

JOINT RETRENCHMENT COMMITTEE

Minutes

Monday, August 4, 2003

McKee 127 3:00 p.m.

Members present: Clough, Gregg, Gustafson, Huang, Jenkins, Schoneck, and Temkin

Members present by proxy: McConnellogue (Schoneck) and Reed (Schoneck)

Members absent: Lennon

Special assistants: Dinges, Garcia, and Gavin

The July 28 minutes were approved without objection as amended by noting that Reed was not in attendance.

President Norton thanks the Committee in her memo of July 31 for its work. Temkin informed the President last week that the Committee will submit a list of its recommended criteria to be used to evaluate programs and services. The President's staff, with assistance from Ellie Gilfoyle, will work on a comprehensive planning process at their retreat on August 11-12. Ms. Gilfoyle will be invited to meet with the Committee at a later date. As requested by the President, Temkin read the tentative agenda for the retreat to the Committee and asked if there were suggestions or other matters that might be added to the agenda. There were no other suggestions.

Roger Kovar's 1996 Academic Plan was discussed, especially centrality from the Evaluation Matrix, as a supplement to Dickeson's list. Kovar's concern was that everything be measurable and that no subjective judgment be made. Centrality will be a criterion but interpretation is an issue. It should not be interpreted as the number of things in the internal mission statement that the program does. It may be better to factor things that are "part of the picture rather than something that absolutely defines the decision." The Committee agreed that graduate programs need to have a higher standard of scrutiny than undergraduate programs.

Programs need to be prioritized, both academic and non-academic, then decide what to do about the prioritization, e.g., the program with last priority may not be eliminated if it seems worth doing for some reason and there's a way to do it.

MOTION: Temkin moved that since we are supposed to be comprehensive at the undergraduate level with respect to the various components of undergraduate education (majors, minors, and general education), we ought to examine a set of institutions that are relevantly similar to UNC in terms of mission, history, size, funding, and location, and see the frequency with which the various programs we have occur in the programmatic offerings of those institutions.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously by a voice vote.

Uniqueness was not discussed in Dickeson's criteria but should be included. Quality and uniqueness encourage people to attend a university. A problem with uniqueness is that it is something that can change due to factors beyond our control. At question is whether there is a way of estimating the future uniqueness rather than the past. The Committee unanimously agreed that uniqueness suitability contextualized is to be added to the list of criteria.

Quality as a criterion was discussed again. At question is whether quality is independent of the other criteria. Should the quality of a program be measured by applying the other criteria to it to see how it measures up, i.e., should quality be tied to factors so it does not stand alone.

MOTION: Jenkins moved to combine the two quality criteria #s 4 and 5 into one criterion as #4 then renumber the remaining criteria for a total of 10 (including uniqueness).

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously by a voice vote.

Schoneck, Clough, and Jenkins will work on a draft of criteria, which will be distributed at the next meeting.

The Committee will meet again on Wednesday, August 20. Time and location will be determined later.

The meeting adjourned at 4:33 p.m.

Jack Temkin, Chair

Vicki Garcia, Recording
Secretary