1) **Review notes from 2/1/2013 meeting**
   a. It was suggested that the word “glossary” be used instead of “thesaurus” under item & at the bottom of pg. 2
   b. The meeting notes from 1/25 were affirmed by the task group.

2) **Review comparison institutions criteria and questions/prompts**
   a. The group was given a table that compared the criteria and questions developed by East Bay with criteria and questions used at three other institutions that have reviewed administrative services. Task group members were asked to review the comparisons and come back prepared to offer any modifications to the list that has been developed by East Bay thus far.
   b. There was some discussion about using different questions/prompts for some of the services that have an institutional or external focus. No decision was reached.
   c. There was discussion about whether some information ought to be collected as background and not included as part of the weighting, such as the description of the service.
   d. Regarding customer surveys, it was pointed out that this needs to happen within the next two weeks.
      i. The survey does not necessarily need to be dependent on completing the list of services.
         1. The current list of services developed for the student survey will be sent to the task group again, along with the sample survey templates.
         2. The group was asked to review this material and come prepared to discuss at the next meeting.

3) **Continue review of pilot tests**

4) **Discussion with Vice Presidents**
   a. The vice presidents expressed that a helpful result of this process would be for them to know from the university community what is most important and where resources ought to be invested.
   b. The current lists of services from the five divisions are not consistent to each other and the discussion focused on how best to achieve a consistent list of services, not organizational departments.
i. There was agreement among the vice presidents and the task group members that, when appropriate, common terminology for services should be used across the divisions, e.g., “advising students”.

ii. CFO Wells reviewed the process and resulting list of services that was developed for Administration and Finance (AF), which the vice presidents agreed was a useful model.
   1. The AF model will require that managers allocate costs of services across individuals who may be involved in the delivery of more than one service by determining the amount of time each individual devotes to any specific service.
   2. There was acknowledgement that the task group needs to work with a manageable list of services for the whole campuses, and that the divisions might need to look for ways to consolidate services further.

c. The task group will consider the AF approach to identifying services and whether it should be the model for all divisions to use. This will be on the agenda for the next meeting.
   i. There was recognition that finalizing the list of services will likely be an iterative process between the task group and the vice presidents/managers.

d. The task group was encouraged to consider using a model that could be used in future years.

5) Meeting days and times during spring quarter
   a. Mondays from 10:30a – 12:30p seem to be the best option. This will be confirmed with one missing task group member.

6) Other
   a. There was a review of the ground rules the group established for itself at the beginning of the process. Members were encouraged to discuss and share the activity of the group with others until they get to decision making points about services. Confidentiality applies at this point in the process.
   b. The current list of criteria for the Instructional Program Task Group was shared with the group.
      i. Consistency with strategic commitments and ILOs
      ii. Demand
      iii. Program quality
      iv. Revenues, cost, and efficiency
      v. Potential and unique issues