

Table Discussion Notes subcommittee 1

Well thought out document—one of the best of the four

What is meant by “exceptional education” go straight to CSUF will prepare students for....

Under Outcomes—the Knowledge bullet doesn’t make sense—clarify—it’s a run on sentence.

“write, create and speak about” not just write and create—arts students (and probably others) make things—and analyze and critique

Don’t like the word “survival”—thrive or resilience will be better words

A lot of the language from subcommittee #1 should go into subcommittee #3—in particular the need for recognizing there is more to education than outcomes and professions—need to continue to recognize the liberal arts and general education

They should learn how to learn—be aware of the learning process. This is in addition to knowing the subject matter.

Lifelong learning is vital.

How does this reflect our graduate programs/graduate students? Should we note that we have different levels of students?

Not just broad curriculum, there is also specialized curriculum (grad students and credential students)

What resources do we use currently to track alumni success (Otis Report for the ARTS; SNAPP National Statistics on Arts careers and impact to the economy)
Like that we are hiring a Director of Writing Across the Disciplines—to help with writing in our programs

Things are changing in the world—it is a disadvantage if they specialize too early—analytical, verbal, writing, quantitative

Commitment to the Liberal Arts—need to have a foundation

Concerns about trying funding to jobs students get (this is happening in other states)

Students need to be resilient about finding another career—try other programs

We need partnerships with K-12 (and Community Colleges) are we preparing teachers?

Table Discussion Notes subcommittee 1

We need to balance early preparation and access with an understanding that college is where you explore

How do we motivate students if they are just here to get a degree?

Are we having part timers teach lower division classes and they are not motivating in the same way a tenure track faculty might be?

Integration of teaching and research from an early point on in all programs, get the students involved in the professional aspect of the discipline

Our best faculty/teachers should be teaching lower division—would need more money towards TAs to help with this. (concerns with infrastructure—no big class rooms)

Where should we teach?

Online—not for everyone. They need to be motivated.

We need to look at our online pedagogy to improve it.

Distance Ed is also embedded in our face-to-face classes. Need to invest in FDC.

Need more TAs and Grad assistants to assist with our teaching

Too much focus on learning in the classroom, need more emphasis on interacting with the instructors outside of the classroom setting. This would be especially helpful for students who are struggling.

Students in the sciences need to know there are other programs/opportunities for them. Have a pre-science major and if students don't succeed there they should not be allowed into the major.

Define the word "success"—what does this mean—define it

There is a lot of focus on workforce readiness; we need more focus on preparing students for a democracy; civic engagement

Missing the values of social responsibility

Context—classrooms needs to be pedagogically appropriate

What outcomes will guide our work—don't like survival—resilience

Skills too much emphasis on skills that are transferrable to the workforce

If we are a global community we are not just contributing to the local community

Table Discussion Notes subcommittee 1

Nothing in here about being a lifelong learner

Need to be nimble and prepared for the future; students will have many different jobs; need to be able to evolve

Under values—no mention of diversity, equity, inclusiveness and also should be reflected elsewhere

What about context—its not just where it has to have a “why” behind it (why teach at a satellite campus?)

What do you think about “awareness”—Students need to know why they are doing what their doing. Understand they are social beings. This section could be worded better. Clarify that this is not just about the workforce (some felt there was too much emphasis on the workforce elements)

Outcomes—awareness—is this critical awareness/critical thinking? Does critical thinking need to be a separate goal from awareness (maybe “critical awareness”?)

Student sense of control over their lives/self-determination
Agree with a lot of it

Feels like there is some criticism of programs/courses and then they are used as models

University as a whole needs to support lower number of students if they want HIPs. Is this just rhetoric?

Need to get more students through quicker—students complain that it is too much work; students haven’t heard about how great service learning is and then low enrollment happens and the class gets cancelled. This leads to faculty, community disillusionment

Roadmaps should be part of this discussion—HIPs should be built in from the beginning of a student’s career.

RTP process is broken. Faculty are pressured to do things that are inconsistent: put a lot of time into service learning but that might not be recognized in RTP.

Inconsistencies in AMP and RTP process. What’s the incentive in getting a grant (its better to just get a publication)? Putting roadblocks in the way of faculty. Do we need University level personnel committee?

General Education—We need to double count with the major

Internship class is HIP and counts for the major—why should GE be different?

Table Discussion Notes subcommittee 1

Q3 point 2—include “non-profits”

Overview: instrumentalism – moral good vs youth-bases good. Tone down the instrumentalism (just for educations sake).

The broader aspect of quality of life. That is broad and not necessarily financially driven.

Also consider knowledge per se. Not all education is skills driven. Knowledge as its own value.

Outcomes read a bit strange. Expert top down. Struggling with the way it is worded.

Information literacy – practical outcomes, life skills.

Resilience vs survival, flexibility --- open to change.

Q4.2 Some of the ideas there might be reflected also in overview section. Seems disjointed with overview.

Not sure first statement under GE (empty sentence). Could argue that GE does not need to be integrated into programs. Strong objective statements about GE.

Having a high quality of life might not be measurable, non-overlapping with GE.

Integration of GE but students are retained when GE courses are lined up. One way of looking at integration is looking at career path and GE. This works when students are prepared or in a professional track. Would they receive the breadth of education?

How to make GE meaningful for students who are undecided.....not always a linear process or a consistent process for all. Changing a major or double major may not increase time to graduation. Depending upon type.

No sentence about GE including about GE itself. Overview begins with strong liberal arts core.

Support for flipped classrooms

GE seems unfocused students don't know why they take it, why are some GE areas at CSUF upper division and lower division at another campus

Why will we teach what we teach more emphasis on discussing the workforce needs, need liberal arts based education

Table Discussion Notes subcommittee 1

Critical thinking can be taught in many areas

Students could benefit from life skills courses like financial planning

It's an upper division course at Fullerton, a GE part of lifelong learning

More emphasis on the graduate programs in the AMP document Cal State Master's level education is high quality and can train students for a lot of professions let's emphasize that if we don't have MA programs and post bachs help recruit quality faculty

Students need a broad-based education that stays with them throughout their curriculum, understand what the big issues and questions are
GE should better help students to make sense of their responsibilities as citizens and citizens of the world

Many students don't have GE here, their degree is from CSUF, so they should have broad based regardless

Maybe connect GE with these broad-based human questions

Make sure they get educated not just graduated

Getting them through, employers don't want poorly trained students with degrees, there has to be quality and elements of what students should know so that they are strong candidates for employment

What the students learn in getting the degree is what's most important...

Students should be provided with the opportunity to explore career/discipline options...make sure students can explore and try different fields

Too much emphasis on pushing students through quickly jeopardizes their education

Students should be well-rounded, students should have the time to find their niche

We could do a better job earlier, of providing students with guidance early, more exploration, more reflection, help them set up goals

HIPs, early on more exploring in a field so that they get a deeper experience rather than a push throughout

What are the demographics of our student body and how does that impact our students to try and push them through...

Will this AMP also include plans for the development of new programs,

Create a mechanism by which initiatives can be created

Create specific program plans and will the CSU let us create such programs

Let's be proactive, how specific

Should we partner with other CSUs, is there any way to leverage with other CSU

CSU needs a better mechanism to allow cross campus collaboration

More money for programs and program development

Who controls the what we teach? The department should be responsible for program development

Broader picture, continue to be an urban comprehensive univ, suggests a comprehensive as opposed to a niche university, our charge is to offer a broad-based education all the fields present and supported

Expansion and development of programs with consideration to the budget, need to be strategic in terms of resources available when developing programs, space consideration

Holistic learning outcomes

Table Discussion Notes subcommittee 1

Wide student outcomes,

Emphasis on the idea that students need to be active participants in the learning process and they need to be responsible to the outcome

Citizenship and civic responsibility

Give support to faculty to facilitate learning outcomes (pay raises, as one example)

Important to think strategically about what we're going to do, growth doesn't always equal success, what do we define as quality for our students, our programs our curriculum, what can we do with the resources available to us

Student learning outcomes, two tracks, for WASC and then what we really did,

develop a student how do we do this and then also answer to WASC

We do this work implicitly and then how do we document that here's our WASC stuff, but then here's what we do...

We're trying to do this the department determines the student learning outcomes

Ask questions what do you want the students to know what kind of person do you want them to be we change because we want to do this and so we're changing the program

Why will we teach what we teach? Not a whim of someone in charge not a budget decision why do we have the departments we have? How we decide should be able to articulate why we have the departments

The budget comes at a secondary supportive level rather than a determinative one

What does it mean to prepare students for an evolving workforce? We shouldn't be a tech school, prepare students for a broad range of professions? A liberal arts education prepares students for a variety of occupations...further articulate in the document...there's pressure to indicate incomes of students to better make decisions throughout level

Curricular changes within the department, can identify what to teach, but faculty have different opinions on how what we teach impacts faculty personal, faculty don't want to change course content, what we teach, how we implement is another, faculty should determine curricular changes, if the changes are dictated from elsewhere they will resist

Tenured faculty are tenured, they work through so many years, they earn where they are, something that is created should be acceptable to others, there should be collegial, and consensus building

HIPs, the problem is we're putting a lot of effort into HIPs but not very many resources. Undergrad research is built into the curriculum, but don't have resources faculty are too often doing this with their own time.

We say we want to do these HIPs but we're not funding them or supporting faculty with those projects

Each college works independently, we have many distinctions and disagreements

Consistency in allocating budgets for HIP

The strong liberal arts core needs to be strengthened and more science and math incorporated in the liberal arts, critical thinking, more interdisciplinary cross-fertilization between science, math, humanities, social sciences,

GE definition from many years ago is different from what students need now, ie students need more awareness of IT, science and engineering

We don't have resources,

Table Discussion Notes subcommittee 1

Two things: President needs to get us more funding
FTES model, where colleges compete with each other, is no good, rethink how we do things
Major fundamental shifts in how we do the budgeting,
We would have money to do those things
If we have no funding, we can't innovate,
Who is going to pay for these
Support cross-campus, cross-college collaboration
Human resource is a resource, not just putting money, but a culture for people to advocate, IT very important, comp sci very important,
Start with ideas, then use the budget to support the ideas
Constraints: Funding, space, time, human resources, budget work in parallel with ideas, if we have an idea for how to overcome the limitations, need to have the budget to sustained
Do we grow the doctoral programs, will we be funded for this if we're relegated to a comprehensive university
We're training the students to let them go somewhere else for PHD, if students have a choice to go to another school, choose other schools because we don't support students (grad) they go somewhere else, we're in an expensive area, we can't pay students here, at grad level they are not being supported if SDSU can do better why can't we
How does the Irvine campus affect that we're teaching
ABET controlled in engineering, equivalence for transferring quality of courses and teaching in Comm Coll for transfer students
Stem cell related programs
Entertainment programs
Maybe take advantage specialist occupations in the region to develop programs and then attract students, faculty, and community partnerships—perhaps supporting funding
Where we teach directly influences our educational programs in education, we need to be in partnership with community where we teach
Professional programs, prepare students for workforce through professional degree programs, possibly partner with private sector to support those programs
Keeping alumni engaged with the campus as learning resources, mentoring, fund raising,
Why do we teach? To become critical thinkers, good writers, prepare them for an evolving workforce we teach them what we teach them to be productive careers, we're not a research one university, we're comprehensive we train them for careers
Explain what we're doing now but who do we envision ourselves to be
Identify areas for future growth and support exploration and innovation what do we add what do we subtract?
A thread through the entire AMP constantly looking at reviewing revising what we do and strengthening what we have
A constant thread of reviewing and evaluating

Table Discussion Notes subcommittee 1

Engaging the alums in terms of what their interests, taking a survey of the pulse of where they are, build around and draw from their interests, possibly surveying them for their experience satisfaction levels

Alumni contributions to the region, state, global at every level, national international,

Programs - sometimes best when 2 colleges are involved. Silos. Collaboration among disciplines and interdisciplinary involvement. Do not see that here.

Required of students to take an interdisciplinary course. Becomes very narrow. How to meet the needs.

Making it personal, understanding the community where we are based.

Overview – don't think that we currently do a very good job. Students don't know what it going on in the world and how to prepare students for a global outlook.

Wonder if this is even more predominant in STEM.

Critical thinking should be imbedded in all courses. Hides in syllabus and is not expressed.

Curriculum needs to evolve more. Refreshing the curriculum and organization.

Cultural diversity option is too wide. It would be great to have one GE course that multiple programs use. Racism as an institution rather than an act. Race and identity as conversations nationally but are we preparing our students to engage in those conversations and equip our students to deal with these realities.

Some courses never provide the opportunity to engage in cultural conversations.

Class size does not always facilitate these discussions. Bigger issues that do not get discussed if students do not feel safe in discussing these.

How to get students to be engaged more in University.

Tied to strong liberal arts core—not just one class that you check off. Relates to post-graduate outcomes. How to make it part of the University learning.

Need more student voice. Focus groups.

Cultural awareness – is it the same as intercultural awareness. Use a glossary.

What will we teach? Does that have implications for the departments that we have?

Is that a question that should be asked? Do we have the right structures?

Our disciplinary structure and organizational structure would be familiar to someone from the 19th Century. Should they be?

When does curating become self-perpetuating.

Need to adapt to current workings of a disciplinary—are they in alignment.

Should we have more cross disciplinary teaching? Education is incorporating art, but does this apply to other areas?\

Students see more things combined. Tearing down silos.

What is the purpose of the college structure and does the college structure facilitate what we need? Do they exist just because they have been there forever?

Push to minimize but some programs have small resource needs.

No new funding—how will we do this? How do we elevate our prominence?

Highlight our faculty? Within the community and internally. Lots of faculty serve in professional organizations.

Outcomes – keep track of what happens to alumni and how they influence the community. We can do a much better job with this.

Table Discussion Notes subcommittee 1

Big picture outcomes – data driven evaluation of the Universities. Academic plan does not articulate how we exist in a data driven environment. Something beyond graduation rates. Some fields are less able to be captured in quality outcomes. We need a position about where we stand with data-driven outcomes (qualitative vs quantitative). In context of what Governor wants vs what we want.

The system may only narrowly define outcomes. Needs to be here in the AMP that includes data beyond graduation rates. Examples critical thinking, active citizen. Need to include statements by outside stakeholders. Need to know what community thinks so that the community voice is included. And includes more than corporate. Cultural awareness info in Q 1.1 might need to be more evident – it is a value. Too buried. Pull out and put at top. Informs what we teach, how we serve students. Student centered in several places but not defined –be more specific about what that means.

(Does this info such as definitions need to go into a glossary (student-centered, cultural competence)

Cultural competence as an outcome and under GE. Modernize GE –how it relates to today to be relevant. Under GE a goal for social-cultural relevance.

Build on community engagement how to interact skillfully.

Outcome: change to resilience from survival. Has a broader meaning than survival.

Q1 what we will teach and the outcomes should be aligned—check on this.

Experiential and collaborative: include interprofessional/interdisciplinary learning and collaboration.

How do we implement the value of research with teaching load.

Pull out community as a separate item to make clear that it is outside of University communities.

Is 3.2 speaking to looking forward adequately? And the appropriateness of the types of spaces to the programs—multiuse collaborative spaces. Being intentional about those decisions to make sure there is flexibility. More conducive to high impact, collaborative spaces.

Exit survey getting post-CSUF contact info. Alumni outreach.