AMP Subcommittee 3 (Faculty & Pedagogy)
10/22/15 Meeting Minutes

Attendees:

Shari McMahan, Dawn Macy, Susan Glassett-Farrelly, Bill Hoese, Jeff Kuo, Laura Lohman, Alvin Rangel-Alvarado, Diana Guerin, Anthony Davis, Paul Levesque, Adelina Gnanlet, John Carroll, Rohit Murarka, Su Swarat

Whole group discussion:

- Diana updated the group on the steering committee discussion. The November communication to the campus will address some of the questions.
    - Think of AMP as a "compass", not a map; More aspirational.
    - Revised timeline: 1st draft – mid march, 2nd draft – early fall, final AMP – December.
    - Discussion on the possibility of "rebranding" the AMP.
- Diana discussed what the faculty subgroup will work on today: Review of data and examination of possible scenarios.
- Shari discussed what the pedagogy subgroup will work on today: Keep working on the draft – recap and adding in new discussion topics.
- **FDC presentation on faculty support is scheduled for Nov. 17.**
- We will decide whether to bring in faculty recruitment presentation (HRDI) at a later point.

Faculty subgroup discussion:

- Diana reviewed a powerpoint summary of the discussion on tenure density (TD).
    - Historical trends in faculty tenure density: Gone down over time; Note that SFR did not stay constant.
    - Contributing factors: # of faculty, # of students, SFR
    - The "peak" for 2009 TD was due to lower enrollment of students.
    - CSUF TD is below the CSU system average, and the average of other large CSUs.
    - Data from 2006-2015: Average hires 53.7/yr, loss 35/yr.
    - Projection of annual faculty hires for 4 different scenarios (in terms of FTES growth) was shared.
    - The reality: We are at capacity, have relatively small campus space, and TD is at historical low.
- Robit suggested looking into students in the CO's doctoral incentive program, and recruiting from them to establish a "pipeline". We can look into how the system can support us.
- Paul: Our conclusion is that we need to stay and rise above the current TD.
- Anthony: Need to consider faculty retention in addition recruitment.
- Paul: Staff salaries are particularly low. Retention of staff is an issue as well.
- Paul: Should we examine the way we do searches? Can we streamline the process?
- Diana: For the AMP, we will recommend a minimum of 80 hires a year, which probably will require at least 100 searches a year.
- Adelina: Could we recommend a dual-career policy to encourage hires.
    - Diana: We could make it clear on our postings that we encourage/discourage dual-career.

- Diana: CSU recruitment report showed that 15-18% full-time faculty comes from part-time lecturer pool.
- **Group consensus on AMP draft:**
    - **We will include all the data charts in the AMP draft.**
    - **We need 80-110 <u>hires</u> per year to maintain a 55% TD, while accommodating 2-3% annual FTES growth. [Anthony: CRISIS!]**
    - **We will recommend that TD should increase as an aspirational goal.**
    - **We will also discuss faculty recruitment and retention.**
- Adelina shared faculty recruitment practices in MCBE.
    - Being aggressive on timing is important.
    - Focus on benefits, not just salary.
- Diana: Should we discuss best practices in faculty recruitment? Or should we focus on faculty retention?
    - John: Rather focus on faculty retention.
    - Paul: Make salary expectations realistic upfront.

Subgroup report back:

- <u>Faculty group</u>:
    - The group reviewed data, and discovered that to maintain the current TD, we need 80-100 <u>hires</u> per year, assuming SFR and FTES annual growth stay constant.
    - The group will explore best practices in faculty recruitment and retention.
- <u>Pedagogy group</u>:
    - The group discussed the definition of "teacher scholar", and how the definition differs by discipline.
    - The group discussed what it means to make teaching a "communal effort", and how to provide peer support.
    - Course redesign is discussed, and how it can address accessibility issues.
- Next meeting (Nov. 3): A sharing meeting
    - Laura will circulate drafts among members of the pedagogy group.
    - Diana will discuss documents on faculty TD – powerpoint already in dropbox.

Pedagogy subgroup discussion:

- The group started where they had left off previously, defining "teacher scholar" (consideration #6. Laura presented a concept from the book <u>Scholarship Revisited</u>, by Earnest Boyer. Rather than look at just one type of scholarship, Boyer suggests that there are many:
    - Scholarship of integration
    - Scholarship of application
    - Scholarship of discovery
    - Scholarship of teaching and applying
    - Scholarship of integration

  The group decided that using multiple types of scholarship provides framework with maximum flexibility and that it leaves the teaching/scholarship ratio up to the departments and colleges. This topic includes issues of weighted teaching units and values of scholarship and teaching in the RTP process. All of this should be determined by using the framework of "what is best for the student?"
- CSUF has a UPS that identifies that teaching is the primary focus of the university.
- In an effort to better understand potential faculty focus, the group considered suggesting that applicants should be asked to submit a statement regarding her/his teaching

philosophy/disposition. Possibly ask, how does your scholarship relate to your teaching and vice versa?

- Regarding the question, how do we get new faculty to be good teachers, the following concepts were mentioned:
  - Technology should always be considered an option
  - SLOs should be what is weighted
  - SOQs should be weighted less because they inhibit risk and forward motion

Next meeting: groups will share information with one another