NOTES – Academic Master Plan Steering Committee  
Wednesday, 08.26.15 | 2:30 p.m. – 4:00 p.m. | CP-1060-05

**Attendees**  
President García, José L. Cruz, Berenecea Johnson Eanes, Danny Kim, Amir Dabirian, Emily Bonney, Peter Nwosu, Shari McMahan, Erica Bowers, Kristin Stang, Sean Walker, Diana Guerin, Mark Stohs, Michael Badal, Kelsey Brewer, Mary Ann Villarreal, May Wong, Alison Wrynn, David Forgues, Su Swarat

**Opening Remarks** – President García

President García thanked the committee for agreeing to work on the AMP. She discussed how the PRBC recommended last fall that we move forward with AMP. The AMP framework document presented to the steering committee was developed to help people understand the process. The CSU chancellor and Board of Trustees have asked the president on the part of the University to move forward with the AMP, so they are fully aware of this endeavor. President García is confident in the committee’s success in completing this AMP.


The AMP will give us clarity on fundamental questions that every university should have answers to, such as what do we teach, how do we teach, whom do we teach, and how many students do we teach. We are very familiar with the mission and the strategic plan of the University, and now we will gain greater clarity on how we advance the mission of the University. The University would improve its decision making if we had clear, even if philosophical, responses to the fundamental questions.

The PRBC recommended to the president that an AMP be developed that explicitly answers these questions. The framework document that was developed over the last year was created to provide a structure for the steering committee and subcommittees. Committee members were chosen for their expertise as institutional leaders, not to represent a particular department. The end product should have an introduction that frames all the constraints we have, and the body of the document will contain the answers from the subcommittees in response to the questions that have been posed.

The end document will give us direction on how we make some of the decisions for the University, and will also provide context for any additional conversations that may be needed. The work of the committee will be presented to the entire campus for their input. The main task of the steering committee is to bring together the work of the subcommittees and the feedback from the campus community into the final document.

**Review and Approval of AMP Charges** – Dr. Emily Bonney

The charges were developed to keep the focus of each subcommittee on the questions that are asked. The questions came out of the framework, and they are organized to help capture some of the bigger issues. The topics listed are just suggestions, they are not exhaustive, and the subcommittees can add or delete topics. The subcommittees’ responses should detail why the topics were picked, why others were deleted, and how these choices made a difference to the response they framed. The subcommittees are autonomous and should decide how “deep into the weeds” they will go based on the time allotted to develop their responses. The chairs are encouraged to tweak their respective charges prior to taking them to their subcommittees.
Subcommittee 1: Programs, Degrees, and Outcomes
What will we teach?
• Disciplines
• General Education
• Balance between liberal arts and professional programs
Why will we teach what we teach?
• Workforce
• Better citizens
What do we want to accomplish?
Are we tied to brick-and-mortar classrooms?

Subcommittee 2: Students
What kind of experience do we want students to have?
• Undergraduates vs. graduates mix
• Freshmen vs. transfers mix
• Number of students we will accept

Subcommittee 3: Faculty and Pedagogy
Who will teach and how will we teach?
What do we mean by teacher–scholar on this campus?
We need to determine the balance between teaching and scholarship.
• How will this affect our hiring?
What terminal degrees should our contingent faculty have, keeping in mind they teach our most valuable courses.
What are the possibilities for teaching?
• Online
• Hybrid
• Community engagement
• Study abroad

Subcommittee 4: Infrastructure and Resources
Clarify what it means to be a model comprehensive university.
What makes us different not just from other CSUs but other institutions?
What are the challenges to becoming the best model comprehensive university, and how do we turn the challenges into opportunities?

Review and Approval of Fall 2015 Timeline – Dr. Peter Nwosu

The timeline document that was distributed contains three parts:
1) The first was taken from the framework document and informs the 2015–16 timeline. The committee is expected to have a document by the end of the semester.
   • Subcommittees should develop their internal calendars. These internal calendars will be shared with all the subcommittee chairs.
   • Subcommittees must provide draft reports to the Office of Academic Programs, which will then work with Dr. Bonney, Provost Cruz, and Gladys Maldoon to compile the reports and share them with the steering committee for discussion.

The second part of timeline document has proposed timelines for fall 2015. A proposed timeline for spring 2016 will be developed in January when the committee is reconvened.
   • Subcommittee chairs will be expected to speak at each steering committee meeting to give an update on their progress.

The third part describes the communication plan. A website has already been established (fullerton.edu/amp); this is the same website that was utilized when communicating the AMP framework document with the campus. All materials distributed will be housed in the website. Feedback and progress will be disseminated periodically to the campus; the frequency will be discussed with the co-chairs of the steering committee. One of the tasks of the steering committee will
be to approve the communication plan.

**Discussion** – All

The concern was raised that some of the issues being addressed can go across different subcommittees—for example, online classes. It was determined that subcommittees can address questions that are listed under the other subcommittees. Additionally, it was determined that the question of what is a model comprehensive university should be addressed by all the subcommittees.

There was concern about decisions being made by one subcommittees that could impact the other subcommittees. The steering committee would ensure that communications are open to all members so they are aware of the work each subcommittee is doing.

Historically we relied on our students and the public to tell us what programs to offer. To what extent should we focus on students living in California and those who will stay in California after they graduate versus international students? How do we handle the legislature wanting more online classes, and having all credits be transferrable? Determining our student population and how/what we will teach will effect the work of all the subcommittees.

Cal State Fullerton turns away more than 20,000 students. What are those students telling us? Could we recalibrate programs to allow more of these students in?

The question was raised of how students would be made aware of the work being done and whether they will have a chance to weigh in on the AMP. There was discussion about Strategic Communications’ involvement in creating the communication pieces to ensure that all governing bodies of the University are aware of the progress being made and have a chance to weigh in.

The committee was reminded that at the end of this process they will not have answers but responses, and possibly even more questions. The committee has an opportunity to determine where things are diverging and converging, and this process will give clarity on how to proceed.

**Closing** – Dr. Bonney/Provost Cruz/President García

The AMP should be a visionary document, a document that can be used as a guideline to make informed decisions. We have a responsibility to not be just reactive but proactive, and we cannot be proactive if we do not have a sense of what we want to be for the students and the community we serve.

The AMP will bring clarity to our message of being a model comprehensive university. By having a first-order response to these fundamental questions, we demonstrate that we are willing to have thoughtful conversations about who we are and what we want to contribute not only to our community but to the nation.

Learning is preeminent not just to our students, but to all of us. We are engaging collaboratively across the campus to ask some really important questions. We may not have all the answers, but we will learn from each other in collaborative way about how to move this institution forward.

**Action Items:**

The steering committee will work on how to keep all subcommittees informed of each other’s progress, to avoid any duplication or conflict in responses.

The chairs are to send their edited charges to the steering committee in one week (September 2). Maldoon will send an email to remind the chairs.

Steering committee will help develop the definition of what it means to be a model comprehensive university, based on the input of all the subcommittees.
Dr. Nwosu will send an email to chairs and coordinators regarding the subcommittees’ internal calendars.

At the next committee meeting, a communication plan and calendar will be ready for approval.