



NOTES – Academic Master Plan Steering Committee

Wednesday, 09.18.15 | 10:30 p.m. – 11:30 p.m. | CP-1060-05

Attendees Michael Badal, Erica Bowers, Kelsey Brewer, Amir Dabirian, Berenecea Johnson Eanes, David Forgues, Diana Guerin, Danny Kim, Gladys Maldoon, Shari McMahan, Peter Nwosu, Kristin Stang, Mark Stohs, Sean Walker, May Wong,

Guest: Mary Ann Villarreal

Absent: Su Swarat, Alison Wrynn

Approval of Minutes – All

Minutes approved with no changes.

AMP Steering Committee Co-Chair Report – Bonney/Cruz

On September 11, suggested guidelines for preparing subcommittee responses were sent to the steering committee along with the draft minutes from the kick-off meeting; earlier this week, updates from President García and from the steering committee co-chairs were sent to the campus community.

On Wednesday, the steering committee co-chairs met with the dean, associate deans, department chairs, and program coordinators of the College of Humanities and Social Sciences to address some concerns that the chairs and coordinators had raised regarding the AMP. Among the concerns raised during the meeting were 1) ensuring that enough time was built-in to the AMP process for broad campus consultation; 2) including at least one faculty representative from each college on each of the subcommittees; 3) providing adequate mechanisms for all campus stakeholders (e.g., part-time faculty) to voice their opinions and present their perspectives; and 4) clarifying how the AMP fits into the overall governance and decision-making processes of the university.

AMP Subcommittee Co-Chairs Report

Subcommittee 1: Programs, Degrees, and Outcomes

Co-chairs: Kristin Stang and Peter Nwosu

The subcommittee met on 9/14 and discussed their charge and the reasons why we need an AMP, reviewed the timeline, and received a summary of the issues discussed at the kick-off meeting of the AMP steering committee meeting. The subcommittee used the proposed timeline to establish some milestones. As a first step, the subcommittee decided that it would be beneficial to have each member respond to the questions posed in the charge, understanding that not all the answers would be fully fleshed out. The subcommittee determined that this approach would allow people with different expertise and experiences to suggest additional questions that could be incorporated into the subcommittee's charge and to identify additional information that the subcommittee may need to do its work. (e.g., specific university policy statements.) The subcommittee coordinator will gather the responses and post any necessary documentation for the next subcommittee meeting.

The subcommittee expressed interest in getting campus input before finalizing its first draft response, but wanted to check with other subcommittees that may be thinking the same way so as to coordinate efforts.

The committee considered breaking up into small teams, but for now have decided to stay as one group. Meetings have been scheduled for twice a month and co-chairs will do phone reviews with those members who are unable to attend a meeting.

Subcommittee 2: Students

Co-chairs: Sean Walker and Berenecea Johnson Eanes

The co-chairs revised the draft charge to the subcommittee and have discussed the data they'd like to have in hand prior to convening the subcommittee to help contextualize the ensuing discussions.

Subcommittee 3: Faculty and Pedagogy

Co-chairs: Diana Guerin and Shari McMahan

The co-chairs revised the draft charge. Specifically, they reframed the *How will they teach* question. The subcommittee also split into two teams, one to focus on Faculty and the other on pedagogy. Dr. Guerin will lead the Faculty team and Dr. McMahan will lead the Pedagogy group. The subcommittee coordinator, Dr. Su Swarat, created a framework to help guide the subcommittee's discussions.

The Faculty team discussed various aspects pertaining to tenure track density: reasons for establishing a target level, costs of achieving said level, and the challenge of recruiting and retaining faculty. At their next meeting, the team will look at the current profile of CSUF's faculty (VP Gentles will provide relevant data) reviewing historical trends in tenure track density. As part of their deliberations, the team will examine best or next practices for addressing tenure track density issues. The team will also consider the role of faculty in a model comprehensive university.

As a result of their discussions, members of the Pedagogy team determined that the focus of their charge needed to be more about teaching and less about the modality (face-to-face, online, hybrid) used to teach. The consensus was that a good teacher could teach in any and/or all modalities. Future discussions will reflect this understanding.

Subcommittee 4: Infrastructure and Resources

Co-chairs: Mark Stohs and Danny Kim

The subcommittee met on September 10. The co-chairs had met prior to the steering committee kick-off meeting and revised the charge to the subcommittee. The new charge reflects the need to establish a process to articulate resource requirements once the AMP is developed. The new charge focuses on the following questions:

- How do we assess and articulate the resource requirements of the AMP?
- How do we align our physical and financial resources to support the AMP?
- What are the barriers that may impede the campus from delivering adequate physical and financial resources to sustain the AMP, and how do we address them?
- What policies/procedures/practices/facilities would we need to have/change/adjust/modify to support/maintain/sustain the AMP?
- How can we respond to budget challenges?

The subcommittee divided into three teams, each with its own lead, that will look at one or more of the questions identified in the new charge. The subcommittee chairs will float across all teams. The subcommittee developed a timeline that calls for a first draft of the subcommittee's report to be completed by early November.

Discussion – All

Various steering committee members expressed the need to clarify how the AMP relates to the various executive orders, university policy statements, PRBC processes, administrative manuals, etc. Dr. Cruz explained that the need for clarity is precisely why the AMP work is so important. By providing first-order responses to the fundamental questions identified in the framework document, the AMP will provide the campus some clarity as to how internal and external policies and practices work together to facilitate or impede our university's ability to advance its mission and achieve its goals.

Mr. Badal commented on the excitement from students on the various subcommittees and their ability to represent the students and have their voices heard.

In response to recommendations received from various stakeholders, the steering committee co-chairs proposed that the AMP process be extended from summer of 2016 through fall of 2016. The steering committee discussed the pros of extending the timeline (e.g., provide additional time for consultation prior to and after producing the first draft of the AMP) and the cons (e.g., possible loss of focus for the subcommittee's work). The steering committee approved this proposal.

The steering committee co-chairs also presented a proposal to expand the membership of all subcommittees to ensure that all colleges would have at least one faculty representative. The steering committee approved this proposal with the understanding that the steering committee co-chairs would jointly identify the faculty that would be recommended for appointment where needed. The steering committee also agreed that a concerted effort should be made to ensure that part-time faculty are able to inform the development of the AMP. The point was raised that the subcommittee members are first and foremost representing the institution and that their college-level perspectives should inform, but not dominate, their collective work.

A discussion ensued regarding how to best elicit campus input prior to producing the first draft of the AMP. The steering committee co-chairs agreed to develop a draft timeline with specific windows for campus consultation. The first window will likely be slated for late October or early November. All subcommittees will determine the type of input they will request and the vehicle to be used (e.g., online survey, open forum). The AMP website will serve as the primary means of communications.

The steering committee discussed the process through which subcommittee reports will be integrated into a first draft of the AMP. The committee acknowledged that the work of the various subcommittees will inevitably be interrelated and that it will be important to edit the contributions into a single coherent document, but that for transparency, the original subcommittee reports should be preserved and made publicly available. The steering committee will continue to discuss the way forward, but one possibility is to create a drafting team with representation from each subcommittee and a separate reading team to provide comments on the integrated report.

The steering committee agreed that subcommittee meetings should be open to the campus community. The meeting schedules will be published on the AMP website once it goes live. Subcommittee chairs will be responsible of setting rules of engagement for subcommittee meetings and should provide a mechanism for guests to participate in a meaningful and productive way.

Action Items:

A progress report will be sent by the end of the day to the campus, with a preview to the chairs of HSS addressing the recommendations they made and the decisions of the committee. (Done.)

The steering committee co-chairs will develop a new draft timeline for the AMP process that considers the extension of the work through fall 2016 and will add milestones for subcommittees to receive campus input prior to writing their drafts. Co-chairs will have draft timeline ready for the steering committee to review prior to the next meeting.

The test link to the AMP website will be sent to the steering committee for comments prior to the site going live.

The steering committee co-chairs will develop a draft, one-page visual describing how the AMP relates to the Strategic Plan and other documents that inform the University's decision-making and submit to the steering committee for consideration.

Dr. McMahan will ask deans at the next COD to consider including the AMP as a standing item in their chairs meetings.

A draft of the new timeline will be sent to the steering committee so they can review and be ready to discuss at the next committee meeting.

The scheduled meetings for all the subcommittees will be sent to all the members of the steering committee.