SLT Budget Reduction Process Committee

Friday, September 16, 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, Cindy Martin, Fatima Nieves, Fiona Hert, Jim Peterson, Laurie Chesley, Lisa Freiburger, Marty DeVries, MaryBeth Beighley, Wanda Acevedo-Ferrer

1. Welcome
2. The minutes of the September 9 meeting were approved.
3. We went through another review of all of our draft documents.

Characteristics that GRCC’s Budget Process Should Possess

• The committee unanimously liked Pam’s and Fiona’s edits to the Characteristics document. Laurie will tweak the grammar.

GRCC College-Wide Data

• We agreed to add a line for Contingency Employees.

Questions to be Addressed by All Programs and Services

• The committee approved all of the changes made; no further revisions were suggested.

Template for Non-Academic Programs and Services

• The committee approved all of the changes made; no further revisions were suggested.

Template for Academic Programs and Services

• The committee approved all of the changes made; only a few minor phrases were added to improve clarity.

Strategic Planning / Budget Development Process Timeline
• The committee reviewed Lisa’s improved and expanded timeline and liked it very much. Some minor changes were suggested in wording.

4. A suggestion was made for future consideration: do the questions posed on each template ask for an appropriate range of trend data?

5. The committee spent time reviewing Mike Light’s DRAFT rubric / evaluation tool for the narrative questions portion of our proposed process. We were very appreciative of Mike’s efforts, which got us started on a difficult task. The following suggestions were made regarding the rubric.
   a. The rubric as it was drafted was quite good. We like the model in general.
   b. Our final rubric should use the same language that is used on our narrative questions document (e.g. consistent language is needed).
   c. We should have a 1-5 score for each category of evaluation.
   d. A rubric on the narrative questions should have separate evaluation categories for internal and external demand for the program/service.
   e. We also felt that the rubric could be adapted for use on the templates (for both non-academic and academic programs/services). We would just need to make sure that the language of the templates and the rubric was consistent (and, thus, more quantitative in nature).
   f. We agreed that Laurie / Lisa would take these suggestions and try to rework the rubrics for our next committee meeting.

6. We spent some time discussing our presentation for the SLT meeting on September 23. We agreed to keep the PowerPoint more general and to refer the SLT members and those whom they represent to the SLT website to review documents in greater specificity. We agreed that Lisa and Laurie would present, but that all committee members would sit at the front of the room and assist in answering questions as needed.

7. Finally, we outlined the issues we have yet to address.
   a. Laurie will schedule additional meetings at the same time for upcoming weeks.
   b. We will need to have EBCO’s determine what units of analysis we’ll be using for this process (e.g. how we will determine programs and services).
   c. We will need to revise templates as needed based on how programs and services are determined.
   d. We will need to incorporate feedback from SLT and those they represent on our draft process and documents.
   e. We will need to determine timelines and schedules for our proposed budget review process.