

AMP Subcommittee 1

- We need to teach students about career development. How to develop a strong resume and portfolio that will make them competitive. How to create a brand for themselves. Our students are lacking in this area. They need to establish connections with practitioners in their profession.
- when considering what we will teach - how do we factor in CSUF faculty workload? How does CSUF faculty workload appear relative to other CSUFs with comparable amounts of students, faculty, course needs, etc? How does our workload shape what and how we teach - especially if we consider the time integrating HIPs can take? How is the CSUF 4-4 workload factored in to any decisions the university makes? How can we support the relationship of faculty research/creative activities to foster better teaching? If our outcomes are to better and more thoughtfully/deeply integrate HIPs, what sort of support can CSUF provide to faculty that will make better teaching viable. Given that good, substantive instruction requires time and attention - how might CSUF lower the faculty instructional course load to assure faculty and students have the temporal resources needed to do the work we aim to do?
- An elephant in the room is interdisciplinary programming and collaboration. While over the last two decades the university has declared its commitment to interdisciplinary teaching and scholarship, the policy and financial infrastructure has not been shaped in ways to promote and sustain such efforts. Ideas like cluster hiring, interdisciplinary centers, team teaching, research collaboratives have been floated and sometimes initially supported, but have usually withered on the vine due to administrative turnover and dean and faculty resistance to breaching their silos (or cylindrical centers of excellence) and possible losing FTES to other programs. What would be a big step forward for CSUF is a true plan to support interdisciplinary efforts with hard funding and protection from vicissitudes of state funding and institutional inertia.
- What will we teach? An addition to curriculum that would be beneficial to community and students would be American Indian Studies, minor. For health or nursing, social work-american indian studies could be a good fit as our graduates may eventually work with a Native American community.
- I believe this document captures the ideals to which we should aspire.
- "It is my hope that the AMP moves away from the creeping and perhaps dominant language which equates higher education with job preparation. Yes, we do want students to be able to be gainfully employed upon graduation. But that is not the sole reason, and perhaps not even the main reason, why we teach. We are shaping the ability of citizens - of localities, states, nations, and the world - to critically and creatively engage the world around them. This is in part through the means by which they earn a living. But this also reflects through family life, civic institutions, the political sphere, various social domains, the physical and natural world, etc. My

encouragement, then, is that we renew a notion of higher education in which the notion of "higher" also refers to ideals of educating the whole person and heightens her/his ability to engage the world around them. I also echo the point made by the subcommittee the need to help develop the moral and ethical faculties of students. Knowledge and skills without the appropriate moral and ethical sensitivities are dangerous. What we teach should recognize that we prepare students not simply with static knowledge but the skills and abilities to evolve, mature, recreate, and refashion themselves and their environments for progress. Just as important as deciding to teach these things is to heighten the awareness among students of the value of this perspective on learning and higher education and to get them out of the college-leads-to-job mindset. In terms of where we will teach, we should not lose sight of the value and uniqueness of interpersonal communication and interaction. Going online should not be seen as a substitute to in-person teaching. Thus we must invest in our physical infrastructure as much as our technological innovation and create adaptable, beautiful, functional physical spaces which are designed to communication and interaction. Design decisions matter, and those should be reflected in the spaces where teaching and learning occur."

- In addition to "where" will we teach, it may be useful to think about "when" we will teach - the campus is underutilized on Fridays. In "Main Outcomes", "survival" doesn't sound too appealing. Can we come up with a different term? Resilience? Also, missing a period in the description of the "knowledge" outcome.
- "Regarding Q4.1. Why is collaboration seen as central to learning outcomes? How is collaboration to be measured? Why is individual achievement not given equal consideration as an important learning outcome? Regarding Q.4.2. How Will we measure if students have a "high quality life"? This assumes that there is one measure of high-quality. This measure is not the business of a university: we impact students' experiences here, but we do not determine their experiences after they leave the university. Indeed we shape and expand their opportunities in measurable ways, but measuring a "high quality life" is neither possible nor desirable; again, it is not our business."
- Based on comments which I have heard from a LOT of recruiters from many major corporations, there is a consistency in their discussion regarding 3 items, specifically regarding the Fullerton campus. (1.) Many say they are very frustrated with the poor quality of our students' written communication skills; 2.) Many view that our students have inadequate critical and creative thinking skills; and, (3.) They view our students as having limited ability to actually "apply" their knowledge once they enter into the post-college career world. As a result, I have actually had a few recruiters tell me that they are becoming more focused on interviewing (especially for their really good jobs) at other universities. I believe these 3 items need to be a very strong priority.
- Where/how will we teach: in smaller classes (i.e., sections of 40-45, instead of 60)

- Chancellor White recently stated "The six touchstones for us are: diversity, quality, student success, public good, sustainability and innovation." While I see reference to diversity, quality, student success, public good, and innovation in Programs, Degrees, and Outcomes, I would like to see explicit inclusion of sustainability as well.

AMP Subcommittee 2

- We are an institution that is educating the children of the working class. Many of our students are first generation college students and they need more institutional support to have a sense of belonging and persist.
- when considering who we are as teachers - how do we factor in CSUF faculty workload? How does CSUF faculty workload appear relative to other CSUFs with comparable amounts of students, faculty, course needs, etc? How does our workload shape who we are as teachers - and especially when thinking about our effectiveness and capacity? How is the CSUF 4-4 workload factored in to any decisions the university makes? How can we support faculty research/creative activities in ways that bolster and foster better teaching? why doesn't every college get to include students in the instructional process as teacher assistants - how might that be supported across disciplines by the university?
- We? President Garcia calls us all "Educators". As educators, we have taught and are teaching students, co-workers and community. There is no limit to how many an educator will teach.
- The challenges sections are useful for identifying issues we are either already facing or will be in the near future, but for a forward looking master plan, it seems to be missing potential solutions to these challenges. For example, it is difficult to imagine how we maintain an annual increase in student body unless we greatly expand either physically or as an online presence. It also seems difficult to maintain our activities if we remain the lowest funded of the 23 campuses so action to remedy this situation should be proposed. If the university wants more graduate programs, it seems changes need to be made that provide incentive to departments for creating and maintaining those programs (classes capped at 15 or 18 are expensive to staff). Lastly, apparently we have a pretty good idea of what outcome based funding the governor is/has proposed so an explicit plan to counter negative outcomes from the funding plan while maximizing funding CSUF receives should be proposed.
- "This question is simple: We are the future, and we are teaching the future. I don't limit this to the notion of the ""future workforce."" Our campus is teaching a microcosm of what Orange County, Southern California, California and the United States will be. Everyone else will be catching up to who we are and what we do. As such, innovation should be at the heart of what we do. We should not follow or imitate, we should be breaking the mold. Our campus should be a laboratory where ideas of the future are tested and refined. But we can't do this teaching a

volume of students that outstrips our resources. So, either get more or cut down the number of students we serve. Access is a central value of our university, but there are resource limits. If the volume of students outweighs our resources, we will not be able to do anything well let alone innovate in education. In addition, who we are should not be an organization that constrains the creativity of those doing the educating. Faculty and staff should be freed from the shackles of administration, administrative structures, and bureaucracy which stifle innovation and creativity. Let the components in Academic Affairs lead and reform other portions of the university to support that leadership."

- To support student diversity, the plan might include a comment on how the university can help support, retain, and ensure the success of historically under-represented minorities or disadvantaged students.
- Why does table/figure 2.3. have year ranges (in the left-most column) that "jump" - e.g. it is not instantly apparent how many degrees we awarded from 2011 to 2013. Under section 5.3., I feel that one of the challenges for students is related to the fact that CSUF is a commuter campus. Another challenge: so many of my student indicate that CSUF is not their first choice. Can we do some research into this? What factors make other institutions more desirable?
- I disagree with the statement that we are at or a little bit overcapacity on their campus. We are terribly overcrowded, and we do not have sufficient classrooms. Faculty cannot teach effectively and students cannot learn effectively under these circumstances.
- Again, lower the class size and students' access to instructors will vastly improve

AMP Subcommittee 3

- We should welcome practitioners to also teach our students in order for the students to be current in the professional skills that are required by their industry.
- "This document makes it sound like the university values scholarship only insofar as it is "blended" with instruction. Real scholarship is about pursuing truth, advancing knowledge, following a line of investigation wherever it may lead. I would prefer to work at a university that respects the advancement of knowledge as an end in itself. I'm sure I'm not alone in this. "Technology is a given, not a debate." Is this combative attitude necessary? In articulating our principles, shouldn't our tone be loftier? Besides, we're in the business of interrogating things-- nothing is off limits, not even technology! How could online enrollment not be growing faster than overall enrollment? Instruction should be "aesthetically pleasing"? When studies show that teacher evaluations vary based on the race and gender of the instructor, do we really want to bring something as subjective (and, frankly, disturbing) as appearances into the equation? Do

we want to stress this as one of our key principles? Moreover, some topics and subjects just aren't pretty. Again, truth and knowledge should be our guiding principles..."

- when considering how we teach - how do we factor in CSUF faculty workload? How does CSUF faculty workload appear relative to other CSUFs with comparable amounts of students, faculty, course needs, etc? How is the general CSUF faculty 4-4 workload factored in to any decisions the university makes regarding the provision of high-quality learning opportunities - especially if we want our faculty to be wonderful teachers who make a difference as well as active and productive in their respective fields, etc? How can we support faculty research/creative activities in ways that bolster and foster better teaching?
- To recruit and retain high-quality faculty, we must improve faculty salary, which is currently lower than that for community college faculty
- I am glad to see the commitment to supporting teaching. I am equally disheartened about the lack of commitment to support scholarship, especially research of all kinds. Integrating scholarship with teaching does not occur without an administrative and financial infrastructure that is consistent over time. While the consolidation of the research offices is a start, it is crucial to realize that CSUF has lost innumerable opportunities for PI-initiated funding because of the lack of cohesive structure across the colleges and within Academic Affairs, and because of the inefficiency of ASC. And this is the case even though the Strategic Plan has a target of increasing PI-initiated funding by 25%. Where does that fit in here? Many of the issues raised not only by this subcommittee but also subcommittees 1 and 4 would be ameliorated by a consistent resource flow from PI-initiated funding, but that will not happen if it is viewed as a stochastic "soft" money source rather than as a consistent and sustainable resource that can be incorporated into planning. But for that to happen, the university needs to invest resources in greater support. Invest resources to generate resources. Also, how are the subcommittees communicating with each other? Much of what is written by subcommittees 1,3, and 4 is contradictory.
- For an american indian studies minor (or major) it would be awesome for authorities to have strong ties with Native American tribal/community by either having the strong credentials and/or drawing on personal experiences of the Native American person-that is the instructors should be native american.
- There is much description of recruiting, retaining, and supporting faculty and improving tenure density in this report, but nowhere does it address the most obvious mechanism for doing this, provide competitive salaries for faculty!
- "Quite simply, we need more tenure track faculty. The university and all of higher education has relied on and taken advantage of part time faculty for too long. To attract more tenure track

faculty, INCREASE SALARIES. It's that simple. Other than that, it would be helpful to find ways to (a) reduce teaching loads for those interested in scholarship, (b) reduce service load, and (c) foster an aspirational environment for faculty to feel that the university supports its faculty and does not just view an instrument to educate students. With respect to supporting faculty, the saying is simple: happy faculty are better educators. The subcommittee's notion of the teacher-scholar seems to imply that scholars come to campus and become teachers. There is insufficient discussion on supporting the scholarship component. It is important to realize that our ability to teach and be good teachers is enhanced by our research. Thus, support conference attendance, professional development, research, creative activity. All of those aspects of the intellectual life of faculty must be supported for the teacher-scholar to exist. In fact, I would suggest that we are scholar-teachers not teacher-scholars. We teach and are excellent teachers based on our excellence as scholars."

- "1. Evaluation of faculty teaching should ideally include objective measures, e.g., performance in future (more advanced-level courses), related employment, etc. -- currently, there is a strong emphasis on subjective measures (e.g., student evaluations), when there is empirical evidence suggesting that students are poor evaluators of effective pedagogy. 2. Effective recruitment and retention of faculty requires the provision of competitive salary and support for all three types of activities (teaching, scholarship, service). 3. In order to ensure high-quality instructional practices, consideration should be given to student-to-faculty ratio in the classroom (and in advising). It is important to limit the number of students enrolled at the classroom as well as the program level."
- "This document completely neglects support for a faculty research. This is unacceptable and must be revised. The language of this subcommittee is unclear and implies a restricted assumption about pedagogical methods. For instance, in Q.2.1 there is an implied value for holistic approaches but what is meant by that term is unexplained. In Q.2.2 the requirement that teaching be accompanied with a ""positive affect"" needs to be clarified. What is that? How would it possibly be measured? In Q.2.4 the doc states that ""technology is a given""; can you clarify your vision of technology? In Q.2.4 the requirement that teaching be ""aesthetically pleasing"" is confounding and suggests some kind of standardization that is not achievable. Also, aesthetically pleasing to whom, exactly? In Q.2.5 please define ""wrap-around 24/7"" and explain the need for a ""neutral space."" Finally the statement has defined quality teaching by standards that have little to do with actual classroom instruction and more to do with measuring instruction."
- Somehow this issue needs to be included into this subcommittee's project. We need to increasingly focus on finding ways to motivate faculty to "give it their all" when it comes to teaching. I am continually amazed at how many faculty tell me that they are either losing, or have lost their motivation to do the best teaching job possible. This DOES NOT mean more administrative nightmares, nor marching orders - that would just make it worse. One thing

which I have seen in life in the corporate world is that one of the most important characteristics of a good leader, is their ability to motivate people to achieve the goal and mission. My impression in the classroom is that the reduction of faculty's motivation seems to be reducing students' motivation to learn.

- Smaller class sizes allow much greater interaction with the instructor and other students, facilitating dialogue and discussion
- "RTP MUST be aligned with campus goals to increase high impact practices. There is not currently any incentive for faculty to accept a leadership role coordinating high impact practices outside traditional research, despite the tremendous value to both students, faculty, and campus, and lower cost per capita of campus community partnerships, campus as a living lab, etc. In order to make any initiatives re: student success effective the first priority must be alignment with faculty incentives, career development, and progression."

AMP Subcommittee 4

- Budget challenges may be alleviated by creating strong relationships with industries that need our diverse talent.
- when considering any changes - such as, how we might increase external research grant applications - how do we factor in CSUF faculty workload? How does CSUF faculty workload appear relative to other CSUFs with comparable amounts of students, faculty, grant solicitation, etc? How is the general CSUF faculty 4-4 workload factored in to any decisions the university makes regarding hiring of faculty. administrators, or the funding of intramural grants, support for external funding efforts, etc?
- "A centralized (computer-based) scheduling of classes and all campus spaces" may seem ideal in theory, but departments (rather than the university) would be most appropriate and qualified to determine teaching courses, teaching schedules, and lab spaces.
- I am concerned here with the implication that graduate programs are a problem regarding space and should be cut. Is that a correct interpretation? If so, that will need to be stated far more clearly with justification in terms of history and the mission of CSUF. If not, that should be clarified because the rumor mill is going.
- "It appears that money will cure all issues with the AMP. Where can we get some? In coordination with tribal entities of CA it's possible that Indian gaming monies could provide some support for an American Indian studies program at CSUF, (possibly other native american activities at CSUF). Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on aspects of the AMP."

- Related to the report on students (AMP subcommittee 1), use/allocation of space requires more than just an attempt to more efficiently use the space we have (of course, improved efficiency is a good goal, but will not make-up for the ever-growing enrollment). Either a clear plan to move more online or acquisition of more physical space must occur. A second issue with this notion is that not all space can be allocated by a centralized system in a manner that supports needs of faculty and students who are engaged in exactly the types of high impact practices that are so frequently promoted. For example, running experiments. Space requirements for running subjects varies depending on the whims of volunteer sign-ups, unexpected issues with research design, need for a follow-up experiment, when a study receives IRB approval - I could go on for a long time. The point is, all space being allocated by a central system to maximize efficiency (thereby requiring a rigid and predetermined allocation of space) may work for scheduling classes, but is problematic for other, less rigid, education practices. I personally already struggle to get the space I need when I need it, especially going through university scheduling. If our departmental space were also centralized I would find myself scheduling space I hoped to use rather than what I need when I need it. Centralizing space allocation won't solve the space problem and will likely create several unforeseen problems.
- "The physical space is too small for the number of students we teach and the amount of non-teaching activity that goes on. So expand the space we have or find ways to maximize what we have. As mentioned in previous comments, design matter. Not only in terms of aesthetics, but in functionality as well. We need smart space as much as we need more space. Our infrastructure problems will not be solved with technology along, though continued improvements in the function of technology are needed. To increase financial resources, the campus community needs to be mobilized for greater advocacy to the CSU for more funds. This requires a coordinated plan among constituent groups and a surge in advocacy that results in a social movement for higher education and not just elite politics."
- "In order to ensure adequate support for and retention of faculty, departments should be given some decision-making capacities. In particular: 1. Assignment of teaching schedule for faculty -- this has been managed effectively by departments, to ensure a good match between faculty availability and student needs. If a centralized university system were to assign teaching schedules, faculty members with scheduling constraints (e.g., public transportation schedule; family needs) would have difficulty assuming their teaching responsibilities. 2. Assignment of lab space and equipment -- in order for there to be effective faculty recruitment and retention, it is important that the department has some control over space allocation and assignment. In my discipline, assignment of lab space is expected of tenure-track faculty. To not have guaranteed lab space and resources means that desirable candidates will not accept faculty positions at CSUF. Additionally, it would be helpful if graduate programs could be re-assessed with regard to student outcomes (relative to resources). Recruitment and enrollment in graduate programs would ideally allow for a reasonably selective admissions process. Pressure for graduate programs to recruit more students than are qualified, for financial reasons, would

ultimately lead to inefficiencies (e.g., attrition; loss of faculty time; decreased quality of instruction) -- I hope that there will be plans in place to help prevent the recruitment of less-than-qualified graduate students and to make the admissions decisions adequately competitive."

- AMP Sub 1, 2, and 3 cite faculty research as an important part of the AMP. However, physical space is the only shortcoming of the Univ by AMP sub 4. This is certainly not the only impediment to increased research activities. Faculty have only 24 hrs in a day and if research is to be an integral part of the AMP, resources need to be provided to release faculty from other responsibilities. Otherwise, the Univ is asking to "have cake and eat it too".
- Cut administrators' ridiculously high salaries to enable hiring of more instructor with smaller class sizes
- Absolutely agree that a new campus master plan is needed, to be developed using current and projected enrollment and utilization data. Would also like to see mention of Life Cycle Analysis, design for flexibility, and building maintenance estimates incorporated into project design for new construction and major renovations as we frequently utilize our buildings well beyond the average tenure of a standard commercial tenant. Also, state mandates re: Net zero buildings and ongoing reduction of resource use. The physical and operational environment of campus can be an immersive educational experience in addition to providing functional, inspiring, and aspirational spaces, if we frame it in that way.