



APASP Task Force Meeting

Friday, November 3, 2017 | 2-3 p.m. | UC #225

MEETING MINUTES

1. Approval of 10.27.17 Meeting Minutes – APPROVED
2. Provost Edmond moved item 4 to be next item of discussion. Question to TF: will their recommendations to the President and Cabinet cover programs and services only in prioritization category 3, or include recommendations on programs and services in other categories as well?
Discussion:
 - next to nothing in category #3 and most of them are already in moratorium, not useful to Cabinet or anyone else to implement
 - Cabinet will accept categories and recommendation if they are limited to category #3, cab reserves right to move things between categories, Cab very focused on cat #1 and #3, need to give clear vision of what really are priorities, middle cat less specificity, process misses opportunity to provide change and direction; prerogative of cab to move
 - thought we would focus on all the areas from the beginning
 - in category #1, what guiding the TF movement to category #1, charge: align with strategic vision and strategic plan; we are going to priority #1 and align them with planning and assessment process, only process that would allow us to do that is if it aligns with vision and plan
 - admin side: doing good job, but they don't need more people and more money; academic program will need that and we need to provide cabinet more guidance for category #2
 - admin: more thought and effort, transparency and are we using those funds wisely?
 - should we be discussing this in the categorization phase or in the discussion portion? Opposed to automatic amount that go into category #3, other structural problems causing issues
 - Cabinet does not want a forced distribution, suggestion from Dickeson, will of TF that we not do it, so we didn't, at the same time, the framework document states that a combo of qualitative and quant review followed by a shift to a discussion n sustainability, at the end of the day it is an issue of financial sustainability
 - administrative units: we've seen units at risk are doing the best they can, further neglect will put the university at risk, some units are also not aligned with the university's mission and goals
 - are we going to promise recommendations in category #1 and #3?
 - will put the majority of your energy in cat #3, but there are some things in cate #2 and #3 that we have seen that we need to tell Cabinet about for those items; possibility of movement btwn categories especially because category #3 is limited
 - concerned about only using the vision as our guiding document because there could be some that don't align with it right now but are growth programs
 - Yes, I think the document is broad enough to do that, but there are some that may fall out of

that right now; missed opp to not align our priorities with the APASP and vision

- need to find procedure for recommendations
- not enough deliberations in meetings, on the 20th we are supposed to have a 3-hour meeting to finalize everything – how in the hell are we supposed to do that? If we don't get categorization right, it does not put us into a good place to provide recommendations. We have to figure out logistically how we are going to do the recommendations if everything is in the middle category; 2 hours to put 100 programs into the middle bucket; rather we spend 2 hours to focus on 12-15 programs that fall into the top or bottom category
- Ones that fall in the top or the bottom should be discussed more
- Program with 30% drop in enrollments/majors and we are putting them in the top category, how does that make sense?
- Connect APASP to strategic vision, disconnect if we don't do this right
- too many in the second category and we do a disservice if we don't do recomm for the middle category
- disservice to this process if we don't consider budget constraints
- the point is that I don't see final recomm wrapping up in 2017, cabinet will continue to work on this, there is no way that APASP will be able to finish this, cabinet should continue this
- can't sustain this level of work over next semester
- put it incumbent on ourselves to do a default recommendation, can't make detailed recommendations on 400 programs; put some programs on warning or consider for investment going forward
- endorse prior comment, originally thought we would have recomm for all programs, thought there would be short summaries by each lead reviewer, need to put more energy into 1 and 3
- agree with prior comment as well; if lead reviewer has specific thoughts on one they should put that into a short write-up for consideration
- Motion: TF provide recomm for all cat 3 and as time allows the other categories; motion fails
- New motion: ask lead reviewer to make an initial recomm and other tf members can have input on that recommendation
- ask framework sub-committee to take on this issue over the next week
- another set of written reports, doesn't move it forward, prioritization is not part of the current motion
- already part of the process, asking for a sentence at the end that tells us the recommendation from the reviewer; motion failed
- middle category offers a wide variety of actions and our recomm and provide a little bit of direction to the cabinet
- issue with one reviewer writing the final report because they are all over the place
- need to get initial recommendation out there
- programs with the most deviation are the ones that we should be discussing
- we are faced with the prob of workload v. time; can do a superficial job of reviewing all programs or do a thorough deliberative review of the programs with the most variation or in top/bottom; credibility hanging by a thread
- credibility – process may have flaws and is not perfect but we are doing a good job, credibility is like saying “the soup was rotten from the beginning” and that is not the case
- budget needs to be a very serious consideration in Cabinet, if we don't have those in place

moving forward we will find our place in the same place in 4 years

3. Review Process Debrief (Sub-Committee Chairs, Dawn Ressel)

a. Action items:

- i. How to handle the report submitted for multiple Missoula College programs
- ii. Athletics and programs that did not submit reports

Discussion of Missoula College programs for which a single report was submitted and Athletics reports:

- I got a sense that we are moving away from deliberative judgement, this is not a term paper, data is there, but they may not have address it, we are obligated to dig into it because many reports didn't dig into the data
- add Business Services to this list; duplicated information from one report to the next; they did not do the report for the unit that we asked them for
- trying to skirt the process and cover up their individual weaknesses, should go into the bottom category
- had 4 reports like this, didn't treat it in a punitive way, but I couldn't figure out how they fit into prioritization they did receive a low score
- Motion: those programs (BS, MC and Athletics) that did not provide individual information be put into the discussion agenda in one of the next meetings; motion passes
- unit of analysis for Athletics is the coach not the sport
- recommend that they should be put into insufficient evidence category
- concur because they were 5 diff programs that were put into one program

iii. Update on status of reviews

4. Prioritization Process Debrief, including discussion of Category 1 (all)

5. The TF's work beyond November 17

- a. Scheduling meetings
- b. New sub-committees to focus on Phase II and Secondary Charge of continuous review process
- c. TF recommendations
- d. Roles of TF, deans/sector heads, President/Cabinet in coming months

Discussion of input from deans and sector heads

- TF needs to hear from them what they thought and why or it can be in the set of input the tf sends to Cabinet; need to know how TF would like to handle this
- deans could see opportunities to combine, restructure departments, but not commenting on every program and their category
- yes, Provost wants their recommendations on how to reorganize/restructure departments
- their opinion on category doesn't matter, but what should be done is what matters and why; what they see for their college or school
- ask them to directly address bottom category and if they have time after that they can address whatever the else they want
- we've said we were not going to allow people to get us to change the category, we've done all these deliberations, why did we do this if we allow them to change the category?

- Provost Edmond will be asking them for specific comments and questions that are separate from the TF
- deans will have input on our recommendations, but not categories

6. Communication Update (Claudine Cellier)
 - a. Internal and external comms updates

7. New Business

Organization for Saturday's meeting

- propose to extend deadline to make motions to pull from the consent agenda, extend to 12am tonight; motion passes
- anything with 12 or more votes will go directly into the consent agenda, someone can pull it if they would like
- not a lot of admin svcs with 12 or more votes, leaves a lot for Monday to vote on

8. Adjourn Upon Completion of Business

FALL MEETING SCHEDULE

- Friday, November 17 – 2:00-3:00 p.m. in UC #225