MINUTES

AMP Subcommittee #1

October 19, 2015

10-11:30

CP 550

PRESENT: Mark Drayse, Phil Armstrong, Kevin Wortman, Kari Knutson Miller, Marsha Orr, Aaron Mezzano, Irena Praitis, Jim Taulli, Taylor Feher, Morteza Rahmitian (via phone)

Excused: Mira Farka, Sheryl Fontaine, Amanda Hughes, Dean Kazoleas

A. Review of minutes—the committee reviewed the minutes from the 9/30/15 meeting

B. Steering Committee update—Kristin discussed the updates that are being provided by the Steering Committee. Committee members shared how this is being discussed in HSS by their chairs. Questions were raised about the process—how will this be approved. Jim (ART) is asking for chairs and faculty in his college to answer our questions in only one sentence. NSM, ECS, UEE, EDUC, Irvine indicated there was no/not much discussion yet. Kristin and Peter will bring this to Steering Committee for discussion.

C. Documents included in the drop box for everyone to review:

1. Email from Steering Co-Chairs

2. Steering Committee Meeting 10/20

3. Resources from some of the committee members were shared with everyone:

   a. From Marsha Orr
   https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=DHRxerr30Hk and
   https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vw_Ey9Oip9g

   b. From Phil Armstrong
   Discussion on the future of the "university":
   http://nation.time.com/2013/09/20/reinventing-our-universities-in-the-21st-century/

   c. Available in our library: *The University Next Door: What is a Comprehensive University, Who Does it Educate and Can It Survive* (Schneider & Deane, Ed.)
   Available at PL

D. *Discussion from examination of key questions*—Kristin reminded the committee of the Report Narrative parameters (see below). Kristin asked how the process worked. One committee each worked on their own. Another committee had one member start and the others add in. Another tried to synthesize what others included.

1. Team responses to questions—Where will we teach? What will we teach?

2. Feedback—everyone provide feedback individually or should we stay in our small groups to review the other groups. The latter was selected as the process.

One person in each of the 4 groups will take the "lead" and each of the 4 teams will review 1 other team (1 reviews 2; 2 reviews 3; 3 reviews 4; 4 reviews 1). What will the response entail in our "next steps"? Peter described all the possible ways to move forward. Irena, Kari, Marsha, Aaron will each lead their teams and post a "summary" of their teams' discussions.

Response Guidelines: Look for gaps, as well as overlap, provide feedback from institutional knowledge, embed, add and augment. Validate and question too. Make sure you follow the final report guidelines. Provide data and sources (links to data/sources are OK) if you have it. If you see any burning questions or red flags, note them for the committee to discuss.

Post team "reports" in drop box by: Friday, October 30

3. Needs—Peter and Kristin will get more reminders out to the committee; give an update on the revised timeline from the steering committee once they are determined; Peter and Kristin will clarify the calendar.

E. Next steps-Questions continued to be raised about the process the approval the AMP would follow. Peter referred committee members to the AMP website and asked that they share the website with others who have questions. At what point should we start talking to the other subcommittees? Peter and Kristin can bring these questions to the other subcommittees. The question was raised is where is the issue of "quality" being addressed? Instead of talking about "quality"---How do we support student learning, how do we recognize this? How will we support excellence in teaching? Should the question on "learning outcomes" be added to all of the 4 subcommittees? "What outcomes will identify successes?" Remember to get feedback from you colleges and departments.

Next Meeting: November 3, 8:45am, CP 560

Submitted by: Alison Wrynn

Report narrative parameters:

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.