**Meeting Summary**

**Decisions**
The following were decided by the Academic Task Force.

Rubric: The AcTF approved the rubric for use by faculty completing the templates.

Categories: The AcTF approved the descriptions of the five categories.

Training: The AcTF scheduled sessions to present more information about the template, the data, and the software.

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

**Meeting Notes**
1) Training
   a) Agreed to receive training on the data definitions and the software before continuing template training
   b) Worked on expanding training opportunities to include many days and times and possibly specialized sessions (e.g., GER templates)
   c) Reviewed that training is explanation not interpreting data or suggesting responses which only program faculty are qualified to do

2) Category Placement
   a) Reminded that “percent” implies scoring to some audiences though this is not the placement method for academic program prioritization
   b) Reminded that criteria weights are not percents of a score but rather relative importance in assigning to categories
   c) Reminded that scoring is not possible because criteria are not independent (e.g., cost is relative to size)

3) Open meetings and recusal
   a) Reviewed the goal of controlling for bias and conflict of interest.
   b) Noted the importance of explaining the mechanisms chosen to control for bias and conflict of interest.
   c) Conflict of interest definition
      i) Noted that recusal would require a clear definition of when it is needed.
      ii) Noted that interdependence of vote makes all votes a conflict of interest.
      iii) Noted that interdependence of programs makes a clear line extremely difficult (e.g., some task force members positions are more dependent on other programs than those in which they are hired)
      iv) Noted that definition “helped complete template” could be circumvented by avoiding completing templates.
v) Noted that definition “teaches and/or does research in” misses many programs that impact those faculty (e.g., teach required courses for another program)
d) Recusal from voting
  i) Noted that, because placement is by 80% of voting members, recusal from voting means that 14/17 is required instead of 15/18 and this does not change any result.
e) Recusal from discussion
  i) Reviewed that no information beyond template may be used.
  ii) Reviewed impact on discussion, if needed, of having an affected faculty member present (either task force member or other)
f) Analysis of potential conflict of interest
  i) Agreed to analyze final results to check for any pattern in placement of programs with potential conflict of interest
  ii) Noted that all results will be posted, so everyone can check for signs of bias