

Minutes

AMP Subcommittee #1

November 30, 2015

10:00-11:30

CP 550

Present: Aaron Mezzano, Phil Armstrong, Irena Praitis, Marsha Orr, Peter Nwosu, Kristin Stang, Alison Wrynn, Mira Farka, Kari Knutson Miller, Mark Drayse

Excused: Jim Taulli, Sheryl Fontaine, Dean Kazeolas, Rahmatian Morteza, Kevin Wortman, Taylor Feher, Amanda Hughes

Guests: Mary Ann Villareal

1. *Review of minutes*—no comments were received
2. *Steering Committee Update*—Peter discussed the issues that were brought up at the most recent AMP Steering Committee meeting.
 - a. Subcommittee Reports – **Questions Raised** – there were several questions raised about the survey. The Steering Committee decided against having a survey—mostly due to the timing but also some of the other committees are already finding this information out in other ways. Some committees have made progress and already want to share it with the campus community.
 - b. There were questions about how the report will be written. Steering committee decided that we should write the report however we wish and then a small group will pull all of these together.
 - c. The question of what is an AMP was once again raised—should we create FAQs (instead of an infographic?). These are currently being drafted and will be shared with the campus community on the AMP website.
 - d. *The AMP Explained* – Infographic – a draft was created but for the time being it was decided not to use the infographic.
 - e. *AMP Communications Strategy* – The Steering Committee had a lot of discussion about how the communications strategy would work. Who should do this work and at what point should it be done? No one really wanted to create another committee to do this work. A Communications “team” is being formed: Mary Ann Villareal, a person from Strategic Communications, Gail Matsunaga, Christina Cardenas (AP), a staff person from the Provost’s Office and an ASI Communications Representative have begun to work on this issue. Mary Ann shared some details of their work thus far with us.

Mira asked what would be included in this website. Kristin and Peter explained all of the materials that would be available on the website. Discussion ensued about what materials from our sub committee should be shared on the website. Maybe we should include a process statement about how each document was worked on. Irena suggested that we should always upload only the most recent document and move the earlier drafts to an “archives” folder. Mark has some reports on occupational projections documents; do we want to include these very long resources? Yes, we do want to have these available to everyone. The website will

be a dynamic document—we can include or exclude items on an ongoing basis. We will hold off on sending all of these resources until we have organized them—but the communications team will probably reorganize it. Peter suggested we wait until we see how it will be organized before we send along all of our resources.

- f. *AMP – First Campus-wide Checkpoint and other upcoming deadlines*—Some time in mid January the subcommittees are expected to review the feedback that has been received via the website.

In mid February the subcommittees need to share their draft documents with the other subcommittees.

In late February, early March a small group will pull together the initial draft.

In mid March a first draft will be shared with the campus for a second round of feedback.

3. *Draft Timeline* –Peter discussed the timeline for the lead-up to the website launch and first campus-wide check-in that were created by the Steering Committee:
 - **Tuesday 11/24 by 5pm:** AMP Steering Committee (AMP-SC) will receive draft FAQ for review.
 - **Wednesday 11/25 by noon:** All subcommittees submit documents/resources they want to share with the campus regarding each of their questions (please cc Christina Cardenas when sharing these materials with the steering committee).
 - **Monday 11/30 by 5pm:** AMP website with input tab shared with AMP-SC for review. AMP-SC submits feedback on draft FAQ.
 - **Wednesday 12/2 by 5pm:** AMP-SC submits feedback on website and receives revised FAQ for finalization/approval.
 - **Friday 12/4 by 5pm:** Final AMP website goes live; AMP progress report #4 goes out to campus, which will include (1) AMP website link, (2) FAQ, (3) finalized minutes from 10/20 meeting, and (4) invitation for campus input via website.
4. *Draft FAQ-Review* – The Draft FAQ document was shared with the subcommittee members in attendance. The idea of an FAQ is a good idea; keep it open ended/updated as new FAQs will need to be added.
5. *Next Steps for Sub-Committee #1*—
 1. Organize the dropbox (particularly the resources folder) Mark is going to do a first draft at creating a structure for the dropbox. The subcommittee members can, in the future, send along suggestions as to where documents they submit will go in this new structured dropbox. Possible structure headings (curriculum trends, economic forecasts, HIP/Experiential Learning, Online learning, International Education, Campus Policy, CSU Policy, State Policy).
 2. The subcommittee members should look at the website as soon as it goes live and make any content suggestions or corrections.
 3. Kristin collected corrections/suggestions for the AMP website (see below) to send along to the communications team. Move the “supporting documents” section out to its own section and include a “working drafts” section for each meeting that is listed. The landing page for the AMP should be re-drafted for clarity.

WEBSITE (notes from Kristin)

General feedback

Use subcommittee #s throughout along with titles.

Landing Page

Paragraph 2, set aside this is no small task, at the end of the paragraph so it is clear as whether or not the .

Last paragraph.....maybe omit the final sentence....and make a stronger statement....

OR....as a final suggestion maybe show authorship/date of approval and by whom and with a link to full document

Committee Membership—please check affiliations for all

Marsha—delete distance

Phil-Geological Sciences

Parallel structure in titles throughout

Aaron, Grad Student in American Studies

Document Section

A general Supporting Document that covers all meetings

Within each meeting date, include a working drafts folder

Next Subcommittee Meeting –we will do another doodle poll to schedule our spring meetings. When we reconvene we will need to focus on the draft from our subcommittee.

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.