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Committee
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Synopsis
The following items/topics were discussed:

1) Approval of Minutes
2) AMP Steering Committee Co-Chairs Report
3) AMP Subcommittee Co-Chairs Reports
4) Additional Communication Strategies
5) Discussion

Considerations/Outcomes

1) Approval of Minutes
   a. Minutes were approved previously via email.

2) AMP Steering Committee Co-Chairs Report
   a. Bonney: met with HSS chairs on October 14 and they were quite engaged and interested in what the AMP Committee is doing. Will meet with the COMM chairs on Friday and will meet with the ECS chairs on November 12. The offer to talk to chairs has been greeted with some enthusiasm.

3) AMP Subcommittee Co-Chairs Reports
   a. Subcommittee 1 – The subcommittee has drafted answers to all four questions. Members are cross-editing each other’s drafts. All members of the committee provided responses to all four questions and the teams analyzed those responses and will build an initial response. Committee members were asked to have conversations with their colleagues. The question of how to engage students was raised. The committee wants to ensure that student feedback is part of the process. Another question that was raised was how to determine whether learning outcomes are being met. Possible approach would be to revise the piece in the subcommittee charge about learning outcomes to ask about the outcomes that will guide our work, rather than question how well we are teaching. Subcommittees 3 and 4 can then address how we will support excellence in teaching. The subcommittee requested additional clarification as to the aim and role of the AMP.

   b. Subcommittee 2 – The subcommittee met, and groups are working in parallel to answer all of the questions; they will then pull all the answers together. Their meetings have been very productive and they acknowledge that this is an enormous task. They have created three subgroups; Walker and Eanes are leading two, and Bush is leading one.

   c. Subcommittee 3 – The subcommittee felt the timeframe issue is a critical one for them since plans for faculty recruitment are currently being rolled out. They discussed how specific they needed to get in terms of deciding decision making vs. benchmarks. It was determined that the subcommittee should be looking at all of the questions that are part of the plan, and they need to be at a high level—less operational and more aspirational. The pedagogy group has split in half and has started discussions on
high-quality learning opportunities, how to support faculty, and how to provide equitable access for
students. They discussed evidence-based practices and the teacher–scholar model, as well as how
recruitment on this campus reflects the actual work we expect faculty to perform on this campus.

d. **Subcommittee 4** – The subcommittee had a full committee meeting two weeks ago and has split into
three teams. They have committed to coming together with a full first draft around the Thanksgiving
holiday, and they are making progress toward that goal. They need to address how to go about resource
needs and be mindful about salaries, benefits, and support.

4) **Additional Communication Strategies**

a. There have been conversations about when the campus community will have a chance to provide input
and how the final AMP will be approved. It was proposed that during the month of November, the
campus should begin to provide input to the four subcommittees. The campus can weigh in on the new
charges and any additional questions each subcommittee wants to pose to the campus. The campus will
be able to post their feedback for the remainder of the semester. In mid-spring (late February or early
March) the first draft could be sent to the campus to read and provide input. Early fall (September)
there could be a second draft for input. In December the draft would be sent to PAB to look at to review
and endorse. We would also provide the draft for ASI, PRBC, Academic Senate, and the President’s
Senior Leadership Team to take a look at those documents and endorse in whatever way each body
likes.

5) **Discussion**

a. The steering committee discussed the questions raised by Subcommittee 1 regarding talking about
outcomes more broadly and not just learning outcomes. It was determined that they will remove the
word *learning*.

b. The committee discussed how to better convey the essence of the AMP; it was agreed that adding a
tagline would be the most effective approach.

c. The question was raised about the existence of an FTES plan. It was discussed that the chancellor had
commissioned two different groups to work in parallel to answer the question on the sustainable
financial model and the system-wide academic master plan. The system-wide AMP is looking at how
many students are being enrolled, where they are being enrolled on our campuses, and are they being
redirected to other campuses that are less impacted. These groups were commissioned at the same
time because the two questions are interconnected. The academic side is looking at the guaranteed 1%
that we have through 2018 because of Proposition 30. The Chancellor’s Office is looking at some of the
proposals that came out of the sustainable task force group that looked at increasing tuition. It is
unclear if the tuition is increased if that will mean we can enroll more students.

**Action Items/Future Meetings**

1) The AMP website will be sent out for the steering committee to provide feedback before the next steering
committee meeting.