

Minutes
AMP Subcommittee #1
February 1, 2016
H 213

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

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

Guests: None

1. Review of minutes—no comments were received

2. Steering Committee Update

A. Discuss the new timeline—Kristin and Peter discussed the new deadlines from the Steering committee

- Drafts by February 22—very ROUGH drafts
- March 8 feedback to steering committee with steering co-chairs drafts
- March 17 Steering committee meeting to provide edits/discussion at meeting
- March 18 AA/AS retreat to work on the AMP drafts from the various subcommittees
- March 25-feedback is integrated and revised drafts are shared with the steering committee for final review
- April 8-steering committee provides feedback on rough draft
- April 15 Current draft of the AMP out to the campus community

(Whenever it says “steering committee” above there is the assumption that it is being shared with our subcommittee)

Graduate Education Committee has also been working on these four questions (of the subcommittees) and will share with each subcommittee. Kari suggested that perhaps each committee of the Senate should provide feedback to the subcommittees. Kristin will bring this up to the Senate Exec tomorrow. A way for programs to provide feedback is also being created (instead of only individuals being able to provide feedback). Dean suggested calling it “continuous feedback” instead of “feedback” so that people realize that this is not a one-time thing [This will be brought to the steering committee’s attention].

After the rough drafts go out to the campus community, what is the role of the subcommittee—may need to give some response to feedback.

B. Discuss scheduling another meeting before March 21 (or should we work offline?)

Working groups can meet and work on their writing—either face to face or remotely. Where is the overlap and where are the holes? Identify data for the appendix. Posted the “most recent” version of our document in dropbox under “The Working Document” folder.

C. Need a new draft by February 8 (email to Peter and Kristin) will return to you and then need to return to Irena, Peter and Kristin by February 17

Stay in your current subcommittees—working groups—and get something to the Co-Chairs and Irena to begin to pull it together.

D. Discuss the scope of what they are writing and suggestion for how to accomplish the work—keep the framework in mind

Questions were raised about the process: Should we start working in google docs to keep track of the latest version?

The title of all docs should now include the date/time so we know it is the most recent version.

Between now and the 8th, work on the single document in the “Working Document” file. Each working group should work on their own section, use track changes. Keep saving the document to the file, use the date at the end of the file name.

Between February 10th to the 16th at 5p everyone look at the whole document and provide feedback.

February 19 Peter and Kristin will work on the draft Irena provides to them so it can be submitted to the steering committee by February 22.

Still need to get all the data into the document—could have an appendix where we have a last page that says “add in this data later”.

At our March 21 meeting we will work with the feedback that was received from the March 18th retreat.

Next scheduled meeting of our subcommittee: March 21

Next steering committee meeting is February 23

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.