

Process Committee

Summary Points of Meeting

December 12, 2008

Hawai'i Hall Room 309

8:00 am – 9:30 am

Attendees: Mary Tiles, Ming-Bao Yue, Christine Sorensen, Ashley Maynard, Klaus Keil, Gregg Geary, Keith Sakuda, Jaime Sohn, Ann Sakuma

Not in Attendance: Alan Teramura, Brian Taylor, Peter Crouch, Walt Niemczura

Distributed book entitled “Prioritizing Academic Programs and Services: Reallocating Resources to Achieve Strategic Balance” by Robert C. Dickeson to committee members present.

The process of prioritizing campus units and programs should be data driven as much as possible to maintain objectivity. Accessible data will be published on the Process website for units to use when doing their evaluation. Majority of the data will be linked from Academic Affairs (Institutional Research Reports) and Human Resources (Personnel Data).

Committee to review available data to identify reports the units should include in their assessment of programs for better consistency across the campus. Committee to also develop instructions for the units and define at what level these evaluations should begin. What is the “unit of analysis?” It is important to be able to identify low performers for a successful and productive prioritization process.

Change “appropriate size” in rubrics to a ratio or percentage as a clearer guideline for units. Rubrics to be drafted in a way that it ends up with the four (4) VCs (Student Services, Research, Academic Affairs, and Administration) for their review and analysis before being submitted to the Chancellor with recommendations. At the VC level, cross communication should take place.

The overall analysis of programs and units will take place at the Dean/Director level.

Points in the WASC Institutional Proposal apply more to the executive level and thus, these points should be considered when the priority process reaches the VC level.

The Academic Program Review should also be aligned with campus principles, priorities and criteria to ensure consistency with prioritization process.

Narrative section at the end of the rubrics shall be limited to one (1) page of bullet points and a set number of characters to encourage units to prioritize and analyze their comments. A counter will be built into the narrative section so users will be aware of the remaining number of characters available.

The results of the process at each level will be published on the Process website to enable units/departments to see where their programs lie within the scope of the entire Mānoa campus.

Homework:

Use “track changes” to reflect additional updates on the 12/11/08 version of the draft to make it easier for Chris to review and compile. Ming-bao will develop a draft definition of a “unit of analysis” for committee members to review. Chris to assemble a list of data sources (links).

Committee to think about and provide recommendations on the following:

- how the criteria [main topics for the three (3) areas] should be weighted
- how the process should be rolled out to the field