMP?

Pedagogy Subgroup Next Steps:

- Laura will provide us with possible variables across departments for being a teacher scholar
- Can we get a definition from the steering committee on the scope of “aspiration”
- Can we find out what years the AMP should cover?