Planning for Distinction
Support Program Task Group
Meeting Notes
April 8, 2013

1) **Review notes from 2/22, 3/1, 3/22 and 3/26/2013 meetings**
   a. The meeting notes from 2/22, 3/1, 3/22, and 3/26 were affirmed by the task group.

2) **Report from Steering Committee**
   a. The Steering Committee reviewed the criteria, rubrics and report template completed by the SPTG.
      i. There was a recommendation to remove all the detail of the rubrics that use a scale and provide an example of what would constitute a good response.
      ii. There were suggestions to prompt the campus community to consider certain aspects of the criteria and report template, including weighting that might be given to individual criterion of questions.
      iii. They agreed to allow comments to be collected until April 30.
   b. The Steering Committee recommended that SPTG representatives have meetings with division managers and academic department chairs to review the report template and take feedback directly from those who will be completing the reports. Those meetings will be scheduled within the next couple of weeks and some members of the task group may be asked to participate, as their schedules allow.

3) **Review Template**
   a. There was discussion about the feedback from the Steering Committee and the task group offered their feedback regarding the revised template.
      i. There was minor wordsmithing throughout the document.
      ii. A legend might be added to provide clarity when rubrics are shaded in gray and when colors are used.

4) **Scoring and weighting**
   a. The task group reviewed the questions that did not have a rubric to determine if any scoring would be added.
      i. **For the question on mandates and service uniqueness, the group decided to add scoring of mandate/unique description = 1; no mandate/no unique response = 0.**
      ii. The group kept open the decision to score or not score the questions on comments to the University customer
satisfaction survey and other/additional things the author may add.

b. There was discussion about whether all questions, with the exception of the “other/additional things”, could be scored in three groupings: importance, quality and efficiency. The group concluded that the remaining two future-looking questions, about improved efficiency, could be moved to the efficiency category.

5) Next Steps
   a. Next week the task group will look at possible scoring alternatives and weighting of criteria and/or individual questions.