

Minutes

AMP Subcommittee #1

November 16, 2015

10:30-12:00

CP 550

Present: Jim Taulli, Aaron Mezzano, Phil Armstrong, Irena Praitis, Mark Drayse, Dean Kazeolas, Marsha Orr, Peter Nwosu, Sheryl Fontaine, Rahmatian Morteza, Kristin Stang, Kevin Wortman, Alison Wrynn

Excused: Mira Farka, Kari Knutson Miller, Taylor Feher, Amanda Hughes

Guests: Mary Ann Villareal

1. **Review of minutes**—Minutes were reviewed by the committee.
2. Peter shared with the committee the **tentative timeline** that the steering committee will discuss this week and finalize—March 2016 the first draft of the AMP will be shared with the campus community. Early fall 2016 2nd complete draft shared with the campus. Mid to late fall 2016 revised draft submitted to multiple stakeholders. December 2016-revised complete draft shared with President's Advisory Board. Feedback that is received will be sorted and given to the appropriate subcommittee.
3. **Steering Committee Update**
 1. Information is needed for the upcoming Steering Committee Meeting on 11/18. Feedback is needed on the following questions:
 1. *The campus will be invited to weigh in on the revised charges of the subcommittees and each subcommittee will present a set of questions which they would like the campus to answer.*

Peter asked people to weigh in on any questions they might want to add to the campus survey. Sheryl asked why would we not just ask our four questions? Mark indicated that the faculty in his department would like to reply to a survey that he provided to them to provide feedback. Sheryl suggested that we might try a likert scale and ask people to respond to how the sub committees replied to the 4 questions. Jim asked is this a philosophical or proscriptive document? Peter indicated that it is flexible and could be both. Kevin suggested that the campus could give us guidance on questions that were of concern to the entire campus community (eg. Textbook affordability; Liberal arts vs. vocational education; etc.). Kristin reminded us that we need to make sure we get student voices (and not just from ASI). Peter asked people if we need to 1) ask questions (survey) in our college or 2) via a campuswide survey? Do we agree that we want to be part of the campus wide survey? Yes. Phil believed it should be one survey, Irena agreed with that so that we don't inundate the campus with surveys. Irena suggested that we provide them with our draft and ask for additions, deletions, other feedback. Peter

indicated that we did not yet have a draft to share from our subcommittee. Dean asked can we take our drafts and use them to frame our questions? Jim said when he collected information the responses that he received showed that we as a committee were mostly on the right track. We need to keep it concise and simple. The survey's 4 parts all need to look similar (in structure and size). We could use clarity from the steering committee—who has to act first, the subcommittee or the “community” responses of the survey? Morteza asked the following questions (thinking like someone who would receive this survey) Why is the survey sent to me; what are the goals of the survey; what is missing here; what kind of questions are we going to ask in our surveys; do we want responses or comments; what will the survey look like; is this going to be too long? Marsha asked: Where do you see the gap between where we are now and what a model comprehensive public university should be? Jim said we should have the steering committee answer this question. Are the other subcommittee meetings grappling with these issues? Irena asked could we put all of our dropboxes and their information available on the AMP website and anyone across campus could access it and then they could provide feedback if they wanted. Invite everyone to be a part of the process. Kristin shared the draft AMP website with everyone so that they could give feedback. We could still give some sort of a survey—we could perhaps narrow it down to asking what are the 5 main features of a model comprehensive public university? What should the plan look like (aspirational vs. proscriptive)? If we gave them a survey we could guide them to the website to provide more information/detail if they wanted to do so.

2. *These surveys will remain open throughout the spring 2016 semester, so that subcommittees can continue to work on their first draft while comments are being submitted.*
3. *Which questions you would like to ask the campus in order to inform and guide the work of your respective subcommittee?*
4. *Are there any other formats by which we could invite comment from the campus?*

Kristin had asked the Steering Committee if there could be more open areas on the AMP website for providing feedback any time (not tied to a specific question potentially).

4. New report format for sub-committee to Steering work

1. Peter talked about the new report form that we provide. Our summary is in the dropbox.
2. Asked if there are any additional questions for the steering committee? (Just what was discussed above).

5. Continued discussion from examination of key questions by teams—we did not get to this, move to the Nov 30th meeting.

1. Review of responses
2. Review of feedback

6. Data/Resource Collection—in response to the subcommittee's request for more information we have provided what we have collected in the dropbox.

1. Review of information collected to date
2. Requested but not yet rcvd—we will keep collecting data.
3. Still needed?

7. **Next Steps**—please continue working in your subcommittee teams. Peter and Kristin will provide feedback from the steering committee on the survey issue. Sheryl indicated that HSS has a chairs meeting tomorrow and would like Peter and Kristin to let her know if steering committee makes a decision on communication plan so she can share it with them.
8. **Next Meeting November 30, 10-11:30, CP 550**

Minutes taken by Alison Wrynn

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.