RESTRUCTURING TASK FORCE – PROGRAM GROUP IDENTIFICATION

Draft minutes of the meeting of February 27, 2004
Prepared by Lynn Rosenthal

1. The meeting was called to order at 2:30 in T115/713. Members present: Aletha Baumann, Eustace Esdaille, Solomon Kabuka, Adam Parr, Lynn Rosenthal, Gwen Moolenar, Lorna Young-Wright, Denis Griffith, Joan Marsh, Debora Fontaine. (Bob Stolz continues to have a conflicting commitment at this time.)

1. The minutes of February 20, 2004 were approved.

2. Lynn Rosenthal reported that the costing sub task force had received the *basic* program group list, and had discussed approaches to costing. Particular issues, (summarized in an attached memo to that team) included
:

a) costing must take into account new responsibilities of Deans and program unit leaders, not just existing release,

b) *basic* program groups do not include "deep structure" which may well be appropriate in some areas, e.g. Business Administration, because such management needs will be addressed by proposals now being developed,

c) the need was again stressed for objective approaches to allocation of release and costs to program groups which are not expected to be equal in the amount of leadership management required.

Dr.Kabuka noted that it had been determined at the meeting that costing would include analysis of only those financial matters which would be changed as a result of restructuring.

3. The recent communication from the team developing position responsibilities was discussed and some problems noted. The Provost indicated that she is instructing the chairs of the teams to communicate through her to avoid miscommunications. (Approved minutes can be sent directly to Bob Godfrey for posting on the web site.)

3. The status of proposals from each area were reviewed and it was decided that further development would be continued with proposals due on Wednesday night, March 3, 2004.

4. Criteria for formation of Schools: Dr. Kabuka suggested an additional criterion to evaluate the extent to which composition of schools facilitated implementation of the University's mission.

5. Weighted ranking of the criteria for evaluating alternative composition of schools was approved for subsequent approval voting on proposed organization. Members were asked to rate the criteria. The provost approved of circulation of the criteria to the faculty.

6. The Provost noted the need for presentation of the new structure in June, and, working back through approval by the Board subcommittee, by Cabinet, and by the full task force, reminded the team of the need to complete the work of program identification within another week or two. The next meeting of the team will be on March 5, 2004.