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Meeting Summary

Decisions
After extensive discussion the following were decided by the Academic Task Force.

Template Deadline: Voted to set January 31st as the deadline for the first template submission with all templates due by March 7th.

Template Questions: Voted to not change the template.

Program List: Voted to not delay or remove any program types. Program types include graduate and undergraduate degrees, minors, GERs, sponsored research, and others.

The AcTF did not reach a conclusion on open meetings and voting.

Meeting Notes
1) Academic Program Prioritization Schedule
   a) Presented expected release of centralized data November 8th.
   b) Discussed timeline concerns including feasibility for program faculty, feasibility for AcTF, and concerns over current lack of timeline.
   c) Voted to set submission timeline separate from final report deadline.
   d) Voted to set January 31st as the deadline for the first template submission with all templates due by March 7th.
   e) Discussed options for how faculty might distribute templates over this time period.
2) Template
   a) Discussed the need for full templates to be well informed of each program’s contributions.
   b) Discussed that many departments have already done signification work on templates for their programs.
   c) Voted to not change the template.
3) Program List
   a) Discussed options for easier submission of overlapping programs including automated copying of templates, reference to other templates and combined templates. Decisions pending more information.
   b) Voted to not postpone review of any major types of programs.
4) Reconsideration of System (Quintile)
   a) Presented poll results on preferred method (quintiles/quadrants/1D score and forced, even distribution or other distribution). Preferences roughly evenly distributed.
   b) Discussed value of each method as both decision making tool and presentation.
c) Discussed how each method can provide a sufficient prioritization (distinction between programs) without appearing falsely precise.

d) Discussed possibility of each method creating an avoidable stigmatization of programs.

e) Discussed distribution options including equal, closer to normal distribution, natural (discover, don’t specific).

f) Discussed importance of using the same method for both STF and AcTF so that functions and programs undergo the same review. Cross task force discussion are now underway.