1) **Review notes from 3/15 and 4/8 meetings**
   a. The meeting notes from 3/15 and 4/8 were affirmed.

2) **Campus Comments**
   a. The comments from people on campus were distributed to the group. Four comments have been received.

3) **Feedback from Academic Department Chairs**
   a. At the Provosts meeting with academic department chairs, Chair Agrawal and Vice President Dalton explained how the report template would be completed. Several concerns were expressed by were those in attendance, primarily the number of reports to be complete based on the services performed by the departments and the timing. The Vice Presidents asked that the task group review these concerns and recommend ways to address.
      i. There was discussion about ways to collapse the number of services so that the chairs need only fill out 2-3 reports, perhaps academic services and administrative services.
         1. There was a suggestion that the Associate Deans could assist with completing the reports.
      ii. There was discussion about postponing the completion of the report for academic departments until the fall quarter.
         1. Most members of the task group did not like the idea of separating the academic departments from the review and scoring for all other units. There was a strong preference that departments complete the reports in the same timeframe as all other groups.

4) **Customer Satisfaction Survey**
   a. Associate Vice President Machamer presented some alternative ways the group could review the results of the customer satisfaction survey. A file
will be mailed to all members for each to review and provide feedback about the most helpful format to review the data.

5) **Scoring and Weighting**
   a. The members reviewed a proposal for distribution of all the questions into three categories for scoring purposes: importance, quality and efficiency.
      i. There was extensive discussion about the two-stage process proposed, using “importance” as the first threshold that must be passed.
   b. The members reviewed possible scoring models for each category and were asked to come to the next meeting with thoughts/ideas about:
      i. Whether some questions should be weighted more than others?
      ii. How to establish high, medium and low groups of scores.
   c. The group discussed the use of the “Unique Issues” and “Other” questions.
      i. **There was general agreement that these questions would be included.**