Support Program Task Group
Meeting Notes
November 30, 2012
1:00 – 2:30 pm

1) **Review Notes from 11/23/2012 Meeting**
   Notes from the last meeting were approved with no modifications

2) **Review draft criteria**
   Chair Agrawal shared a list of criteria taken from the discussion at the last meeting, combined with criteria suggestions from the book. The group discussed that for the purpose of identifying criteria, the focus should be on the big picture.

   There was discussion about combining history with future opportunities as one criteria. Some members of the group did not want to lose the history aspect because there are reasons why programs are in place. History can inform future opportunities. The group agreed to keep both history and future opportunities as criteria but separate them.

   There was discussion about what constitutes quality of service, which might include indicators such as reliability, empathy, appearance or knowledge

   There was discussion about measuring productivity, which could be characterized as output divided by input. Joining with another program could make a unit more efficient / effective and provide more resources.

   Members of the task group were encouraged to serve as the voice of the people they work with, and be sure concerns or input should also be brought to the committee as data.

   A question was raised about whether money and budget should be taken completely out of the scenario? Money could possibly get in the way of analyzing a program. Others suggested that budget is a common element for every department and should not be completely ignored.

   There was a suggestion that one criteria ought to be how does the unit contribute to recruitment, retention, and graduation of students?

   There was discussion about the origin of programs and agreement that there is either internal demand, external demand, or a mandate by law or the university mission.

   Every unit generates an output/service/unit and every unit needs input.

   The following organizational schema for criteria was proposed:
A: Inputs (resources) used
   A0. History of the service unit & purpose
   A1. Quantity of inputs/resources used
   A2. Quality of inputs/resources

B. Outputs generated
   B1. Quantity of service generated (amount of output)
   B2. Quality of service
   B3. Productivity, efficiency, cost-effectiveness (ratio of quantity of service/quantity of input used) (similar to B1/A1)

C. Justification for service

D. Future opportunities/possibilities, both known and perceived gaps

The criteria will later be weighted

3) **Review draft list of units of analysis**

   The Writing Skills Test is part of the English department / testing office. Service/ separate program of English dept.

   A list of service units will be published on the website for campus input and help to identify anything that might be missing.

4) **Future Meetings**

   Next meeting is 1:00-2:30 on Fri. Dec. 7. Dean Nelson will be absent, and Dean Agrawal will be late.

   Next meeting: start with discussion of measures