

JOINT RETRENCHMENT COMMITTEE

Minutes

Monday, August 20, 2003
Gunter 1120 1:00 p.m.

Members present: Gregg, Huang, Jenkins, Lennon McConnellogue, Reed, Schoneck, and Temkin
Members present by proxy: Clough (Jenkins) and Gustafson (Schoneck)
Members absent: None
Special assistants: Dinges, Garcia, and Gavin
Guests: President Norton and Dr. Ellie Gilfoyle

The August 4 minutes were approved without objection.

The Committee discussed the draft of criteria to evaluate programs and services that was prepared by Schoneck, Jenkins, and Clough, who were thanked for their work. It will be proposed to use the draft in the Charting the Future process. The main difference between the draft and the criteria adopted by the President's staff is the detail, the things that should be considered while applying the criteria.

The Committee agreed earlier to combine the quality of inputs and quality of outputs criteria into one criterion. The Committee had also agreed that uniqueness would be a criterion; the subcommittee decided that while uniqueness may be a strength lack of uniqueness is not a weakness, especially for programs central to the mission. Centrality to the mission was added as a criterion. It was noted that the quote in #8 and subsequent paragraph are meant to be cautionary in evaluating costs.

MOTION: Gregg/Lennon moved to amend by changing lines 9 and 10 of #2 to read, "... primarily in the fields of education, indicates that being in ~~the~~ a field of education...."

VOTE: The motion to amend passed unanimously by a voice vote.

MOTION: McConnellogue/Lennon moved to amend by changing the second sentence in the Summary to read, "...directed to Instruction is ~~just over~~ between 50% and 55%.

VOTE: The motion to amend passed unanimously by a voice vote.

MOTION: Schoneck/Jenkins moved to amend by changing the last sentence in the Summary to read, "It is reasonable...which comprise the ~~other half~~ balance of UNC's State appropriated budget."

VOTE: The motion to amend passed unanimously by a voice vote.

Grant activity, centers of excellence, and programs that have been recognized should be included in #6.

MOTION: Temkin/Gregg moved to amend by changing #6 to read, "Program ~~productivity can be measured by~~ measures may include but are not limited to Student Credit Hour...."

VOTE: The motion to amend passed unanimously by a voice vote.

MOTION: Schoneck/Jenkins moved to amend by changing the first line after the quote to read, "Examination of program productivity needs costs need to examine consider what the structural...."

VOTE: The motion to amend passed unanimously by a voice vote.

MOTION: Temkin/Schoneck moved to accept the draft as amended and submitting as the JRC's recommendations for criteria to be used in the process called Charting the Future.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously by a voice vote.

If the Charting the Future process includes the recommendation for a reduction in force (RIF), the Committee will have a limited time to respond as to whether or not a RIF is necessary and to prepare, or

in consultation with the President prepare, the RIF plan which will include the criteria. The chair questioned if the Committee should prepare for the possibility if a RIF is recommended by starting to get the information needed to investigate alternatives, to recommend criteria in conjunction with developing a RIF plan, and to continue to meet through this year. Concerns expressed were that it would be a duplication of work and time and, that if word gets out that the Committee is preparing for a RIF, it would be viewed as a forgone conclusion that there is going to be a RIF. Another concern was getting the data in a timely manner.

President Norton and Dr. Ellie Gilfoyle, special assistant to the President and facilitator for the Charting the Future process, joined the Committee to go over the Charting the Future process. In the Proceedings of President's Staff Retreat August 11 & 12, 2003 Initiating A Comprehensive Plan for UNC's Future, the President went over the elements of the process (page 16), the guiding principles (page 17), the criteria and report format (page 18), and the timeline (page 19). By October 1 units will have packets with directions on how to prepare the report or self-analysis. Temkin noted that the Committee approved its criteria that are relevant to the Present Descriptor part of the criteria and report format section. A draft of the plan, put together by a Design Team, should be finished by March, 2004 to present to the Board. The final plan should be finished by May for presentation to the Board. It will be stated in the March draft whether or not a RIF is recommended. If a RIF is recommended, the Committee will have from March to May to respond to the recommendation. The Committee decided earlier that it does want 60 days to respond to a RIF recommendation. The Board would not be able to order a RIF until it has a response to the recommendation or lack of from the Committee. It was noted that the Committee has the power to interpret the RIF policy.

The meeting adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

Jack Temkin
Chair

Vicki Garcia
Recording Secretary