

JOINT RETRENCHMENT COMMITTEE

Minutes

Monday, July 28, 2003

McKee 127 3:00 p.m.

Members present: Clough, Gregg, Huang, McConnellogue, and Temkin

Members present by proxy: Gustafson (McConnellogue), Jenkins (Temkin), and Schoneck (McConnellogue)

Members absent: Lennon and Reed

Special assistants: Dinges, Garcia, and Gavin

The July 14 minutes were approved without objection.

The Committee discussed the criteria to be used to evaluate programs and services. The suggested criteria for program prioritization suggested by Robert Dickeson in his book were used to begin the discussion. It was noted that President Norton has read the book, discussed it with Dickeson and finds the criteria helpful. The Committee needs to say whether it recommends or does not recommend the criteria and why or why not in each case. The criteria do not need to be limited to those listed. All agreed that the mission should drive the criteria.

1. **History, development and expectations of the program** – in agreement this should be a criterion.
2. **External demand for the program** – in agreement this should be a criterion, but be defined.
 - the demand for the program needs to be distinguished from the demand for the credentials which the program confers, which may need to be another criterion.
 - it was questioned if demand is a meaningful measure of anything.
 - national trends are not of interest unless they are followed locally.
 - undergraduate and graduate programs are on the table; graduate programs should have a higher level of scrutiny.
3. **Internal demand for the program** – in agreement this should be a criterion with more specific detail.
- 4&5. **Quality of program inputs and processes/quality of program outcomes** – there are problems with these criteria.
 - quality is difficult to determine and arguable not quantifiable.
 - in so far as quality of faculty performance is a measure of this criterion then, if the prioritization results in a RIF then the RIF process will have been used as a shortcut around the dismissal for cause process, which raises important issues with regard to both policies.
 - on the other hand, if program prioritization does not lead to a RIF the use of qualitative criteria would be less problematic.
 - in so far as quality is subjectively determined, there is a risk that this criterion can be used to compromise academic freedom.
6. **Size, scope and productivity of the program** - in agreement that this should be a criterion.
 - when looking at student credit-hour production for a program other activities need to be considered, e.g., cash-funded hours, which typically are not in the statistics.
 - how will things be weighed.
7. **Revenue and other resources generated by the program** - in agreement this is clearly a criterion.
8. **Costs and other expenses associated with the program** – in agreement this is clearly a criterion.
9. **Impact, justification, and overall essentiality of the program** - in agreement this be a criterion.
 - centrality to mission?
 - good will, public relations benefits.

10. **Opportunity analysis of the program** - in agreement this be a criterion, it looks at the future.

It was noted that probably what the President has in mind is to first find out which programs to reduce or eliminate and which to keep or enhance then look at if it will involve letting tenured faculty go.

For the next meeting, the Committee members are to think about what the Committee wants to say about the criteria in more detail and ask if there are other factors that need to be included. Sections will be assigned for writing drafts, which will be discussed at the next meeting. Huang will provide a copy to Dinges of the comprehensive plan developed by Roger Kovar to be distributed for the Committee's review.

The next meeting will be Monday, August 4 at 3:00 p.m. in McKee 127. Committee members are to bring their calendars so a regular schedule can be set.

McConnellogue reported that the President found the Committee's response to her preliminary report favorable and will have a written response soon.

The meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.

Jack Temkin
Chair

Vicki Garcia
Recording Secretary