1. Review and approve meeting notes from March 15, 2013 meeting
   a. The 3/15/13 notes were affirmed with the following change:
      i. Add that there continue to be issues that need to be addressed
         with the program count for GE.

2. Review the program report template
   a. Criterion 5 – Unique Issues and Future Directions
      i. The title was previously changed from “Potential” to “unique issues
         and future directions.”
         1. There was discussion regarding whether “potential” and
            “future directions” have the same meaning.
         2. A vote was proposed on three alternative titles for this
            criterion. The current title “Unique Issues and Future
            Directions” received 13 votes, so this title remains and
            no further votes were taken. The other two options were
            “Potential and Future Directions” and “Potential and Unique
            Issues”.
      ii. Assumptions and Instructions
         1. All prompts will be changed to “up to” 125 words instead of
            “minimum.”
         2. There was discussion about the meaning of “capacity”.  
            Subcommittee members indicated that it could range in
            meaning from the quality of design, enrollment, etc. There
            was discussion about this topic and the group will consider
            editing.
         3. There was discussion about the open-ended prompt allowing
            the report writer to present information not covered
            elsewhere in the report, whether it ought to tie to other
            prompts in the template, how much space ought to be
            provided, and allowing for departments to address the
            impact of previous budget cuts.
            a. It was agreed that this criterion ought to cover budget
               cuts, budget augmentation and potential and potential
               be allowed up to 250 words.
         4. The subcommittee presented two tables of information that
            the report writer would complete. The first asks the
            department to allocate FTE faculty, teaching assistants and
            technical staff across programs; and the second asks them
to identify the number of courses and sections offered for different purposes (e.g. major, GE, cluster, area F, etc.).

5. There was discussion about the value of knowing how faculty are being used to support the curriculum. The group concluded there was not sufficient value to ask department chairs to complete this table and therefore it will be dropped from the template.

6. There was discussion about the value of the information sought from the second table on the courses/sections offered. The group concluded this table will be put in the background information portion with only the information that can be provided from Institutional Research for the past five years.

   iii. The task group unanimously voted to affirm this criterion.

   b. All of the criteria are integrated and do not necessarily stand alone, which will be taken into account as the task group evaluates each criterion.

   c. There was a suggestion to change the order of all criteria with this fourth criterion being the first. As time had run out, this conversation will be resumed at a later point.

3. Other

   a. The importance of having the Support Program task group ask the same question about the impact of previous cuts was raised.

   b. Several members raised the issue of inaccuracy of the institutional data and how that can be corrected and when. The vice chair will work with Institutional Research and try to get data out to departments early so those issues can be resolved before the report templates are populated and distributed to departments.

* Two observers were present.