1) **Observers**  
   a. The task group has agreed that observers would not be present during deliberations.

2) **Second Reading**  
   a. A second reading of reports was done on reports that fell in the bottom category.  
   b. Scores were submitted.  
   c. There may be some errors as the reviewers provided different numbers for the numbers of degrees and for FTES, which should not vary.  
      i. These numbers will be corrected by the chairs based on the score sheet.  
      ii. There was an error in one of the formulas. The formula will be edited on the master summary sheet.  
   d. 25 of the programs received a slightly higher score in the second reading.  
   e. Scores were similar but Criterion 2 showed the most variability.  
   f. If the new scores were used, 12 of the 28 programs would move up.  
   g. If some programs get moved up a level, then other programs will drop to the lower 10%.

3) **What will be done with the 2nd reading scores?**  
   a. There was a suggestion that the score from the second reading be used to move programs up in category but that no program should be moved down.  
   b. Programs that don’t fit into the rubrics should be evaluated differently.  
   c. There was discussion about the scoring process, results, category names, the initial charge, and how programs fit into the process.  
   d. The programs that landed in the bottom category were presented.  
      i. Some programs on the list were discussed.  
      ii. Many received low scores because the report was poorly written.  
   e. The task group was polled to see if they first wanted to revisit the category names or to deal with the use of the 2nd reading.  
      i. **14 members preferred to decide what to do with the data first.**  
   f. The task group presented possible options of working with the second reading and voted:
i. The second reading would not be used to move programs out of category 4 but to verify the work already done. Only the first reading would be used.
   1. 15 members were against incorporating the second reading, but use the initial scoring since it closely mirrored the first score.

4) **Categories**
   a. The names of the category titles were revisited.
   b. There was a motion that the categories be renamed as:
      i. Currently Distinctive Programs
      ii. Comparatively sustainable programs
      iii. Reconsider/review funding and/or organization
      iv. Provided weakest justifications
   c. There was discussion about verbiage and amount of the above category proposals.
      i. The group determined that they need to decide upon how many categories they would use.
         1. Having three categories would result in 30% being in the lowest category.
      ii. The motion (see 4-b) was withdrawn.
      iii. The group was polled to determine if they are leaning toward using 3 or 4 categories:
         1. 6 voted for 3 categories as the current preference.
         2. 11 voted for 4 categories as the current preference.
   d. The program standing is as follows:
      i. Top 20% – 71 programs
      ii. Upper 50% – 183 programs
      iii. Lower 20% – 72 programs
      iv. Bottom 10% - 28 programs

5) **Next Steps**
   a. Corrections to scores must be sent in.
   b. Teams that have programs that don’t fit the process or otherwise cannot be accurately rated, must be identified for the chairs.
   c. The task group was asked to consider the presentation of the programs as they fall into the categories.
      i. Alphabetically with no scores versus ranked by scores
   d. Reviewing GE and Library
      i. GE and Library need to be specially reviewed.
         1. A different super team was developed with a person from each college and the chairs.
   e. The group will plan to meet on March 14 and 21.