1) **Review notes from 4/22/2013 meeting**
   a. The meeting notes from 4/22 were affirmed by the task group with no changes.

2) **Campus Comments / Feedback from Division Meetings**
   a. A good amount of feedback is coming from the campus.
   b. Comments coming from the division meetings will be incorporated into a version of the report template with track changes so members can see the suggestions.

3) **Criteria Evaluation and Weighting**
   a. The group reviewed different models for overall evaluation of support services.
      i. One model would move forward in just one stage by creating 16 categories of services based on the four criterion used to score the services and would not use the mandate criterion to eliminate consideration of any service.
      ii. The second model would move forward in two stages, first examining the mandate criterion and the importance criterion. This model could exclude some services from further consideration. The second stage would examine quality and efficiency together.
         1. **There was a unanimous vote to use the one-stage model.**
   b. Using the one-stage model, there was then discussion about various scoring systems. The group considered using median scores, quartiles, mean or Z-score.
      i. **There was consensus to use the Z-score method, including using a scatter plot of scores within each measure.**

4) **Possible Categories for Grouping Services**
   a. The group briefly discussed possible buckets that could be used to categorize services.
   b. This discussion will be continued next week.

5) **Evaluation Process**
a. There was discussion about how the group would read and evaluate the reports. Various options were presented which include all members reading every report, or dividing up the reports in some random manner so that members would read fewer than all 300+/- reports.
   i. The group decided that each report would be read by 5 group members following these rules:
      1. Service reports will be randomly assigned to task force members.
      2. No member will evaluate services offered by their own department.

6) Other
   a. Group 1 revised their rubric to a scale of 5 to accommodate services that might have both direct and indirect impact on students.