1) **Review notes from 11/26 meeting**
   a. Organization of guests and committee attendees should be separated
      i. Include a template for tracking attendance
   b. Notes to follow the agenda outline
   c. **Meeting notes from 11/26 were approved by the committee**
   d. **Notes will be posted except for closed sessions**

Having closed sessions has not yet been discussed – will hold off discussion for a later agenda.

1b) **Selection of Vice Chair/Secretary** – Added agenda item
   a. **Vice Chair**
      i. Mitch Watnik nominated for Vice Chair position
      ii. **No objections → Mitch Watnik has been appointed as Vice Chair**
b. Secretary
   i. One reason cited as a need for a Secretary would be if staff will not be permitted to attend closed sessions.
   ii. No need to make this decision until having closed sessions is addressed

2) Soliciting input from campus
   a. The committee reviewed two diagrams intended to explain the iterative communication process between the various PFD entities and the campus community and the timeline for the process. Some changes were suggested to each diagram.
      i. Both diagrams will be posted on the website
   b. Ideas for pushing information out to the campus community:
      i. RSS feed
      ii. Opt-in mailing list
   c. Campus survey
      i. Fields should not be character-limited
      ii. Cut & paste feature should be included
      iii. Include an optional name field
   d. Communique regarding the survey to be composed
      i. Providing group statuses might be challenging considering that both task groups are at different stages in the process
      ii. The goal is to get as much input as possible before 12/13 so that comments can be provided to the task groups when they discuss criteria and program definition on Dec. 14

3) Task force updates
   a. IPTG: Vice Chair Mangold described the following activity at the 11/30 meeting: Kris Erway, Carol Reese and Amber Machamer reported on data that could be used for the template to address criteria that might be established by the task group. Vice Chair Mangold provided information on how other universities have defined program, established and weighted criteria and evaluated programs. A preliminary program definition was presented for further discussion at the next meeting. 11 preliminary criteria were presented to the task group, which was divided into subcommittees. Each subcommittee will define what the criteria means and evaluate
whether the criteria fits CSU East Bay. The subcommittees will present their findings at the next meeting.

b. SPTG: Co-Chairs Nelson and Agrawal described the following activity at the 11/30 meeting: An updated set of criteria was presented for discussion. Suggestions were made for modifications, which will be reviewed by the group at its next meeting. The group has not yet established a program definition, which is significantly more complex on the administrative side, and is hoping that fleshing out criteria might help with the definition. A question was asked about posting this preliminary criteria on the website for the campus to view. The task group chairs believe that can be done after the Dec. 7 meeting of the task group, although the criteria would still be considered draft.

4) Meeting during winter quarter
   a. The group decided to continue meeting on Mondays from 4:00 – 5:30

5) Programs that do not fit neatly into instructional or support
   a. Several "programs" were identified that do not neatly fit into either the instructional or support group. The steering committee will need to provide direction to the task groups on the following:
      i. Athletics – seems generally to be support, except for the courses that athletes take as part of their participation in intercollegiate sports
      ii. academic department offices – consider including with instruction as part of each degree program except for those functions that are more substantive, such as graduate program admission
      iii. centers and institutes – seems to be support unless there is a curricular component
      iv. graduation writing requirement – closely related testing and instructional components – should they be considered together?
      v. GE office and the freshman program – support for administering the programs
      vi. ASI – university support for ASI activities will be considered under the support program group. However, the ASI as an entity will not be included in the review process since they have their own elected, legally separate, board which conducts its own prioritization activity