1) **Review notes from 10/11/13 meeting**
   a. The notes were approved as presented.

2) **Review assignment of reports for review**
   a. An allocation of the reports for reading was done based upon the agreed upon guidelines:
      i. Each report read by 3 people
      ii. Teams of 3 will rotate after reading about 20 reports so that a new group of 3 will read the next 20 reports
      iii. Teams will come from different parts of the university organization, ensuring that there is one representative from the division being reviewed.
      iv. Individuals will not review supervisor’s services
      v. Individuals will not review their own services
      vi. Individuals may review other services from their division
      vii. Similar services will be grouped for a team to read e.g., LIVE Scan
   b. **Confidentiality**
      i. Since the task group will now start discussing which services are being reviewed, staff will no longer attend the weekly meetings
      ii. There was discussion about the degree of confidentiality within the task group.
      iii. **After extensive discussion, the task group voted to share the entire allocation list with all members of the group so that everyone knows who is reviewing what service.**

3) **Review evaluation process**
   a. The rating process discussed in the spring was reviewed again, including preliminary discussion about assignment of a service into one of the final categories.
      i. A question was posed about how the responses to unrated questions will be used. There was agreement that these responses would provide context for other response and help in evaluating those services that might fall on the line between two scores.
      ii. The group was reminded about the three categories for recommendations:
         1. Enhance support
         2. Maintain / Sustain support
3. Reduce support (includes reorganize, consolidate, reconsider), which includes the potential for reducing support to zero.

b. When reading a report, if a team needs more information, the process is to check-in with their fellow subgroup members. If there is no clarification, it goes to Lori and the SPTG Chairs. They will take it to the Executive Committee and once approved, the question will be sent to the service by Lori.

4) Template for scoring
   a. There was discussion about the scoring process.
      i. The plan is that each team would submit one score for each section. After discussion about possible differences of opinion amongst the team members, it was decided that the three scores would be averaged and the team would decide if it was comfortable with that final score.

5) Next Meeting
   a. An example of a service that has already submitted a report will be shared with the task group so that each member will score the report. At the meeting the following week, the members will share their process and rationale for how they reached that score, with the expectation that a common approach can be established for all members.