Minutes
AMP Subcommittee #1
March 21, 2016
H 219

Present: Phil Armstrong, Marsha Orr, Peter Nwosu, Kristin Stang, Alison Wrynn, Kari Knutson Miller, Sheryl Fontaine, Dean Kazeoleras, Kevin Wortman, Irena Pratitis, Mira Farka, Phil Armstrong, Rahmatian Morteza

Excused: Jim Taulli, Taylor Feher, Amanda Hughes, Aaron Mezzano, Mark Drayse

Guests: None

1. Review of minutes—no comments were received

2. Steering Committee Update—none

3. Review of Materials from the AS/AA Retreat

Encourage your colleagues to go into the online comment area to make comments about the AMP.

We have information in the dropbox from the retreat.

Kristin reviewed the materials in the dropbox from the Retreat.

How do we proceed with these materials?

Should we do a content analysis and then things that don’t belong to us move them on to the 4 sub groups in our subcommittee.

We should have a discussion about what goes into the narrative.

Kristin suggested having Peter, Kristin and Alison go through and try and find themes in the document. Then on the 4th we will bring the information to the group to use in writing the next draft.

Need to identify consistent patterns/themes come up; are there meaningful themes that come up?

What is the subcommittee’s role in pulling together all of this material? There will be another wide-scale review of these documents.

The campus community was responding to the outline that we produced. The timeline is short. We all look at this and find themes. When we meet on the 4th—what ones make sense; what ones don’t make as much sense for adding into the document.
Kristin will find out what is the new deadline and what kind of document we will need to prepare (outline or draft).

Other groups had a lot more data than we did—but there was not much feedback on data sources that we need to use.

Our section is the most philosophical of all the sections. It might be useful to put the notes we accumulated under the outline that already exists.

There is some data that we can include: GE courses (how many 10 years ago vs. today; how are GE courses distributed among the colleges).

What is unique about us (CSUF) in this document? This document should give us guidance about what makes us unique? Is it reflective of or different than what we currently do?

Is it the people within the institution that will make us unique (within our context).

How we frame this will help us capture our uniqueness.

We can frame it in a certain way to justify how we talk about our section in a more philosophical manner.

Should it be “what are the things that distinguish us?”

Use the AMP to decide how to grow programs or how to infuse certain broad themes in the curriculum or in programs. And to help develop a process for making decisions. This will probably be used by colleges and departments to create their “own” AMP.

We had included in our opening what we valued.

Keep the process of how we developed this AMP on our AMP website. [SHARE THIS RECOMMENDATION WITH THE COMMUNICATIONS TEAM]

This is valuable for advocacy beyond the university.

What data should we include number of programs, degrees, online; more profile/baseline of what we are doing currently.

The AMP is like a “party platform,” broader things we believe in.

*What we will do before the next meeting:*

  - Everyone review the information.
• We will let people know when the new “reflections” document and image are updated (and put them in the dropbox).

Next scheduled meetings of our subcommittee: April 4, April 25

Next steering committee meeting is:

Report narrative

The following guidelines are suggested regarding the length of each subcommittee’s report narrative:

• 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.