1. Welcome

2. The minutes of the September 16 meeting were approved.

3. We went through another review of all of our draft documents. Everyone was happy with the drafts. No further changes were suggested at this time.

4. All members were asked to share the feedback they had received on our SLT presentation and our draft budget review model. Very little feedback was received. Only Laurie received responses to her email to all faculty and staff in SAS, and then there were only four. Laurie shared the comments with the committee. No trends were identifiable in the four, but with such a small number, that's not surprising. There was a great deal of discussion and concern about the lack of feedback. It was suggested that Laurie and Lisa send an AllStaff email, sharing the draft plan and asking for feedback. Although some suggested that doing so would relieve SLT members of their responsibility for sharing information with those whom they represent, it was initially agreed that we would take that action.

5. The committee spent the majority of the meeting discussing the next iteration of the evaluation rubric. Lisa had taken Mike’s initial draft and incorporated the feedback garnered at the most recent meeting. Lisa explained her rubrics in detail, and committee members asked many questions. Creating a rubric is a very complex task, and it became quickly obvious that it would be very difficult to match item-for-item our templates with our rubrics.

6. After going through the rubrics in their entirety, the committee stepped back for a time to discuss our philosophy of how the budget evaluation should occur. We discussed many questions like: How much should the narrative, more qualitative elements of the evaluation
count? How much should the data points, the more quantitative elements count? Fiona shared
a model of program evaluation from one of her doctoral program textbooks, and we discussed
the merits of having a more simple model. For a time we discussed whether our budget review
process should have a recommendation to “eliminate” a program or whether that
recommendation should be to “seek efficiencies.” The committee discussed using our next SLT
presentation time to get feedback from the larger team on what they would like to see in an
evaluation tool and how they think it should be used. It was suggested that we create two
different evaluation rubrics and get general feedback on each of those – one more detailed and
quantitative, and the other more general and qualitative. The committee then agreed to divide
into two subteams to work on each rubric.

7. Next steps: Each subteam will bring its rubric to the next meeting on October 14 to discuss. At
that meeting, we also can decide how we might use the evaluation rubrics for feedback at the
October 21 all-SLT meeting. At this point, the committee agreed that we would use the SLT
meeting for feedback and not go back and ask again via email for input on the budget review
model we have already proposed.