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* Quorum is present

There was agreement that Monday meetings work better than Friday.

1. **Review notes from 11/1 and 11/16 meetings**

November 1 notes
- Affirm that quorum is 12 with 3 faculty members
- 85% of members present is required for a vote

November 16 notes
- Quorum was not present
- Task group updates
  - Instructional group would like to solicit campus input immediately, as well as at decision points in the process
    - Steering committee will be recipient of input

The notes from previous meetings were reviewed and approved by the committee.

**General comments**
• Meeting dates and locations should be on the web calendar
• RSS feed should be added to the webpage to push new information out. People will get email updates instead of having to follow web page.
  o Possible webpage menu item: what’s new (track changes)
• Overview of instructional programs provided to instruction group will be posted on the web page, noted as a preliminary list of activities

There was discussion about providing a framework for the campus community when solicit input:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOR USING A FRAMEWORK / GUIDELINES WHEN ASKING FOR INPUT</th>
<th>AGAINST USING A FRAMEWORK / GUIDELINES WHEN ASKING FOR INPUT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is general guidance available</td>
<td>Would mislead people into thinking that something has been discussed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing a context will limit input to what the committees need</td>
<td>Leaves responses way too open</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Lori and Linda will draft a form that provides a timeline and provides some general direction on the input

2. **TASK GROUP UPDATES** [note: agenda items 3) and 4) included within updates]

**SUPPORT:**
• The task group began reviewing service units, which is the term they are using for “program”, and discussing ways that administrative units use to evaluate themselves.
• Came up with a preliminary list of criteria
  o Chair Agrawal developed a chart combining the items raised by the task group and the criteria listed in the book to use as a discussion starting point for the next meeting.
• Definition of a service unit is complicated on the support side, so the task group is moving forward with the next phase believing that this will help them frame the definition of service unit.
• A question was raised about where department offices will be evaluated, with support group or instruction group? More research will be done to see how other institutions handled academic department offices.
• Programs that do not have a clear home will be sorted by the steering committee.
  o Perhaps some programs should be considered by both committees

**Affirming rules of SPTG:**
• Meeting quorum is 10 of 14 with 75% of members present for procedural actions → approved
• Approved only procedural part as substantive has not yet been decided upon by committee → approved

**INSTRUCTIONAL:**
**Affirming rules of IPTG:**
• Consensus approach for procedural matters, if there is full agreement the committee move on, if not, goes to a 75% vote of those present) → approved
• Quorum is 16 of 23 → approved

5. **Categories for ranking:**
   • Programs will be categorized into groups
   • Number of groups not yet determined, categories not determined
   • “Buckets” is a better term than “quintiles” / “quartiles”
     o The list on page 102 of the book (enrichment, retained at higher level, retained at neutral level, retained at lower level, reduction/phasing out/consolidation)
     o Vice President Dalton reaffirmed that there are no hard and fast percentages for any bucket.
     o There was general agreement that 3 buckets is too few, but no final decision about how many buckets.

**Other Notes:**
• A concern was raised about having “representatives” at the table.
  o Task group members are not representing a specific department, but sit at the table working on behalf of the entire university.

• There was a discussion about voting processes and whether votes should be public or private.
  o Because someone may have to vote against her/his own best interest, the consultants suggested staying away from secret ballots.
  o Vote method has not been established for any group
  o This will be an agenda item for an upcoming steering committee meeting.