**Program Prioritization Task Force Minutes**

**November 5, 2012**

**Present: Angi Brenton, Vicki Szabo, Chip Ferguson, Joan Byrd, John Baley, Jason Lavigne, Jannidy Gonzalez, Bruce Henderson, Tim Carstens, Brian Railsback, Georgia Hambrecht, Laura Cruz, Dave Hudson, Dave Kinner, Debra Burke**

1. Minutes from 29 Oct. meeting
2. Final approval of narrative for webpage – Angi and Vicki reviewed the narrative and made a few more suggested changes. We will post the long version.
3. Discuss draft of criteria and indicators (see attachment) – Angi has reviewed again and made revisions. Right now we are still dealing with three broad criteria; Brian suggested changing to descriptive categories. We will discuss later. Angi reviewed updated criteria. Contact hours will be qualitative rather than quantitative or count the number of scheduled hours each week. This does not include every time a student drops by, but the more formal contact hours. We’ll check with Larry to see if he can get this data. Discussion ensued.

Discussion ensued regarding assessing the data. Advisees may be more of a reflection of faculty load than productivity. Discussion ensued. It was agreed to leave on the list of the time being.

There a lot of different ways we can look at FTE. This is something we will look at with Melissa next week. We are going to look at percentage of classes taught by adjuncts.

We have added productivity in scholarship (aggregate statistics for program/dept). It was suggested we include external grants. This will include a qualitative statement in addition to data.

We have also included faculty service activities (aggregate for department). We want to articulate the difference between leadership and membership. How do we calculate this? Discussion ensued regarding the challenges of these two additional criteria. Hours may be very difficult to collect. Should this be an aggregate list instead? Discussion ensued. The task force agreed to a qualitative statement to address this criterion.

Angi reviewed Centrality and the task force gave their feedback. All of these items will be narrative accept 5-year liberal studies. Angi will make updates.

Quality – the task force began an email exchange regarding this topic. Do we need to continue this conversation? Angi summarized arguments on each side of this issue. The task force talked through the indicators in this area. We need to include a narrative for this area. Discussion ensued regarding whether students are distance education. It was suggested “context” be included in the data submitted so the task force is clear when reviewing. Yield rates will be for graduate programs. We will begin to put this in a chart that will indicate which is graduate, undergraduate or both. The task force is still considering “turnover.”

Angi will update one more time and provide to the task force and Melissa and Larry prior to our next meeting.

Discussion ensued regarding use of the term “quality.”

1. Program / unit analysis – Vicki updated this list and distributed to the task force. This is to use along with the original list of majors and minors sent to the members. Angi would like to treat BA and BS as one program. The only variable is language requirement – the task force agreed. At some point, we may need to break out data – mainly enrollment data. Discussion ensued.

Angi recommended we do look at graduate certificates – some are stand alone. We also included programs that only offer minors, no majors. Angi would like us to look at these. We did not include just a concentration as a separate program. Discussion ensued. It was suggested that after some tweaking we will send this document out to department heads to review for corrections.

1. Communication strategies for criteria / indicators (Forum / COD / FS / SS / SGA / CLC?) – How do we communicate with these groups? We will add this agenda item to the 11/19 meeting. It was suggested we add department heads and program directors to the above groups.
2. Moving forward
	* Open discussion – items of concern
	* Discussions w/ campus community – Nov.
	* Additional items?
	* Next meeting - Data workshop w/ Melissa Wargo and Larry Hammer - Mon., 12 Nov., 12:30-2:00
	* Next forum – 27 November, 3:30-5:00, UC Theater. – focus will be sharing criteria
3. Short anonymous survey for PPTF membership (re: meetings / communication / etc). – Vicki distributed hard copies of the survey to committee members and will send out electronically as well. This is to check in and see how we are doing. Please return your survey to Anne.

*FYI: Question List for UNC / Peer / Regional Comprehensive comparisons*

As you complete your interviews, please write up a short summary, and send that on to me. I will put together institutional summaries for the group. Thanks – Vicki

* Describe the process (committee / prioritization) on your campus
* How did you define programs (or other units of review)?
* What were your criteria, and how did you choose those criteria *(In our minutes, we had a few versions of this question: what questions or concerns prompted you to choose those criteria? or what information were you trying to capture in the criteria that you chose?)*
* What problems did you have with data, and how did you resolve those problems?
* What went well?
* What would you do differently if you could do it over?
* How did your campus react?
* Did your chancellor follow through?
* What were the different ways you communicated to your campus?