NOTES – ACADEMIC MASTER PLAN (AMP) SUBCOMMITTEE 2 MEETING
November 19, 2015 | 9:00 – 10:00 a.m. | LH 702

Committee Berenecea Eanes, Darren Bush, David Forgues, Sean Walker, Ioakim Boutakidis, Lana Dalley, Emily Erickson, Eugene Fujimoto, Kiran George, Katy Johnson, Emmanuel Lartey, Pamela Madsen, Aimee Nelson, Maria Olivas, Katherine Powers, Lynn Sargeant

Synopsis

The following items/topics were discussed:

1. AMP Steering Committee update
2. Communication suggestions
3. Essential elements of each section

Discussion

Meeting called to order at 9:08 a.m.

I. AMP Steering Committee meeting update
   i. Meeting was held on November 18, 2015; Dr. Eanes recapped the steering committee meeting and shared that the subcommittees' progress reports were presented and received well.

II. Communication Strategies and Campus Consultation
   i. Prior to vetting out the key information that will go into each section, several questions regarding communication efforts was raised:
      a. How will we communicate the plan to our campus community?
      b. How will we get the important documents/information out and shared with the campus?
      c. How do we share what we are doing without setting the wrong context?
      d. What is the document for and how will we articulate the difference of the AMP plan vs. the Strategic plan?
      e. What is the relationship to the Strategic Plan and to other master plans in place?

   ii. The questions raised were discussed and a list of suggestions was developed for **Communication and Campus Consultation Strategies**:
      a. Develop a consistent and clear message that will be articulated to the campus community in an effective way (i.e. a tagline, vision statement)
      b. AMP Website will be the centralized place to access documents
      c. Create narrative about sharing
      d. Provost go to the Chairs' meetings and discuss the plan and process
      e. Communicate the difference between the strategic plan and AMP and the relationship to other plans/things
      f. Transparency when you communicate what it is for and its importance
      g. Identify funding priorities?
      h. Directive vs. aspirational

i. The AMP plan is a living document that will be revised through a collaborative process. The emerging trends should be incorporated and the document should be structured so that it clearly demonstrates the aspects of growth

III. Essentials Elements of Each Section

i. Who are we? Aspirational/philosophical/welcoming piece – an example vision statement from the School of Music was shared. The committee agreed that a simple statement with powerful words be written
   a. Build in language about tolerance/safe/proactive to ensure students we are a safe and welcoming community i.e. we expect our students to…
   b. Use words that resonate with us i.e. tolerance, civility, positive, use "prepare" instead of "provide", excellence, have purpose, be good citizens, creative, successful
   c. Commitment to our community

ii. Whom have we taught?
   a. Who have we failed to teach?
   b. Economics data
   c. Board data side by side
   d. Demographics (growth)
   e. Historical data and chart (progress of the "whom have")

iii. Whom are we teaching?
   a. Data / demographics
   b. Student body trends
   c. Student success trends
   d. How has demographics changed

iv. Whom will we teach? Tabled for next meeting

v. How many students will we teach? Tabled for next meeting

Action Items

1. AMP Subcommittee 2 will be sent notes on the essential elements for each section and suggestions for communication and campus consultation
2. Sean Walker will obtain a copy of the 2005 Facilities Master Plan/Guide

Next Meeting

1. Convene the discussion of questions 4. Whom will we teach? and 5. How many students will we teach?
2. Discuss content and build the frame for each section to get it to a sharing level

Meeting adjourned at 10:06 a.m.