Item #	Topic/Activity	NOTES
1. 2.	Announcements: Minutes and Agenda approval	 Plan to attend the October RP conference. COGNOS is still working Ruth attended the "Innovations Conference in San Diego. Technology was highly promoted. How can we catch up? The agenda and minutes were approved.
3.	Reporting from other College Committees: SGC- Gil, Ruth PDAC- Ruth, Denise DE – Ruth GE- Gil Curriculum –Gil, Terence IDEA – Gil, Humberto TLP – Gil, Terence	SGC • The next BRIC retreat is March 18 th • SGC will have a retreat March 30 th – subject Accreditation. PDAC • Leadership workshops have been ongoing every other Friday and EXCEL trainings have occurred. • Blackboard 9.1 training coming in April. Curriculum • Updating of online supplements for FA11 offering • Outdated courses, Title V • Course designators correctly placed • Review of Distance Education Best Practices and Policy TLP • Restructure of cycle of assessment • TLP Survey • Assessment integrated into Program Review process

		GE • Online Supplement • GE Seminar Planning • FA10 Assessment report analyzing D.E. • BSI funding for D.E. related activities IDEA • No Feb. Meeting • Revisions are being made to the Student Equity Plan. • CUE work – what next? Another team is working on this discussion. • A solid outline is being developed to integrate diversity throughout our institution.
4.	BRIC: Institutional Effectiveness –Gil, Humberto	 Planning meetings have been held to prepare for the next BRIC retreat on March 18th – 12:30 to 5:00 KC Greaney of Santa Rosa Jr. College will be the facilitator. Educational Plan vs. Strategic Plans, both or one? When do we assess our planning processes needs to be discussed. SGC and Planning Committees are invited to this retreat.

5.	Program Review – Gil	Subgroup is talking about revision to program
5.		review.
		• PR will not be resetting to FA11 – planning for a
		FA12 comprehensive plan.
		• FA11 will be an annual update with "more".
		Including some integration of assessment questions.
		• Eventually having program review open all year is
		being discussed. Use of tabs for this with a
		deadline, close the current year tab and open the next years to keep it going.
		• Currently there is no process to give feedback to
		faculty on their program reviews. A peer review
		committee was discussed as a possibility. Deans
		read them all currently. How do we communicate
		that the plan does not meet standards. A rubric will be developed to evaluate that will assist in the
		process.
		• What will enable a "culture change"? How do we
		get programs to come into compliance and do the
		program review for the right reasons and not just to
		get it done (usually by the same few members of a program) or for funding?
		• A committee of two managers, two faculty and two
		classified staff could review them using a rubric to
		measure.
		• Training with feedback was recommended on front
		end of program review. Not just on the

		 technology/mechanics of it. Our current technology would allow for a series of tabs (i.e., budget; goals; and/or objectives) for each program that could be reviewed. Experts in those areas can give feedback and advice. Additionally a report can be generated to check if the program review results are meeting the goals of the college. Gil will put together what we have discussed today and bring it back to the committee. A subgroup will be needed to evaluate how well the Master Plan goals are being addressed. Achievement of objects from the past two years reports also.
6.	Institutional Effectiveness	Humberto reported he has sent his report out for feedback California is changing. It is headed to an era of student learning using data for improvement. Indicators were developed.
7.	Assessing Planning Processes	A committee has been formed. They will map out all the college plans. Where are we in all the planning processes? How are they connected? Could benchmarks be plugged into these processes? SGC is the keeper of the Master Plan and looked at plans at one of their retreats; this may provide some good information. BRIC grant should help with these questions and alignments.

Note-taker: Margaret Hertstein, Meeting adjourned at 4:30 pm