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Meeting Summary

\textit{Decisions}

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

Quintile System: The AcTF chose to abandon quintiles (5 ranks with forced equal percentages) and decided instead to divide programs into five categories with each category having a minimum of 15\% of the programs. The remaining 25\% will be distributed in any category.

In addition, the AcTF decided to revise the meaning of some categories. The most important revision is that the rank described in the July 8\textsuperscript{th}, 2013 memo as “Subject to further review, consider for reduction or phase out” is now a category that will contain programs the AcTF recommends for “Further Review.” The AcTF is not recommending that any program be reduced or phased out based upon this analysis. Determinations on plans for improvement, reduction, or phase out will be made after further review by program faculty and leadership, deans, the provost, and the chancellor.

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

\textit{Meeting Notes}

1) Quintile System
   a) Voted to not use a non-uniform, forced distribution (e.g., bell curve).
   b) Voted to use forced, equal, minimum distribution.
   c) Voted to use five categories.
   d) Voted to use 15\% as the minimum percentage of programs in each category.
   e) Noted that distribution of programs (how distinct in terms of UAA priorities) cannot be known until after it is tried.
   f) Noted that not requiring programs to be distinguished into enough groups requires administration to make more of the decisions.
   g) Noted that distinguishing very finely may require more time than is available.
   h) Discussed quadrants (four categories using two axes).
      i) Considered necessary adjustments for mapping current criteria.
      ii) Noted that the two axes are not equally important (i.e., not the same number of criteria or weight of criteria).
      iii) Considered potential difficulty for faculty to understand this system.
   i) Calculated the number of programs represented by 10\%, 12\%, and 15\% of all programs to determine how many would be minimally in each category.

2) Conflict of interest
a) Noted that a representative committee as requested by some faculty in public forums implies advocacy for programs that is at odds with our commitment to maintaining an institutional perspective.

b) Discussed difference between advocating for a program and assisting committee in understanding information on templates.

c) Noted that forced distribution makes every vote a conflict of interest.

d) Discussed different ways to define conflict of interest including: programs for which you participated in completing a template, programs in which you teach or research.

e) Agreed that task force members must disclose to other members their connections to programs.

f) Noted the importance of the campus being able to trust the process and the faculty who were nominated and selected to serve in this capacity.

g) Noted that fairness means no program can be evaluated using information not on the template and that AcTF members cannot provide supplementary information to a template under discussion.