

**PRIORITIZATION AND RECOVERY STEERING COMMITTEE
MINUTES
September 24, 2007**

Present: Alex, Almaraz, Barnes, Brum, Davis, Delgado, Freer, Fremont, Kellner, Pepping, Sancho-Madriz, Self, Stallones, Warrington, Yates

Absent: Garver, Monemi, Self

Guests: C. Clark, K. Day, K. Dickson, P. Rosenkrantz, D. Straney

Vice President Ed Barnes called the meeting to order at 3 p.m.

Support Programs Presentation

Co Chairs Curtis Clark and Don Straney presented the report. The report has been posted on Blackboard for review the by Steering Committee.

The Support Program Criteria and Indicators were distributed. The categories of review were:

- Background
- Centrality
- Quality
- Efficiency
- Opportunity

Several indicators were listed in each category.

The Committee had a 2 ½ day retreat where they reviewed all programs. Four categories were addressed – increased resources; eliminate; restructure and combine; or leave as is for now.

- Increased Resource—programs had to demonstrate centrality, high quality and a mechanism for assessment quality. Quality over time was considered.
- Elimination- Lack of centrality was noted in these proposals. They showed low quality or an absence of a mechanism for assessing quality.
- Restructure or combine – the program showed it lack in several areas or was a superstar and could/should be combined with others.
- Leave as they are – nothing was changed and it is constant.

It was also stated that the Support Programs Committee asked the questions – “Would CPP still be CPP if the programs did not exist”. If the answer is no, the program needed to be fixed in some way.

Drs. Clark and Straney both stated that there was a time factor. The Committee received their charge later than the Academic Programs P & R Committee. The question was asked if the Support Programs Committee had more time would the report be different? The response was that it might be more detailed.

The Support Programs Committee reviewed all recommendations more than once before submitting their recommendations.

The 19 recommendations contained in the report are the recommendations that the Support Programs Committee could agree upon unanimously.

Questions – Was there an attempt to survey the campus constituency as to the perceptions of the indicators. Did you ask the users how the support program met the indicators?

No the programs were asked to identify their impact on the university community.

It was further questioned whether the user expectations were surveyed in terms of things like efficiency, customer service satisfaction and other types of useful information.

The response was that the department self reported.

The question was asked how the 321 programs are contained in 19 recommendations.

The point was made that the 19 recommendations are not just 19 programs – there are multiple layers in each recommendation.

It was reiterated that the 19 recommendations are the final recommendation of the Support Programs Committee.

The question was asked regarding the environmental scan. The environmental scan will be available sometime in November.

The Committee Chairs were asked to give examples of the strongest case for all four and the weakest case – The strongest case was the Lyle Center and the weakest was the Real Estate Center.

The Support Programs report is on the P & R Website at <http://www.csupomona.edu/~prioritization/>

Academic Programs Committee Report

A PowerPoint presentation was given. The presentation can be accessed at <http://www.csupomona.edu/~prioritization/>

The focus of the presentation centered on the following information which was provided in an email.

Can the reorganization of the academic structure of the University lead to:

- a more effective transfer of FTE and related resources based on quality & demand?
- the creation of new synergies?
- a reduction in curricular redundancies?
- a savings in resources?
- increased opportunities for research?
- increased development opportunities?

If all or part of this is assumed to be the case one can look at the issues that we discussed in the process of developing alternative structures.

Issues that the Committee used in formulating organizational alternatives:

- Affinities (Educational, Research & Development)
- Opportunity for strong programs to provide leadership in advancing affinities
- Provide opportunity for small or weak programs to play a role in the future
- Recognition of noteworthy Programs of Distinction or Priority
- Existing geographic location of programs and the need for expansion
- What is the short and long-term consequences of "status-quo" as an alternative?

A question was raised regarding how service would be evaluated. Professors Rosenkrantz and Dickson stated that there was a rubric for service to the community, service learning and other related service areas.

Professors Rosenkrantz and Dickson were asked to define a program and a department. The response was that the program is either a degree granting program or a general education program. The department is that which houses both the degree and programs such as general education courses, remediation

types of course. The example of the English Department was used – English is a major(program) as well as the department. There is a distinction between them.

Professors Rosenkrantz and Dickson encouraged the Steering Committee to review the individual program submissions on the P & R website.

Additional models of the distribution of resources were also presented. This information is included in the PowerPoint.

The point was made that Phase Two recommendations address the concerns of a FTE driven culture, data, the environmental scan as well other topics.

The question was asked whether the Steering Committee would have access to the summary and rubrics as opposed to the raw data. The presenters stated that the best way to approach it is to read the data on the P & R website.

The point was made that the Steering Committee cannot be expected to read all data submitted. A summary or rubric would be helpful. Several members expressed the opinion that the information needs to be summarized and not in raw data form.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:20 p.m.