

**Program Prioritization Task Force
Meeting Summary
December 9, 2020**

Brian Payne welcomed the group and provided an update about the open forum. He indicated that more than 200 individuals responded they would be attending the event. Payne began the meeting by reviewing the PowerPoint that would be used for the open forum. Task force members provided feedback about the amount of details on some of the slides and suggested that more detailed slides should be included at the end of the PowerPoint slide deck but not addressed verbatim. It was suggested that a slide identifying the five subcommittees be included so the campus community would be aware of the fact that task force members would not be participating in assessments of their home units. Payne indicated that the plan was to present for 30 minutes and use the remaining time for a question and answer session.

Payne provided an overview of the ratings for the administrative units received from chairs and administrators and a summary of the open responses from deans and chairs. Payne told task force members that the specific feedback from the surveys would be made available to the specific subcommittees.

Because some undergraduate programs aren't in departments (and wouldn't be included in surveys sent to chairs), the group discussed a survey that would be sent to those program directors. In addition, the group discussed possible questions that would be addressed to graduate program directors. Payne indicated that the results of the graduate program director survey would be shared with the graduate school.

Nina Gonser shared an overview of the budget data that will be made available to the subcommittees. The data will focus on enrollments, spending, and revenue at the department level. It was stressed that our budgeting model does not allow the data to be provided at the program level. Specifically, because budgets are developed at the department level, rather than the program level, analyses of budgets would need to be done at the department level. Gonser indicated she will produce similar data reports for administrative units.

Tisha Paredes presented draft templates/rubrics for reviewing programs, academic units, and administrative units. The rubrics stemmed from the criteria identified previously by the committee as being important to consider in its efforts. Members discussed the most effective ways to use the rubrics, possible changes to the rubrics, and how communications should be done with programs under review. The group agreed that if a subcommittee wants additional information, they should ask Brian Payne or Desh Ranjan to reach out to the appropriate individual on their behalf.

Desh Ranjan asked subcommittees to report on their efforts since being created at the last meeting. Subcommittees reported that they have begun to review the data that has been made available to them. The group discussed how to continue to collect feedback from faculty. The group agreed to continue to discuss this topic at subsequent meetings.