1. Review and approve meeting notes from March 1, 2013 meeting
   a. Notes were not yet available for review.

2. Review Program Report Template
   a. There was discussion about allowing an opportunity for the program to
      comment on any data that has been provided from the institution if they
      think there are errors. There was agreement that this should be permitted.
   b. Criteria 1 – Alignment with Shared Commitments and ILOs
      i. There is a general agreement with the group to include the
         discipline ILO and modify the language to recognize that not all
         ILOs need to be addressed.
   c. Criteria 2 – Internal and External Demand
      i. There was discussion about pathways for students that might not
         be reflective of major and how best to incorporate that information.
      ii. There was a suggestion that the template provide space for a
          narrative to comment on the jobs data.
          1. The motion passed.
      iii. There was discussion about the jobs data, rubrics, and rating the
          narrative.
      iv. It was recognized that demand largely measures size and is a
          metric that should be considered.
      v. Summary: One proposal is to keep FTES and use quartiles (or
         absolute numbers?). The group will keep graduate and
         undergrad separate. Minors and sections will be eliminated.
         There will be no narrative score attached to the rubric and the
         two previous narratives will be for context only.
      vi. There was consensus to use quartiles and put the narrative in
          category 5 near the rubric.
   d. Data
      i. Planning and Institutional Research staff indicated that running
         another pilot would be very time consuming.
      ii. It is likely that the IR team will be able to provide whatever it is
          needed.

3. Discussion with the Provost – 10:00am
   a. The Provost met with the task group and responded a variety of questions
      including the impact of this project, the process that will come after the
      task group’s work is concluded, and the group’s concern about the
      timeline that had been established.
4. Other  
   a. There was discussion about the development of FAQs ahead of time, that would demonstrate the task group had anticipated that a program may desire to comment or provide alternative data. The chairs are hoping to provide data to the programs before the report templates arrive, giving time for resolution of any differences about the data before departments begin drafting their responses to the report templates.  
   b. The group agreed to continue meeting on Fridays from 9:00a – 12:00p during the spring quarter.

* Three observers were present.