Note – Mitch Watnik attended as an observer.

1. Review of Notes from Feb. 1, 2013 Meeting
   a. The notes were approved as submitted.

2. Subcommittee Reports for Criteria and Rubrics
   a. Quality
      i. The subcommittee has identified three broad quality measures:
         faculty, curriculum and student quality and outcomes.
      ii. Student evaluations were identified as one faculty quality measure,
         but those may not be available for this purpose. The group will
         check to determine.
      iii. The group suggested using 5 years of data, but there were
         questions about whether that is enough so they will review this
         again.
      iv. There was discussion about the use of Professional Activities in this
         criterion and ensuring it is supplemental to a program.
      v. Relevancy and innovations will need to be qualitative.
      vi. Regarding the student success portion of the student quality
         criterion there was some discussion about including graduation and
         time-to-degree.
   b. Potential and Unique Issues
      i. The subcommittee is suggesting using the term “unique issues” to
         cover the previously named “additional information” and that the
         two criterions should be combined into one.
      ii. They have proposed three states of resources: program has
         enough, program needs more, or what the program would do if it
         had less.
      iii. There was discussion about resource augmentation and how this
         should be worded and also about rating capacity.
      iv. Task group members were asked to send suggestions on this
         criterion to Tom Hird.

3. Program Definition
   a. The definition was presented to the Steering Committee last week, but
      due to lack of a quorum no action was taken.
   b. Members of the Steering Committee suggested adding “graduation
      requirements” as another category of program.
c. **There was a motion to add “graduation requirements” as an additional type of program to the program definition, which was passed.**

4. **Other**
   a. There was discussion about the role of the various parties in this process, including the Steering Committee and the campus president. It was explained that the Steering Committee is responsible for synthesizing the work of both task groups and making sure it is valid. The Steering Committee will solicit comments from the campus community and return the information back to the task groups. When both groups have completed their work, a report will be presented to the president’s cabinet. The president will forward recommendations that affect academic programs to the Academic Senate.
   b. Yet to be discussed are the weighting of each criterion and the various rating categories the group will use.
   c. The task group adjourned early to allow the subcommittees to meet.