1) **Review and accept notes from the 4/11 meeting**
   a. The notes were accepted.

2) **Task Group Updates**
   a. Support Program Task Group
      i. Rating and scoring
         1. For review and scoring the criteria have been grouped into four areas: mandate; importance; quality; and efficiency.
         2. There was a brief discussion about the evaluation process for the task group, which will have each service evaluated by 5 people (100 reports per person).
            a. There was discussion about issues that should be considered, including demand and redundancy elsewhere on campus.
   b. Instructional Program Task Group
      i. Criteria Weights
         1. There was a presentation about the weights developed for each of the criterion. Many of the comments from the
campus addressed the weighting, so the task group will review those comments at its next meeting.

ii. Rubrics
   1. The rubrics for all criteria were presented, noting that the rubrics for criteria 1 and 4 are not quite final.
   2. The Steering Committee raised some questions for the task group to consider.
   3. There was discussion about using SFR and how best to interpret the data, including finding a balance between programs heavily focused on lower division and those focused on upper division.
   4. There were some questions about the rubric for criterion #5 since it has more than one measurement.
   5. The task group hopes to finalize the rubrics on May 3, so they can then be posted for campus comment.

3) **New Business**
   a. **Campus Comments**
      i. **There was agreement that the campus comments should be posted on the website for everyone.**
      ii. A point was made that not all comments need to be addressed with changes to the template and that some items can be responded to in the FAQs or on an individual basis.
   b. The meeting scheduled for the May 9 will be put back on the calendar and will only be canceled if there is nothing for the agenda.
   c. A question was brought forward from the Senate CAPR committee about whether the PFD reports could substitute for the CAPR annual reports. It was affirmed that PFD should not interfere with existing Senate processes.