

**PRIORITIZATION AND RECOVERY STEERING COMMITTEE
MINUTES
October 8, 2007**

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

Absent: Almaraz, Stallones, Yates

Guests: K. Day

1. Minutes

Minor corrections were made to the September 24, 2007 and October 1, 2007 minutes.

M/s/p to approve the minutes.

The minutes will be posted on the Public P & R Web page.

2. Phase 2

Chair Self and Co Chair Barnes met with Phil Rosenkrantz and Kip Dickson regarding the submission of the Academic Programs Report Phase 2.

Phase 2 will be divided in three parts

- Explanation of the Process, the Rubrics and Rationale
- Scorecard
- Two page summary for each program

The scorecard is the backup for the summary. It will identify the strengths and concerns of the program based on demand and essentiality, quality, and the efficiency of the program. Next, is an opportunity analysis where the P & R Committee comments on the departments' response to what they would do with enhanced funding. The final section is recommendations. The P & R Committee recommends enhanced funding; stable funding, or reduced funding; and/or, in rare instances, merger or elimination. The main reason for the mergers would be to protect programs.

It is hoped that Phase 2 report will be available next Monday.

The Phase 1 recommendations will be grouped into seven mini recommendations.

3. Draft of Online Feedback Form

Chair Self distributed a draft of a departmental feedback form.

The form is similar to the criteria template. It might be easiest to use the criteria template. Dr. Brum informed the group there were major revisions to the template between the Academic Programs and Support Services criteria template.

It was stated that there are 46 academic departments and 321 support programs.

The following are discussion points:

- One majority opinion per department.
- The feedback instrument should be department based rather than program based. The program operates and the department responds.
- The form will contain opportunities for majority opinion and minority opinion along with a signature page

The consensus was that feedback can come in several ways – Majority opinion of the department, minority opinion or multiple minority opinions and individual submissions.

It was clarified that Undergraduate and Graduate programs will have separate responses within the department response.

Discussion ensued on how to word the form.

The same form will be used for both the Academic Programs recommendations and the Support Services recommendations. It was suggested that there be a drop down menu to identify the constituency of the respondent.

Several members argued the point that the pro and con needs to be included along with the modification section. This might bring in creative ideas.

The consensus of the group is that the form will include pro/con and modifications.

The students and alumni will need a parallel mechanism. The point was made that the Steering Committee, at its October 1 meeting, determined that the ASI and Alumni Affairs would poll their constituents.

The point was made that there are individuals who may not be represented by a constituency; for example, employers, friends of the university, etc. It was determined that they could post an individual response.

A submission deadline will be established.

The consensus was that departments have the responsibility to respond. The department must submit one majority opinion of the department. There is not a cap on minority opinions or individual submissions. If no response is received, it is considered abstention.

4. Timeline

A draft timeline was distributed.

The following additions were discussed:

- Town hall meetings were discussed.
- The external scan will not be available until November. A meeting should be set aside for the consultant for the external scan to make a presentation.
- Retreat – Tentative date -- November 30

The opinion was expressed that the timeline should be established after the Steering Committee has all the documentation. The point was made that the process is the same whether or not the documentation is complete.

A suggestion was made to conduct a Town Hall meeting after Phase 2 is released. This would give the community the option of having public comment. Another Town Hall meeting could be conducted in January closer to the end of the process.

Discussion ensued.

An opportunity for virtual discussion might be an option to Town Hall meetings. It might be possible to set up a P & R list serve to accommodate the discussion.

Discussion ensued.

A suggestion was made that departments could post a draft response and request comments. This would be on an informal basis and not considered the final report from the department. All the submissions would be public.

The P & R list serve would need to have a disclaimer identifying that the list serve would only provide opportunities for comments from the community. The P & R SC would not monitor the list serve.

All responses must be submitted in final form to the P & R SC by the established deadline.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:15 p.m.