

RESTRUCTURING TASK FORCE – PROGRAM GROUP IDENTIFICATION

Draft minutes of the meeting of February 13, 2004

Prepared by Lynn Rosenthal

1. The meeting was called to order at 2:35 in T101/713. Members present: Aletha Baumann, Eustace Esdaille, Adam Parr, Lynn Rosenthal, Gwen Moolenar, Deborah Fontaine, Lorna Young-Wright, Joan Marsh, Denis Griffith. (Solomon Kabuka had notified the team that he had a commitment off island. Bob Stolz has a conflict and was represented by Adam Parr.)

2. The Charge or Goal developed online was amended and adopted as presented in the attached file of working documentation.

3. The definitions of programs and program groups as presented in the file was adopted. The existence of a different definition of “program” in the context of program alignment was noted by Aletha Baumann. (She subsequently emailed that definition and Lynn Rosenthal prepared the comparative discussion presented in the file RESTRUCTURING vs REALIGNMENT PROGRAMS.)

4. The communications from the cost task force were discussed. (See attached RESTRUCTURING - 2.11 FROM COST TASK FORCE)

The program group team agreed with the suggested cycle of definition-cost interactions between the two teams.

The program group team noted that the definitions of program, program group, and criteria for programs developed were responsive to requests for this information.

The program group team notes that leaders of groups will probably have varying levels of responsibility and effort and therefore presumably different levels of release. The team therefore requests the cost team to consider developing a quantifiable approach to assigning release, possibly based on numbers of full and part time faculty, number of degree programs, FTE student enrollment, responsibility for facilities and labs, performances and special events, etc. Such a well defined approach to release time assignment will be needed to compare alternative proposals for program group management.

The program group team wishes to remind the cost team that it will be necessary to include all costs implied by program group definitions, e.g. where a program group includes faculty on both campuses and has a single leader a significant travel budget is implied.

5. The list of steps to be taken by the team in order to define programs was adopted as presented in the working documentation file.

6. The list of existing management was reviewed and amended. (See attached file)

7. The list of programs was reviewed and amended. (See attached file.) Note that this list may still be incomplete and the Chair is still seeking further clarification in some areas. Corrections or additional information is welcome.

The inclusion of grant funded programs, such as the Emerging Caribbean Scientists as suggested by Stolz, was discussed. It was noted that these and other cross-disciplinary, grant funded initiatives usually include funding for leadership under a PI and sometimes for administrative or technical assistance as well. Such initiatives contribute to matrix relationships among program groups but will not be considered as program groups in the team's definitions of the permanent program groups and their management.

8. The team will continue with step 5 by email.

Review group membership strengths, campus locations and match with program group criteria; adjust as appropriate by combining or splitting groups retaining the proviso that it is possible to appoint a single, effective leader to any group, and the objective of limiting to ten the number of people reporting to a single manager or leader.

9. The team decided to continue to meet on Fridays at 2:30. The chair noted that with continued strong interactions online between meetings it might be possible to conclude the business of the team with one meeting to review program groups and one to review composition of schools.

10. The meeting adjourned at 3:40 pm.