1. Call to Order: 9:05 a.m.

2. Approval of Minutes: Minutes from December 11, 2009 meeting were approved without objection.

3. Special recognition:
   Congratulations and appreciation were offered on the one-year service anniversaries of Marybeth Buechner and Anne Danenberg.

4. CCSSE Schedule for Spring 2010 (Community College Survey of Student Engagement):
   It was noted that a slide about the upcoming CCSSE was featured at Convocation. It is hoped that PRIE committee members will be a source of information about the CCSSE for other members of the college community. Dena Chubbic will send a file of basic information about the CCSSE scheduling to the PRIE committee members. Information that may be especially important to disseminate includes the following:
   a. Sac City doesn’t have control over which class sections are chosen to participate in the survey.
   b. Sac City doesn’t have control over which weeks of the semester are scheduled for administering the survey.
   c. Sac City will work with the faculty whose classes are chosen in order to find the time that is best for each faculty member, within the weeks allowed for the survey.

5. P.R.I.E. Committee Plans for Spring 2010:
   This discussion focused primarily on how to assist in preparing data for CSPC (College Strategic Planning Committee). The P.R.I.E. Office seeks to provide a large collection of data to members of the CSPC in March or April. The P.R.I.E. Committee is scheduled to meet once in February, twice in March, and twice in April. It was noted that e-mail communications also could be used to work on preparing data for the CSPC.
   a. Marybeth Buechner explained that last year’s CSPC data packet provided data organized by College Goals, and then the same data organized by topic.
b. Dena Chubbic mentioned that in Fall of 2009 the PRIE committee reviewed some of the data provided to the CSPC and offered suggestions of ways to format the data that might make it easier for readers to use. Marybeth Buechner said that the primary suggestion of the committee was to include more explanatory information beneath the graphs.

c. Thomas Greene suggested that another section might be added, featuring a list of “hot topics” that are currently of great interest to the various constituencies of the college. Examples include:

   i. Goals

   ii. Developmental Courses (how was this phrased?) & Basic Skills

   iii. Funding available for Career Technology, internship programs, and building connections with local high schools.

      1. Mel Duvall discussed how the efforts of two caring people generate a successful program, and if we document that success, then there is funding available from the Department of Education.

      2. Anne Licciardi shared that two faculty in her department are working on articulation agreements with local high schools.

   iv. External data

      1. What are the emerging industries seeking workers and offering a living wage?

      2. American Graduation Initiative: $15 billion in funding to generate an increase of 5 million students completing community college programs

      3. Funding available via Challenge Grants for innovations that contribute to student success

      4. Budget projections (Marybeth Buechner)

Several PRIE committee members were requested to bring “hot topic” data from their respective areas for use in developing the CSPC data packet.

d. Thomas Greene commented that due to the rapid pace of the strategic planning process but the more gradual pace of long-term college goals, it could be beneficial to designate certain years for a major review of college goals, in addition to a standard annual review of the college goals. There various positive comments about such an approach.

   i. Marybeth commented that some of the college goals could be grouped together under more general headings, and that could facilitate the review process.

   ii. Anne Licciardi mentioned that the district is guided by five strategic directions, and it would be beneficial for the college goals to be in alignment with those strategic directions.

6. Additional discussion:

   a. Suggestions were solicited for future “Did You Know” data items, resulting in the following suggestions:
i. Success of SCC’s career technology programs, such as cosmetology, railroad operations, aeronautics, etc.

ii. Success of ESL (percentage of students earning an A, B, or C grade)

iii. Interesting data from previous CCSSE, such as the high ratings students gave their relationships with their professors, or the high percentage of students who would recommend SCC to a friend or relative, or the small number of hours that most students spend studying each week

b. There was discussion about MyEdu.com (formerly known as “Pick-a-Prof”). Apparently the MyEdu.com website doesn’t explain how data is processed prior to publication. Marybeth Buechner mentioned that MyEdu’s report about her doesn’t match the actual data exactly.

7. Marybeth Buechner presented a tour of data available on InsideSCC.
   a. The URL is http://www.scc.losrios.edu/insideSCC
   b. The InsideSCC page takes an extremely long time to load, due to the calendar that uploads on the first page. (Anne Licciardi mentioned that much of the data can be accessed more rapidly through http://www.scc.losrios.edu/FacultyStaff.htm.
   c. “President’s Office,” PRIE Office, left side features links to a few data reports
   d. “Planning/Research” houses items such as:
      i. Unit Plans
      ii. Planning Process Data: many data collections, including:
         1. College Goals Measures
         2. SCC Survey Data (includes the CCSSE, the Noel Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory, etc.

e. “Governance”
   i. Standing Committees, PRIE, Agendas & minutes
   ii. Non Standing Committees, CSPC, Agendas minutes & planning documents.

8. Meeting Adjourned: 10:30 a.m.

Next Meeting: February 26th 9:00 a.m.