



## APASP Task Force Meeting

Wednesday, November 15, 2017 | 11 a.m.-noon | UH 004

Present: Anisa Ricci, Andrew Ware, Scott Whittenburg, Erik Johnston, Stephanie Domitrovich, Paul Haber, Jen Zellmer-Cuaresma, Liz Putnam, Roz Hayley, Laurie Fisher, Ona Renner-Fahey, John DeBoer, Braden Fitzgerald (phone)

### MEETING MINUTES

1. Agreement that TF needs to stick to 2/3 vote, not majority, for items to be approved. **THIS MADE VOTE ON ITEM 4 at 11.13 MEETING VOID**
2. Agreement to have a conversation because there is no quorum. (later an additional TF member arrived so there was quorum for most of this discussion)
- Discussion of Point 4 of motion discussed at 11/13 meeting
  - People don't agree on what to do for recommendations for units in Category 2
    - If individuals want to say something about units in Category 2 as a group they can propose them and then the TF will decide whether to adopt them or not
    - If individuals only provide comments on units that they pick that will leave out certain units...
    - Part of TF charge is to provide recommendations on prioritization – we must address units in Category 2
    - We don't have time to properly come up with recommendations for Category 2
    - We'll be looking at units in isolation but they don't exist in isolation. They collaborate with multiple other units. We don't have the time to recreate groupings and actually make some productive recommendations based on reality
    - Mention of proposal to create 3 types of unit within Category 2
    - Discussion of what recommendations will look like and how to organize them
    - Initial TF votes need to be taken into consideration too, but we don't have time for that. Discomfort with how prioritization meeting decisions took place.
    - Why is TF so committed to "we said we'd do things this way"? Why not more flexibility now that we know more than before?
    - Prioritizing TF time to focus on areas most important to UM
    - What if we start with Category 3 and then start working up into Category 2 based on votes (those near Category 3) as time allows?
    - Proposal to develop an analysis of placement of units in prioritization categories, including a more in-depth analysis of initial votes for all units placed in Category 2 to make distinctions between units
    - Does TF feel obligated to provide heads on a platter?

- Converse: should TF feel obligated to do the opposite, i.e. protect programs that are doing well?
- TF should not have to tell Cabinet what to cut
- What if lead reviewers each proposed recommendations for the programs they reviewed?
- Certainty that Cabinet will “go into” Category 2. Communicate this to campus in the interest of transparency?
- What are we going to do with the input we receive from deans and sector heads?
- Should we have asked deans and sector heads to provide more input on Category 2 in addition to Category 3?
- Direction from President Stearns about what the Cabinet wants the TF to do with units placed in Category 2?
- If all lead reviewers did recommendations as suggested above, that would take too much time for the TF to vet every single recommendation
- Sector Heads might appreciate a message saying Category 2 is not “safe” – please provide information on Category 2 as well.
- Recap/Action items:
  - John DeBoer will draft campus communication to send to Comms Subcommittee by Friday and they will work on it
  - Andrew and Roz will go through some of the numbers and try to develop a way to take all available information into account

Other ideas:

Include in recommendations to Cabinet to get input from dean/sector head before making decisions

Logistics:

Meetings to be set for Monday for TF to develop recommendations for units in Category 3

On agenda for Monday’s TF meeting: how TF will use dean/sector head input

3. New Business

4. Adjourn Upon Completion of Business