1. **Brief review of 2009-10 planning processes**
Discussion – it was noted that timing and deadlines have been a problem, in particular for IT and budget request details. It was noted that this year was unusual in that external events affected the timing of budget, book orders, etc.

2. **Overview of Institutional Effectiveness Reports**
These documents are currently in very rough draft form. Your input on their content and structure would be appreciated.

   - **Benchmark and Key Indicators Report**
   Selection of key indicators for college goals was conducted during this part of the agenda. There was some discussion of what key indicators are and how they are meant to be used. It was suggested that a term other than “key indicator” might be better. Goals 1-6 were reviewed and possible key indicators discussed. We will look at goals 7-9 at the next meeting. The committee then broke into small groups and the draft reports listed below were distributed for review. Comments were written on the draft reports and collected for use by PRIE.

   - **Fast Facts**
   - **Environmental Scan Report**
   - **Staff and College Processes Report**
   - **Basic Skills Report**
   - **Enrollment Report**
   - **First-year Student Report**
   - **Student Achievement Report**
   - **SLO Report**

3. **Meeting schedule for Fall 2010**
Several possible meeting times were suggested including:

   - Second, third, and fourth Friday of September from 1:00pm-4:00pm (from the CSPC charge)
   - Tuesdays 11:30-1:30pm August 31, September 7, 14 (and 21 if needed)
   - The Thursdays that the department chairs don’t meet in August and September 1:00-3:00 pm
   - Fridays 9:00-11:00am September 3, 10, 17 (and 24 if needed)
   - Fridays 1:30-3:30 September 3, 10, 17 (and 24 if needed)

4. **Procedural questions related to College Goals review:**
- **Suggestion related to selection of “key indicators” for each goal.** (see above)
• **Suggestion related to a three-year cycle where goals will be reviewed for substantive change only every third year.**

This suggestion was briefly discussed and there was general consensus that a three year cycle where goals would be reviewed for substantive change every third year would be useful. It was suggested that the cycle align with the accreditation cycle if feasible.

• **Suggestion relating to grouping of goals.**

This suggestion was briefly discussed; there was general consensus that the grouping presented was helpful but some logistical questions arose regarding how such a grouping might be used. Future meetings, perhaps in the fall, will need to look at this.

5. **Items for future agendas**

- Completion of selection of key indicators for goals
- Definition of 3 year cycle for goal review