

**PRIORITIZATION AND RECOVERY STEERING COMMITTEE
MINUTES
October 1, 2007**

Present: Alex, Almaraz, Brum, Davis, Day, Delgado, Freer, Fremont, Kellner, Lord, Lujan, Monemi, Morgan, Pepping, Sancho-Madriz, Self, Stallones, Yates

Absent: Barnes, Warrington

Guests: K. Day

Chair Self called the meeting to order at 3 p.m.

1. Minutes

It was decided that, as a general rule, specific people would not be named in the discussion portion of the minutes. Co-Chairs and other presenters will be identified.

M/s/p that the Minutes be approved as amended. 1 abstention.

2. Members

David Lord replaced Sara Garver due to a teaching conflict.

Ann Morgan replaced Bruce Emerton due to sabbatical leave.

3. Housekeeping

a. Meeting Location Change – The meetings for October 22 and November 5 have been moved to Collins School Building 79-A 1335. A revised meeting schedule will be posted on Blackboard.

b. Questions for Two Committees

The consensus of the Steering Committee was that the Chairs of the Committees will be called to present when questions are raised.

c. Two-hour Meeting Schedule

A retreat format was discussed. It was decided that the decision regarding a retreat would be delayed until the Phase Two report was distributed.

d. Blackboard

The Steering Committee members were reminded to check Blackboard for announcements and postings.

4. Action Items

a. Support Program Report

The Support Program Report needs to be on the Public P & R Website. An email was sent and a vote was taken to place the Support Program Report on the P & R Website.

M/s/p to place the Support Program Report on the Public P & R Website.

b. Academic Programs Committee PowerPoint

The Academic Programs Committee presented a PowerPoint presentation at the October 24 meeting. Ron Fremont stated that because the PowerPoint was oversized for a PDF some editing was needed. He is awaiting final approval from Phil Rosencrantz and Kip Dickson before the presentation is placed on the P & R Website.

c. Reply to Feedback

Ron Fremont offered a draft reply to the individuals that responded to the Academic Programs Report recommendation over the Summer.

Discussion ensued.

Members stated individuals who sent a message expressing concern/thoughts about the P & R process, should be given an individual reply.

In an effort to acknowledge people who have provided feedback it was decided to not go with a standard format. Feedback will be answered by Chair Self.

Chair Self will draft an individual reply for each of the emails received. A template will be developed for past, current and future emails.

Feedback to Committee Members – How the feedback should come to the Steering Committee was discussed. Blackboard will be used.

d. Polycentric

Ron Fremont is working on a feature type news story to be placed on Polycentric. It will be placed on the web as soon as the editing is approved for the Academic Programs Committee PowerPoint.

e. Public Meetings

Discussion ensued regarding the pros and cons of open vs. public meetings. It was decided to hold off until the Steering Committee has their working process defined. At future time it will be It will be reconsidered.

5. Next Step

a. Definition of Process

Support Programs recommendations – The group discussed the information received. It was unclear how the committee reviewed the 321 programs. Only 19 recommendations were received by the P & R Steering Committee.

It was pointed out that the 19 recommendations is a little more representative of the process than it appears. The 19 recommendations represent dozens and dozens of programs. It was reiterated that this is the final recommendation of the Support Programs Committee.

A member voiced the concern that the Support Programs report did not address all the entities and departments and the work that each department accomplished.

The consensus was that the Steering Committee will consider only recommendations provided by the two committees. The recommendations should be handled one at a time. The Academic Programs P & R Committee Co-Chairs will be asked to break down their general recommendation to recommendations that will stand alone. Each recommendation will be considered separately.

Phase Two Report has not been received.

Feedback – Discussion Points

- Form of Feedback – how do you get the constituents to participate, both those that are deeply affected and those that are minimally affects?
- What will the format look like
- Department versus individual feedback
- Limiting the number of pages

Discussion -- The departments are the logical place to obtain the information. The department will be asked for a majority consensus position.

Majority report and minority reports will be accepted. Multiple individuals can send a minority report. Individuals can provide feedback as well.

Consensus was reached on the following points:

- The department will be asked to provide a consensus position, by the majority of the department. A signature sheet will be required. It is encouraged that they send a single majority document.
- The responses will be yes, no and an explanation of both. Feedback without explanation will not be considered.
- Limit the report to 500 words.
- The framework will be the same for all departments, both academic and support.

Framework -The framework was discussed. The following are discussion points:

- What do you want the P & R Steering Committee to know and what is important to think about?
- What do you like about the proposal?
- What do you not like?
- What would you do different -- what is the alternative?

Student and Alumni Feedback – The ASI and Alumni Association will be asked to participate in the same manner as the academic and support program departments. They will be asked to survey their constituencies.

Steering Committee Working Process – It was suggested that the Steering Committee break up into subcommittees to evaluate the feedback. No decision was made on this topic.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:50 p.m.