1) **Review and accept notes from 12/10 meeting**
   a. The notes were reviewed during the meeting and affirmed.

2) **Task force updates from 12/14 meetings**
   a. Support Program Task Group
      i. The SPTG started with eight different criteria, which were then combined into five. The group hopes to finalize the list of criteria sometime during the week of 1/14/13 and then forwarded to the steering committee and post for the campus community to comment. One program area attempted to answer the criteria prompts/questions and discovered that what it had assumed were three distinct programs, actually had more in common and likely could be combined into one program. Other program areas were encouraged to do the same testing. The committee was divided into four subgroups to refine the language defining each criterion and developing questions/prompts for the report template.
   b. Instructional Program Task Group
      i. The IPTG worked on a revised program definition which is still under discussion. At the last meeting in December, subgroups
provided input on definitions, consolidation and possible data measures and the chairs developed a consolidated list of criteria for further review at the next meeting. Like the SPTG the criteria have been consolidated into five. The combined subcommittees are meeting throughout the week to refine the criteria and data measures further. The subcommittees will report back on Friday, 1/18. Staff presented some ideas about existing data that could be used to populate the report template. Discussion with budget staff determined that central data is not categorized by program, and therefore the task group will need to work with the Dean’s offices to break down costs associated with programs. There is continuing discussion about which committee will look at academic department offices. The two groups will continue to discuss and resolve. There was also discussion about whether it might be a good investment for the university to come up with a system that captures budget and cost data for academic programs.

3) **Feedback from campus community**

a. The committee was reminded about the process, which has the task groups forwarded preliminary decision while at the same time posting those decisions on the web for campus comment. Active notification will be given to the campus about this new information.

b. The SPTG seeks Steering Committee support to prioritize a customer satisfaction survey. There are other groups on campus interested in conducting surveys of various campus constituents, and in order to avoid survey fatigue the SPTG seeks the endorsement of the Steering Committee to put its survey at the top of the list.

   i. Questions were asked about the survey audiences and survey format.

   ii. The SPTG is waiting for the final list of programs/services in order to know how to describe the program for its’ audiences.

   iii. Staff shared that they were able to include some questions on a systemwide survey of alumni that may be useful for the IPTG.

   iv. A pretest with a small group is recommended to make sure the language is understandable and that all programs/services/offices are covered.

   v. **The Steering Committee supported the prioritization of the SPTG survey.**

c. Comments received from the campus as a result of the request for input from the Steering Committee were shared with the group. There were very few comments received thus far. The same comments were shared with each of the task groups before their late December meetings. These comments will be posted on the website.
4) **New Business**

a. Is there a need or opportunity to have more forums?
   
i. Prompted from a student email.
   
ii. Publicity about the surveys should be explored to encourage both student and faculty participation, e.g. ASI blast or Pioneer newspaper coverage, message from the President, “Ask Me” type tables.

b. Template training for people responsible for completing the reports is currently scheduled for late February. The date is still tentative because it depends on the work of the two groups.

c. A resolution has been submitted for discussion at the Academic Senate that would require review of the criteria by CAPR and Senate. The chair reminded the committee that there will be many opportunities for members of the campus, including faculty, to provide comments/input on any decision by either group.