1) **Review notes from 12/14/2012**
   a. 12/14 notes need to expressly acknowledge the focus group process that was used.
      i. **12/14 recent notes were approved by committee, with the amendment noted above**
   b. The Administration & Finance department is reviewing their program list with an eye toward reducing it.
   c. The program list from the Office of the President has been received.
   d. The college Deans will come up with a list of their common services next week.
   e. When writing the criteria, make sure that the prompts within each criterion help to get at the useful information.

2) **Review draft criteria – Dec. 21 version**
   a. The responses from the last meeting have been integrated into the criteria chart.
      i. There is much similarity with the IPTG.
   b. There is a new criterion called “other” to allow the programs to cover what was not specifically asked in the report template.
   c. Consider what information is actually needed to understand and evaluate a program.
      i. How important is cost when we are not comparing apples to apples? Cost will be looked at with revenues and efficiency rather than being looked at in isolation.
   d. The importance of each criterion will be determined by weighting.
   e. Add another criterion regarding potential opportunities.
   f. Proposed criteria:
      i. Relevance
      ii. Quantity / quality of resources
      iii. Productivity / effectiveness / efficiency
      iv. Potential for improvement
      v. Other
   g. Proposed criteria will go to the Steering Committee and posted online for campus input.
h. A trial run of the questions/prompts was done by a volunteer program.

Lessons learned:
   i. Some programs could be condensed.
   ii. There was repetition in the criteria.
   iii. “Efficiency” is subjective.
   iv. The group could get a good sense of what the program was about by doing additional trial runs.
      1. Interpretation of certain criterion could be different for different people

3) **Next Steps**

a. The task group established subcommittees for the purposes of reviewing one criterion and developing prompts/questions for their criterion.
   i. Relevance: Angela, David, Joanna
   ii. Quantity / Quality of Resources: Borre, Jim, Linda
   iii. Productivity / Efficiency: Debby, Jeanette, Stan
   iv. Potential opportunities: Brian and Erik

b. Each group will come up with the questions that programs will be asked to complete. The group members are to think of questions that will be useful, that will generate good data, and not be too burdensome.
   i. The focus is on services.
   ii. Members will think about the information they want and create the questions that will generate that information.
   iii. The task group discussed the value of conducting satisfaction surveys. If there is a desire to do surveys, a decision must be made immediately and communicated to the steering committee so that this survey effort can be put at the top of the list.
      1. **The committee concluded it wants to conduct surveys that will ask respondents to rate usage, satisfaction and importance of services.**
   iv. The task group discussed sample questions and constituents to be surveyed for the various services. Linda and Erik Pinlac will identify the most critical services to survey and bring that list back to the group next week.