SLT Budget Reduction Process Committee

Friday, September 9, 2011

CSC 125-127

10:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.

Team Members: Aleta Anderson, Cindy Martin, Fatima Nieves, Fiona Hert, Jim Peterson, Laurie Chesley (co-facilitator), Lisa Freiburger (co-facilitator), Marty DeVries, MaryBeth Beighley, Mike Light, Pam DeGryse, Wanda Acevedo-Ferrer

Present: Aleta Anderson, Fiona Hert, Jim Peterson, Laurie Chesley, Lisa Freiburger, Marty Devries, Mike Light, Pam DeGryse

1. Welcome
2. The minutes of the September 2 meeting were approved.
3. We went through an extensive review of all of our draft documents.

Characteristics that GRCC’s Budget Process Should Possess

- Pam suggested revisions to this document that would improve clarity and group similar items together. Pam and Fiona agreed to work on these revisions. The revisions will be shared with the committee at the next meeting.

Strategic Planning / Budget Development Process Timeline

- This document still needs to be edited/re-created based on feedback from the last meeting.

GRCC College-Wide Data

- We agreed to one change – to eliminate the line that requires FTE under Student Count.

Questions to be Addressed by All Programs and Services

- We agreed to group questions by category – Alignment, Impact, and Recommendations.
- We agreed to revise questions 3 and 4 (see attached document) to better distinguish between the internal and external demand for programs/services.
- We agreed to expand question 5 to provide a sense of history – what actions have been taken, what actions are being taken, and what actions should be considered for the future?
**Template for Non-Academic Programs and Services**

- We agreed to minor changes in phrasing (see attached document) under the section entitled Net Cost of Program/Service.

**Template for Academic Programs and Services**

- We agreed to minor changes in phrasing (see attached document) under the section entitled Net Cost of Program/Service.
- We added “endowments” to the section entitled Potential Sources of Revenue.
- We added the following to the category of Staff and Students: transfer rates, current enrollments, and a notation that the question regarding non-traditional students was related to the Perkins Core Indicators.
- We deleted the following under the category of Staff and Students: Are programs/services duplicated elsewhere on campus or in the area?
- The most significant changes were made to the category of Program Relevance and Quality. They included:
  - Adding a sense of history to all of the questions – what happened in the past, what is happening in the present, and what is planned for the future?
  - Change Professional Standards/Accreditations to Evidence of Meeting Professional Standards.
  - Add two more points to address: 1) What is the cultural/community impact of the program? 2) What are the internal College contributions of the program?

4. Next, we brainstormed the major issues we still have left to address. They include:
   - We need to define our unit of analysis – how are we determining programs and services? The suggestion was made that this should be an EBCO decision.
   - We need to define our timeline and schedule for the budget reviews. Which programs and services will be evaluated when?
   - We need to develop rubrics/evaluation tools for our templates that the future Budget Committee can use to make decisions around maintaining, enhancing, reducing, or eliminating programs/services.
   - We need to test our process with programs to ensure that it is functional.

5. We discussed our homework for next week: a) Review all draft documents again, and b) Begin thinking about what a rubric/evaluation tool might look like.