SLT Budget Reduction Process Committee

Friday, December 9, 2011

CSC 125-127

10:30 a.m. to 1:30 p.m.

Team Members: Aleta Anderson, 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, Lisa Freiburger, Marty DeVries, MaryBeth Beighley,

1. Welcome

2. The minutes of the November 11 meeting were approved.

3. We briefly recapped where we were in the process...with our next steps including sharing all documents with the full SLT team on Monday, holding open forums on 12/14 and 12/15, and asking SLT to vote to accept the process by early January of 2012.

4. We spent time reviewing the comments, thoughts and suggestions received from the SLT meeting held on 11/18, as well as several additional suggestions individual team members had received subsequent to the meeting (note: comments were provided to all team members prior to the meeting).

5. We reviewed ‘test’ templates, rubrics and scoring sheets; one for an academic program and one for a non-academic program.

6. Based on our review of feedback and our examination of the test templates and rubrics, we made the following changes to our documents:

   Academic template:
   - Clarified that we were looking for course fees only in the revenue section
   - Clarified that we needed enrollment based on headcount, and staff numbers based on FTE
   - Defined labor market as local, state or regional (vs. national)
- Requested data around total number of courses offered and total number of courses that transfer
- Clarified that ‘transfer’ means courses transfer to all of our top 5 transfer institutions (currently defined as Ferris, Western, Davenport, Grand Valley and Aquinas)

Non-academic template:
- Added the question “how do you evaluate your services, and “what have you done to improve quality” to the data requested on the template. It is our intention that the department or unit being evaluated would complete the responses.

Rubric A
- No changes

Rubric B – Academic
- Change the weighting for the first question in section 1 to 20% - increased from 15% (question around cost per student)
- Change the weighting for the first question in section 3 to 20% - decreased from 25% (question around assessment)
- Note: we had conversation around the weight assigned to the question on external partnerships and made the decision to leave it as is (the question will remain at 5%)

Rubric B – non-academic
- Reduced the weighting for the second question under the Budget heading to 5% (vs. 10%)
- Reduced the weighting for the section 2 question to 70% (vs. 75%)
- Added a question under the program quality section and assigned a weight of 10%

Finally, after reviewing all data, we agreed that in the overall evaluation process, template or rubric A would be weighted 40% and template or rubric B (either the academic or the non-academic as applicable) would be weighted 60%. This is in line with the SLT recommendation and other feedback received as well as our review of the test documentation.