Minutes
AMP Subcommittee #1
November 3, 2015
8:45-10:15
CP 560

Present: Kristin Stang, Peter Nwosu, Kari Knudson-Miller, Irena Praitis, Phil Armstrong

Absent: Aaron Mezzano, Marsha Orr, Kevin Wortman, Alison Wrynn,

Guest: Christina Cardenas

1. Review of minutes
   Co-chair Stang asked if there were any changes to the minutes suggested. None were.
2. Steering Committee update
    1. Steering Committee Meeting 10/20
       a. Concerns from the subcommittee regarding the input process and learning outcomes were taken to the Steering Committee. Recommendations were accepted by the committee, and a revised piece on the outcomes that will guide out work were also agreed to by the committee.
       b. Communications strategies: Steering Committee discussed a tenative timeline which is not yet formalized. The campus community will be asked to provide input on the changes to the charges beginning within the month. The AMP website will work as a resource to provide information and collect feedback. In late-February, early March, the first draft of the report is anticipated to be completed and will be given to the campus community for input. The second draft is slated for September, at which time more input will be collected. In December, the committee will work on generating endorsements from stakeholders: ASI, PBRC, and Presidential Leadership Team, although list of stakeholders may be revised.
       c. A draft of the website has been reviewed, changes are underway. There is a possibility the AMP will be re-branded in an effort to differentiate it from other Academic Master Plans, including the CO's.
       d. AVPAP Nwosu opened the floor to updated. Members of the subcommittee said they were bringing up the AMP with faculty members in their departments and collection questions, concerns and feedback they will bring back to the subcommittee. Nwosu said a diagram of the AMP timeline was in the works and will be ready for distribution in the next couple weeks. There was also discussion on the website, including its input page. Members cautioned it is currently a busy time of year (finals, holidays, etc.) for faculty to respond with input.
3. Discussion from examination of key questions
    1. Review of other team's responses
       a. Kari Knutson Miller updated the subcommittee on her group's charge to examine "where will we teach?" She said they found they need to reference the Fullerton campus and physical learning environments and include face-to-face

instructional mode. The group will need to decide if the AMP should raise questions for consideration or provide recommendations for "where we teach." Discussion was also had on study abroad/away and online learning and data needed to analyze to see how successful they are in terms of retention and graduation. To further explore "where we teach," the following is needed:

- Info regarding current away/abroad program
- Info re: service learning community
- Comparable universities – online vs. face-to-face and hybrid, and how many satellite (comparison & aspirational)
- What kind of spaces are needed to meet pedagogical goals for the future
- Classroom use, numbers, facility use (booking), timeline for updates for campus classrooms, inc. day, time, etc.
- Check reports/DAA from partner institutions
- List of aspirational institutions that have innovative ways at looking at what they teach
- Analysis of space use and growth (use, building, etc.)
- Open door report
- How many online courses are available, how many students enrolled
- Enrollment management, projections and demographics
- How other universities deal with course fees and other related fees to handle the 'where'
- Identify what state, nation, global community expect in relation to education future jobforce.

4. Next steps
    1. Subcommittee to explore additional degree programs, additional programs and look at overarching questions. Co-chair Stang suggested focusing on questions 2 and 3. Irena Praitis volunteered to compile documents into one in an effort to be more organized and ahead of the curve.
5. Next Meeting November 16, 10:30-12 CP 550 and November 30, 10-11:30, CP 550

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.