DRAFT NOTES – ACADEMIC MASTER PLAN (AMP) STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING
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Committee
José L. Cruz, Michael Badal, Erica Bowers, Amir Dabirian, Berenecea Johnson Eanes, David Forgues, Diana Guerin, Danny Kim, Shari McMahan, Peter Nwosu, Mark Stohs, Sean Walker, May Wong, Mary Ann Villarreal

Synopsis
The following items/topics were discussed:

1) Approval of Minutes
2) Subcommittee Reports—Questions Raised
3) The AMP Explained—Infographic
4) AMP—First Campus-Wide Checkpoint
5) AMP Communications Strategy

Considerations/Outcomes

1) Approval of Minutes
   a. Minutes from 10/20/15 were approved without changes.

2) Subcommittee Reports—Questions Raised
   a. Cruz shared common themes in the questions that were raised by the subcommittees in their reports shared prior to the meeting, including questions regarding the communications timeline, the launch of the website, a plan for reaching out to students, how to work on a data repository, and possible formats for appendices and supporting documents for the AMP.
      i. Regarding format, it was agreed that the AMP draft should be structured to include each question and the relevant response, as well as separate recommendations. At this point we are not sure whether it will be more helpful to start with the recommendations or end with them. It was proposed that each subcommittee answer their respective questions and present recommendations related to those questions; then, members of the steering committee would put all four drafts together into a single document, to help ensure a cohesive voice.

3) AMP—First Campus-Wide Checkpoint
   a. Cruz asked the subcommittee chairs to share their thoughts on how to best share progress with the campus community for the first campus-wide checkpoint.
      i. Subcommittee 1: They feel that they have a clear charge. Some sub-teams have initiated college-level surveys to surface input and ideas. They have already begun writing a draft report, which will evolve as additional feedback and materials come in.
      ii. Subcommittee 2: They have been fascinated by some of the information they have surfaced in their data-gathering, and suggested that the first campus-wide checkpoint could be framed to share the most compelling/interesting/surprising/useful information that the subcommittees have surfaced thus far, and ask for the campus’s feedback on that information.
1. Walker also noted that some of the campus and system planning documents (e.g., the Facilities Master Plan, the Chancellor’s Office Academic Master Plan) should be more accessible. Academic Programs has a copy of the CO’s AMP and will share.

iii. Subcommittee 3: They are starting to explore the third general topic/question (re: faculty development, following faculty across their entire career). They want to present more models for teacher-scholars without dictating/limiting that definition. They may want to survey faculty on the professional development piece, but this is still an in-progress area.

iv. Subcommittee 4: They have developed three sub-teams to address the subcommittee’s charge. Kim asked for clarification on the scope of the subcommittee’s task, e.g., whether the subcommittee should formulate responses that include specific recommendations on how to fund program areas in an environment of limited resources. Cruz shared that the AMP should focus instead on guiding principles, not specific recommendations on resource allocation.

b. Based on the subcommittees’ progress and status, it was agreed that the best way to engage the campus community at this point would be to share summaries/materials that show how the subcommittees have engaged in the questions in their respective charges; highlighting what has fascinated/surprised us; and asking for the campus’s thoughts and responses to that information. Subcommittees were asked to compile the documents, links, and resources they want to share with the campus community and share them with the steering committee for posting on the AMP website. The materials will be presented as hyperlinks or attachments on a new tab on the AMP website, and the campus community may submit feedback via the same tab.

c. General timeline: The website and first campus-wide checkpoint will be shared/open for input the week after Thanksgiving; the survey to receive comments will remain open, and input will be passed on to the appropriate subcommittee as it comes in. In mid-February, subcommittees will share drafts with each other, with the goal to have a full first draft by mid-March to share with the campus community at a second campus-wide checkpoint. By then we’ll have a better idea about rollout/roadshow to colleges. The draft could also be a topic at the Academic Affairs–Academic Senate retreat.

d. To capture the campus’s input, Dabirian suggested an interactive, thread-based comments system for people who do not wish to be anonymous.

e. It was suggested that the steering committee guide a definition around what a “model public comprehensive university” means.

4) AMP Communications Strategy

a. Cruz asked the steering committee for thoughts on how best to leverage the knowledge and capacity of an AMP communications team. Strategic Communications has identified someone who can coordinate a communications strategy/campaign for the development of the AMP. Badal suggested including a representative from the ASI media team.

i. If the goal is to document our process, there will already be ample documentation in the agendas, minutes, and materials that are being collected and posted on the AMP website. Thus, having communications representatives attend subcommittee/sub-team meetings may not be the most effective use of their time. Instead, the goal is communicating the work of the subcommittees to the rest of the campus community.

b. It was agreed to convene a small group of communications leads (StratComm representative, ASI communications representative, and possibly Christina Cardenas and Gail Matsunaga, per Nwosu’s suggestion). Someone from the AMP Steering Committee [Note: Dabirian was selected for this task on 11/20/15] will meet with this group to explain what we are hoping to accomplish with the AMP communications strategy, and ask them for recommendations on structure, implementation, and branding.

i. The goal will be to have a list of all communications as well as a timeline (including, e.g., college roadshow, when we will visit departments) on the website by the end of the year.
ii. The question was posed about whether subcommittees should blog or tweet; the steering committee felt that this would be difficult to organize and might feel too chaotic to the campus community. The AMP website will be the centralized, up-to-date hub for all AMP communications.

5) The AMP Explained—Infographic
   a. Cruz shared a first-pass draft of an infographic that attempts to contextualize the AMP and explain its relationship to other campus, system, state, and federal planning documents, conversations, considerations, and frameworks. The call for an AMP came from PRBC, which has to take into account numerous evolving considerations; what was missing was the articulation of values.
      i. The steering committee felt that several key elements were missing from the draft infographic, including a specific answer to the question of how the AMP relates to the Strategic Plan, and a definition of what is an academic master plan.
   b. McMahan suggested that a comprehensive FAQ document might be more effective in providing straightforward answers to the campus community's questions.
   c. [Note: Per Cruz’s follow-up email to the steering committee on 11/20, Cruz and Bonney agreed to work together on a first-pass draft of an FAQ document that would be used in lieu of an infographic. Further revision of the visualization portion was put on hold for now, and would be revisited depending on the recommendations of the communications team.]

Action Items/Future Meetings

1) Nwosu to share the feedback collected from the campus on the AMP framework document with all subcommittees.
2) Members of the steering committee to offer feedback on the draft AMP infographic by Monday, November 23. [Note: In a follow-up email to the steering committee, the infographic was replaced by an FAQ document, which the steering committee would review and comment on by Monday, November 30.]