1. Review and approve meeting notes from April 5, 2013 meeting
   a. The 4/5/13 notes were affirmed.

2. Update from Steering Committee Meeting
   a. The Steering Committee affirmed the template with minor changes.
   b. Lori will work on getting the template out to the community. It should be ready on Monday.
      i. The campus input will go to Lori and Lori will relay the information to the IPTG during the weekly meetings.
      ii. The deadline to send feedback is May 1.
   c. The SPTG template is out for comment.
      i. The information went out via massmail.
   d. There will be informational meetings for familiarizing departments with the template in which chairs will be asked to attend and help.

3. DCIE
   a. How will the DCIE programs be reviewed?
      i. Possible ways to report for DCIE:
         1. One possibility is to have only two reports which would separate credit (14 programs within one report) and one report for non-credit bearing programs (19 programs within one report).
         2. The other possibility is to look at each program separately on its own report which would create 33 reports instead of 2.
      ii. There was discussion about the options on how DCIE would report their programs.
   b. There was a motion that DCIE non credit programs be reported by DCIE and credit programs would be allocated to the programs that wish to own them. If the DCIE credit programs go unclaimed, they would be reported by DCIE in a separate program report. (There would be one non-credit report and one credit report AFTER programs have been allocated to other applicable programs.)
      i. The motion was seconded and voted upon with the majority in favor.

4. Weighting
   a. Example weights from other universities were shown to the group.
   b. The task group chairs prepared a proposed weighting scale:
i. Consistency with SSCs and ILOs – 10%
ii. Internal and External demand – 20%
iii. Program Quality – 40%
iv. Revenues and Costs – 20%
v. Unique Issues and Future Directions – 10%
c. There was also a proposal to keep all weights equal and other weighting combinations were discussed by the task group.
d. There was much discussion about the weights, what they tell us, and rubrics.
e. There were seven columns of proposed weights after extensive group discussion.
   i. Voting: The group will vote on the seven proposals and drop the lowest results.
      1. Round one: 5 voted for A, 0 voted for B, 11 voted for C, 0 voted for D, 2 voted for E, 2 voted for F, 0 voted G. There were 21 eligible votes.
      2. Round two (with the lowest three dropped): 8 voted for A, 8 voted for C, 4 voted for E, 1 voted for F.
      3. Round three (with only A and C left): 4 voted for A, 16 voted for C. 1 abstained.
      4. Column C will be the weighting used by the task group with a vote of 16 in favor. Column C listed the weights as follows:
         a. Consistency with SSCs and ILOs – 10%
         b. Internal and External demand – 25%
         c. Program Quality – 30%
         d. Revenues and Costs – 25%
         e. Unique Issues and Future Directions – 10%

5. Categories
   a. There was group discussion about the category labels.
      i. There was lingering discussion on the use of “quartiles.”
         1. There was some discussion about what each quartile would mean as far as funding but the group did not go in depth.
         2. There was a suggestion to use quartiles together with the enhance-maintain-review-restructure categories.
   b. The discussion will be continued during the next meeting after the Chairs get clarification on the group’s charge from the Steering Committee.

6. Other
   a. The SPTG has a survey out regarding services and the IPTG was urged to fill it out.