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Opportunity (Purpose or Primary Reason for Project):

- There is opportunity to make the process more efficient for students and departments.
- The assumption is the petition for a late "W" grade process is averaging 25 days (between 7/1/09 – 6/30/11) and preventing students from taking the next step (receiving financial assistance and/or requesting an official transcript).
- Provide clarity to the late “W” grade process for departments and students.

Business Case (Budget Information):

- There is duplication of a petition review involving multiple departments.
- Reduction of the duplication review can save staff time, reduce process costs, and reduce the total time needed to review the petition.
- The assumption is there is variation in departments on how the petitions are being processed.

Goal (Expected Outcomes, Deliverables, and/or Results):

- Reduce staff time, process costs, and total time needed to review the petition.
- Create a standardized process for departments to use.

Scope (Constraints, Boundaries, and/or Key Risks):

- This project will look at when the petition is submitted to the Vice President of Student Affairs from the student to the department, and then returned back to Vice-President of Student Affairs.
- The grade appeal process will be out of scope as well as during the semester’s withdrawals.

Timeline (Define, Measure, Analyze, Improve, and Control):

Define and Measure: December 1, 2012
Analyze and Improve: February 1, 2012
Primary Measures:

- Number of petitions received:
  - 7/1/09 – 6/30/10 – (108) petitions received
  - 7/1/10 – 6/30/11 – (101) petitions received
  - 7/1/11 – 6/30/12 – (67)
- Number of days to process petitions
  - 7/1/09 – 6/30/10 – 28 days
  - 7/1/10 – 6/30/11 – 26 days
  - 7/1/11 – 6/30/12 – 22 days
- Dollars spent in hard costs
- Staff time spent processing the petitions

Other (Additional Resources Needed, Critical Considerations, and/or Initial Concerns):

- A consideration is that some of the documentation provided by the student may be confidential.
- Need to review the HLC (Higher Learning Commission) information to see if there are any requirements that affect this process.
- The impact this project has on tuition appeals.

Supporting Data & Process Map(s): Reference the Petitioning for a “W” Grade Process Map