University of Montana

APASP Task Force Prioritization Meeting

Wednesday, November 8, 2017 | 6-9 p.m. | Missoula College 340

MEETING MINUTES

1. Call to Order

2. Review of meeting procedure

3. Task Force Vote on Public Comment at meeting start and end
   a. 5 votes for public comment before and after; 10 votes for public comment after.

4. Review of Discussion Agenda, to include items moved from Consent Agenda to Discussion Agenda, and Votes – APASP Task Force

   - Motion to move Baucus Institute to Phase 2 (no general funds), seconded, TF vote on this: YES (13) NO (0)

5. Public Comment

6. Task Force discussion on release of prioritization information and response
   a. Action items:
      i. Releasing redacted comments, scores, preliminary votes, and final vote information in addition to reports and categories –

   TF decided to release on UM Box redacted comments (redacted only to protect additional reviewers, who were not informed that their names would be public when they agreed to participate), scores, final votes, in addition to reports and categories.

      ii. Instructions for Author Response – word limits, other considerations

   Task Force will not read author responses therefore won't create instructions for author response.

   b. Information items:
      i. Shared governance reps on TF ensure governance bodies are scheduling meetings early December

7. Process for Developing Recommendations
   a. Review of templates developed by Metrics Sub-Committee and by Chase, Scott and Roz

b. Decision on what template to use
c. Other elements of process

What does TF want in summary reports and recommendations to Cabinet? What would be most helpful, at a glance?

Concern about having so many units in Category 2 – TF create default recommendations for units in Category 2

Holistic approach to what TF wants… start our recommendations with acknowledgement of limiations of process and information gathered. John has started drafting preamble-summary to start recommendations with.

At this point, humility and things TF has learned along the way

Make recommendations creating groupings within sectors, areas?

Steve's model as starting point – merge with form proposed by Chase and Metrics sub-committee

TF voted on making recommendations for every UOA.

Discussions need to be focused. Use sub-committees to accomplish the work.

Whether or not we voted on making recommendations for every UOA in the past, writing thoughtful, deliberate reports for all UOAs is insane. Start with category 3, let's see how it goes…

We could address how to deal with Category 2 by thinking about how we could potentially group various programs. If we can connect the dots between various programs that would do some of the legwork for the Cabinet.

We all seem to be on the same page in terms of template; Chase and Steve revise and send new version for TF vote via email?
Sub-committees should be formed to determine how to make more coherent recommendations

Stay true to original charge – to prioritize programs and services. Trying to group units, while valuable, would be time consuming… it is important to do all programs. But we don't have enough time for that now. Stick to UOAs rather than make sense of things and create coherent groupings.

Concern that no matter how TF makes recommendations, we make it more tractable for the entire group.

This may be something to keep in mind as a lesson learned… the broader context is missing here and it's unsatisfactory at this point.

Draft Report and Recommendation Form in "Recommendation Documents" folder

Meeting Monday – between now and then everyone try using form and test it out

There will be many units for which the TF has no recommendations

Inconsistency in norming amongst members of the group

Proposed sub-committee model helps smooth out ups and downs – rather than the mindset of 1, the mindset of 6 – will create more balance, more modulation.

Value of group thinking rather than individual thinking

TF is in no better position to make decision than deans and sector heads. Should TF even try to do recommendations? We can't stop here – yes we can, we've done our due diligence – placement of prioritization categories is valuable, even though process hasn't been perfect.

TF has been transparent; when recommendations go to Cabinet the expectation is that there will be no more transparency. That's why it's important that the TF provide recommendations for as many units as possible.

Suggestion:

- Lead reviewers who had units that were placed into category 3 use the template to write up those units.
- Discuss experience at Monday meeting
- Decide on whether forming sub-committees will be useful
- Decide on whether to adopt Steve's timeline
- COI or no COI for TF members during recommendation phase?

TF will do summary reports for all units; recommendations for as many as TF has time for.

Proposal of third recommendation for units in Category 2

Discuss all units in Category 3, every other one goes to Consent Agenda and TF members can decide which ones they want to discuss. This will streamline how TF wrestles with units in Category 2.

8. The TF's work beyond the November 20 meeting and recommendations
   a. Phase 2
   b. Secondary charge on continuous review process

9. Adjourn Upon Completion of Business