Meeting was called to order by Jim Zimmerman (Chair) at 9:00 AM.

1. Motion (Hukai/Mogen) to approve the minutes for 2/1/10 meeting. Motion passed.

2. Guest/program representative James Gostomski (Adapted Physical Education) was recognized and asked to share input and answer questions to clarify points that might factor into where the Adapted Physical Education Program (Minor) should fit within the prioritized list of programs generated from the Program Prioritization project/process. Professor Gostomski shared the following points:

   a. At the time that the Program Prioritization program reports were generated there was no actual faculty member on staff working in Adapted Physical Education (A.P.E.). Therefore the number of students in that program was low and declining.

   b. Currently approximately 70% of the public schools in Minnesota/Wisconsin require all P.E. teachers to be trained in A.P.E. Without the minor we will be sending out graduates unqualified to be hired.

   c. The current A.P.E. minor at UWRF completes all requirements for licensure in Adapted Physical Education (for both WI/MN).

No formal action related to the APE program was taken by the committee following Gostomski's presentation.

3. Discussion was initiated on how to proceed with generating recommendations to faculty senate regarding the Program Prioritization list and process. Discussed included the following talking points, concerns, and possible conclusions to be included in the final recommendations:

   • The program prioritization process used was not without flaws. It would be wise to be ‘gentle’ in any actions taken that would be based on these results. We recognize that placement in any of the three categories might change if a different process were used.

   • Significant adjustments and changes have already been made within and between programs to increase collaboration and productivity as a result of the program prioritization list.
Inherent Flaws in the program prioritization process seem to target interdisciplinary programs for being ranked in the bottom 20%.

Committee member Ian Williams commented that The University might the question the policy of making smaller programs vulnerable (through the program prioritization process) as it may not actually serve students. Students need exposure to programs not immediately popular enough to make them fiscally attractive to the University.

Whatever actions are taken as a result of the final list of prioritized programs, the goal of reallocation of resources to more effectively serve the University’s mission and goals (and not to ‘pay back’ system or cover deficits) should be maintained.

There was a consensus agreement that the chair should attempt to gather the various reflected thoughts concerning Program Prioritization, and generate a ‘first draft’ of recommendations from AP&P regarding Program Prioritization. The draft proposal will be completed by the next meeting of AP&P on Monday, February 15th.

5. Motion (Williams/Spencer) to adjourn. Motion passed.

The meeting was adjourned at 9:55 AM.