

AMP Subcommittee 3 (Faculty & Pedagogy)

12/10/15 Meeting Minutes

Attendees:

Shari McMahan, Dawn Macy, Susan Glassett-Farrelly, Laura Lohman, Alvin Rangel-Alvarado, Diana Guerin, Paul Levesque, Adelina Gnanlet, Erualdo Gonzalez, Rohit Murarka, Su Swarat

1) Review of minutes from last meeting

Minutes approved unanimously.

2) Subcommittee November & December reports to campus community

Subcommittee reports were sent to the campus, and made available on the AMP website and in the Dropbox.

3) Updates from the steering committee meetings

- Diana updated the group on the steering committee meetings, particularly in terms of the communication plan. The communication plan was put in place to make the process transparent.
- The AMP website was shown to the group. The location of the supporting documents used to draft the report was shown. Shari clarified that these documents are simply references, not opinions. The campus will review and provide feedback at a later point.

The subcommittee report, due on March 1, 2016, need to follow the guidelines below:

- *Provide clear and succinct responses to the questions posed under your subcommittee's charge.*
- *Provide a clear rationale for the responses drawing from campus data, regional, and national best practices.*
- *Responses may be philosophical or actionable and should take into consideration such issues as the following:*
 - *Possible constraints, perceived strengths, as well as opportunities, based, for example, on planning and evaluation.*
 - *Capacity, infrastructure, and operations, including off-campus instructional locations.*
 - *Institutional values—what makes CSUF unique, and what could further its vision of itself as a model comprehensive public university in the nation.*
 - *Subcommittee report should be approximately 15-20 pages, double-spaced.*

4) Discussion on FDC (continued)

Shari asked the group to continue the discussion from the Nov. 17 meeting on FDC, with foci on: 1) Services we are not currently offering; 2) The presence of the FDC. Summary of FDC (in Dropbox) was reviewed.

- Diana: Physical presence of FDC is not as impressive compared to fellow CSU campuses; A facility designed solely for this purpose would be good. PR/Communication on FDC services could be strengthened.

- Jeff: Could consider making some of the FDC workshops mandatory, particularly for part-time lecturers. Departments could help encourage their participation.
 - o Shari: We need to pay the part-time lecturers or state in the contract in order to make the training mandatory. We could explore online modules on critical issues (e.g. DSS, emergency preparedness).
 - o Diana: Department personnel standards could encourage faculty commitment to professional development.

5) Review of the presentation “who will teach” by Diana:

Diana showed the slides summarizing issues examined by the faculty subgroup, and asked the group for feedback on what should be included in the report. Data on CSUF faculty over the last 10 years were reviewed.

- John: Suggested word change – “lecturer” to “full-time lecturer” -- on the first data slide to differentiate from part-time lecturers.
- From 2004 to 2014, our faculty’s gender diversity increased to nearly 1:1, and ethnic diversity increased from 28% to 35% (ethnically diverse faculty). The ethnic diversity does not match the current state population or student population. Question – Do we want to set a goal (e.g. match the state population) or just say “continue the trend”?
- Tenure density declined over the years, from nearly 100% to about 50%. CSUF tenure density is lower than the CSU average or other comparable large CSU.
- Instruction received by students from tenured/tenure-track faculty is only approximately 30% of the classes offered.
 - o Kezar & Maxey (2015) pointed out the need to focus more on part-time lecturers, and the need to reconsider the traditional model of faculty structure/hires. It also points out the inequity between part-time lecturers and tenure/tenure-track faculty in terms of compensation, number of students part-time lecturers teach, number of different courses, etc..
 - o Susan asked whether it is better to have fewer full-time lecturers, or more part-time lecturers.
 - Diana: It is safe to say that the hiring decisions are made at the department level.
 - o Jeff: We should also look at the diversity of the lecturers as well. Defining the teacher-scholar model for both faculty populations would also help reduce the inequity issue.

Diana asked for specific recommendations on what to include in the first draft:

- o The report will discuss data relevant to:
 - Diversity
 - Jeff recommended showing ethnic diversity of new faculty hires in 2004 vs. 2014. Diana will summarize the data.
 - Tenure density
- o The report will provide some “range” descriptions in terms of faculty hiring plans, based on our data analysis.
- o The report will touch upon the role of instructional/teaching assistants and international faculty, but substantial discussion has not taken place yet.
 - Shari asked Bill to see if he could share manuals and contracts detailing the roles and benefits of graduate assistants.
 - Diana commented that teaching assistants are beneficial to the departments (e.g. cost-effectiveness, student-instructor interaction, undergraduate

identification with grad teaching assistants, etc.), and to the graduate students themselves (e.g. research skills, marketability, teaching abilities). We need to gather some information on them.

- Jeff/Adelina: Is there a need to single out international faculty? What is the definition of “international” faculty? The group agreed that this should not be a high priority topic.
- o The report could state the recommendation of moving faculty from part-time to full-time positions, while acknowledging the scenarios in which professionals prefer to teach part-time only due to their professional obligations (e.g. ECS).
- o The group agreed that the conversations of the 2 subgroups need to be connected in order to draw up conclusions/recommendations.
- o Andi asked whether we should be aspirational or “bolder” in our recommendations.

6) Report drafting assignments for winter break

Shari showed the drafting plan document asking/designating people to write portions of the report. Assignments were accepted. **Drafts are due to Shari by Feb.8, 2016. Shari will put together the draft by the first meeting in the spring.**

7) Spring meeting scheduling

The group agreed to meet every other week on Tues/Thur afternoons in the spring semester. Su will send out the doodle poll to determine dates/times.