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Steering Committee

The month of February was very busy for the Steering Committee. The Self-Study Design was submitted to our Middle States Liaison, Dr. Debra Klinman. In the middle of the month, we then hosted her on campus to give us feedback on the design and to speak to the campus on the process. The steering committee met 4 times to plan for our liaison’s visit to campus, and afterwards to discuss the suggested changes to the design to be re-submitted in six weeks time.

The month of March will consist of making changes to the Self-Study Design, creating a documents repository procedure, and creating a gaps page to allow the steering committee to take those gaps/issues to the appropriate people on campus in order to be addressed. The steering committee will also look closely at coverage of standards and overlap per group.

Working Group 1

- The group has held three meetings to date, with the next one scheduled for the second week of March.
- Questions have been assigned to various members for follow up and committee members are in various stages of progress. Some areas of overlap have been identified and committee members are attempting to touch base with other groups so as not to duplicate effort.
- Good discussion has occurred at meetings and there is a good level of group cohesiveness and teamwork.

Working Group 2

Working Group Highlights and Issues

The group has been working very well together, with lots of input from members, and good attendance. The group has been energetic, and engaged, and there have been very productive discussions.

Initially two members assigned to committee did not attend, a new person was recruited for the 2nd meeting, and our student representative joined us by the 3rd meeting. Co-chairs are coordinating with the Steering Committee Liaison and his communication and feedback to the group has been very helpful.

Meetings are held every other Wednesday at 3pm rotating around campus locations along with the recorder responsibilities. All meeting notes are posted on Confluence.
Research Workload Distribution

The group members reviewed historic issues from previous self-studies and the Periodic Review, Standards of Excellence and looked at other campus models for institutional effectiveness. We brainstormed and created research questions to help us evaluate the college's approach and success with assessing its effectiveness.

The group decided to use a standard rubric for collecting data from campus departments about their assessment practices in order to evaluate the college as a whole. Two members created a comprehensive draft rubric and we spent two meetings fine-tuning the questions, format and strategy for meeting with the campus units. The group also developed open ended interview questions to gather more input from department heads. The WG divided the campus departments according to Budget & Planning Committee units, assigned cross functional teams, and members will spend March and April interviewing the units and reviewing their assessment plans.

Progress Made Towards Historic Issues, Research Questions, Etc.

The planned interviews, the review of documentation, and the ensuing committee discussion and analysis will be the primary sources for answering research questions and addressing historic issues. Through this process we will assess the progress the campus has made in this realm since the last periodic review report.

Research Highlights and Issues

Inventory of Resources Discovered

We will begin to use resources and documents when we commence the unit interviews, collect dept specific materials, and reference campus wide data. We anticipate some challenges regarding the inventorying, storage, and access of these materials. There will need to be a system for storage of campus wide materials that will be utilized by multiple work groups. We anticipate some of these materials could be organized electronically, and some will need to be organized in hard copy.

Discovered Gaps in Data

It is too early in the process to tell- please see #4 above.

Plans for the Coming Month

At our March 10 meeting, the assessment rubric and the list of interview questions we developed will be finalized. A draft of an introductory memo about the process to department heads will also be finalized. Each interview team will give the memo to the department head when they schedule their interview appointments. Each department head will receive a list of interview questions to help them prepare for the meeting. These unit interviews will make up the bulk of our work over the next few months.

We hope each pair can complete one interview before the group meets on March 24 so we can assess how well our methods are working, and whether we need to make any mid course
corrections. We will continue to meet on a regular bi-weekly schedule to assess our progress, and task completion. Committee pairs will begin scheduling interviews soon after the March 10 meeting.

Working Group 3

Working Group Highlights and Issues

Working Group #3 has collectively made significant progress on several aspects of their project at hand. The group has focused on establishing its team members and their roles as either direct members of Working Group #3 or as key Resource Members, fine tuning the Charge, identifying and assigning member participation in relation to the questions, researching quality sources of information and/or reference, and more. Please allow the notes below to offer a more detailed outline of our progress along the group’s past meeting minutes and updated Charge. Below are some other relevant progress items:

- Underwood will clean up redundancies in Confluence, and manage the cleanliness
- Question #10 may include a proposed new survey designed by WG3
- Several sources of information were proposed this month, such as MOU, Green Team, NYSERDA, NSF, Water Testing Lab, and many more
- Discussion on rephrasing question #3, and Branigan worked on this in-depth
- WG3 has two student members, Colin Covitz and Steve Warren

Working Group 3 Members

Mark Schneider – WG Chair
Joe Batchelder – WG & SC Member (Liaison)
Eric Robert – WG & SC Member (Liaison)
Mike Branigan – WG Member
Jack Burgess – WG Member
Ladd Dawson – WG Member
Jason Fishner – WG Member
Kathleen Gillooley – WG Member

Marty Greenfield – WG Member
Deb Underwood – WG Member
Colin Covitz – WG Member (Student)
Stephen Warren – WG Member (Student)
Bob Backus – Resource Member
James Ellis – Resource Member
Pat Heath – Resource Member
Sharon McKee – Resource Member

Updated Charge

Working Group #3 has made a few minor adjustments to their Charge. The current version can be viewed in Confluence, for reference and for consideration when updating the Design.

Assignment of Research Questions

1. Primary > Covitz & Warren
   Support > Batchelder & Robert
2. Primary > Dawson
   Support > Batchelder & Robert
3. Primary > Fishner  
    Support > Batchelder & Robert
4. Primary > TBD  
    Support > Ellis (Resource Member)
5. Primary > Gillooley
6. Primary> Burgess  
    Support> Robert
7. Primary> Branigan
8. Primary> Batchelder
9. Primary> Greenfield  
    Support> Sharon McKee
10. Primary > Underwood

Plans for Coming Month

- Further refinement of responsibilities for questions
- Continued focus on WG3 reference materials/sources for questions
- Delegation of responsibilities for WG3’s addressing of Characteristics of Excellence, and authorship thereof

**Working Group 4**

Not Available

**Working Group 5**

**Working Group Highlights and Issues**

- The group has been divided into subgroups each with their assigned area of research

**Research Workload Distribution**

- Based on Working Group's Charge and Examination of Self-Study Design
- The group has divided into five subgroups

**Progress Made Historic Issues, Research Questions, Etc.**

- Timeline – each group will have their questions answered by our next meeting April 5th

**Research Highlights and Issues**

- Inventory of Resources Discovered for Use in Answering Assigned Topics (MLA format) - discussed at our April 5th meeting
- Discovered Gaps in Data: Information Needs and Plans for Gathering that Information (Surveys? Benchmarks? External Data?) – discussed at our April 5th meeting
Plans for the Coming Month

- March – subgroups continue research
- April – May questions will be converted to format for the report-gaps filled in
- May-June – Sami Chittum has agreed to edit our report
- Summer – review draft
- August-September – review and make final changes for submission to the steering committee

Working Group 6

Working Group Highlights and Issues

- Working Group met four times during the month of February. Group adopted a rotating meeting schedule (Tuesday afternoon’s and Thursday morning’s) to accommodate members teaching schedule. Attendance has been good, with student member able to attend Tuesday meetings. We added one member since orientation (Z.I. Sanchez) and switched another John Kolodzjei to working group 8
- Working Group formulated its charge, discussed and refined research questions, and designed a delegation system to assign work on research questions. Designated Jan Elwell as secretary and agreed to post all meeting notes and documents on Confluence.

Research Workload Distribution

- Working group members reviewed historic issues related to education and curriculum issues from previous institutional self-study; periodic review report, and the memorandum of understanding. Working group members also became familiar with Middle States Standards of Excellence that pertained to working group charge (Standard 11: Educational Offerings; Standard 12: General Education; Standard 13: Other Related Educational Activities).
- Working group designed a delegation system to assign work on research questions. This gave each member 2 to 3 research questions to work on. Most questions were divided amongst teams of 2 to 3 members. Members given deadline to design strategy for answering questions, report progress for answering questions, and post results on Confluence by February 25th. Most members (except two) have completed the tasks as assigned.
Patti Peter Mike Jan Tom Lisa Carolyn Lee Z. Sanchez

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Patti</th>
<th>Peter</th>
<th>Mike</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Tom</th>
<th>Lisa</th>
<th>Carolyn</th>
<th>Lee</th>
<th>Z. Sanchez</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>curriculum congruence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>course/curricula</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accreditation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expansion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>policies on web, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>course syllabi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>honors courses</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advisory committees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expansion of ed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>offerings / MOU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen ed./mission/diversity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>curricular goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relative to gen. ed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-traditional students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students not fully</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prepared</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Progress Made

- In most cases, the basis strategy for how to answer the research questions assigned to group members has been completed.
- Working Group members currently gathering data (periodic reviews, course syllabi, honors course data, General Education, Freshman Seminar data, etc.) to answer questions. Some members have begun drafts.

Characteristics

- Standard 11: Educational Offerings
- Standard 12: General Education
- Standard 13: Other Related Educational Activities

Historical Issues

Several of the historic issues that our working group has discussed are:

- uniformity in course syllabi information;
- quality of academic program reviews;
- future curriculum and academic program planning;
use of remedial and developmental courses;
- development of new curricula and programs based on ongoing need, enrollment, and relevance to mission;
- level of faculty involvement in the development of new program options;
- strategy for development of new programs and elimination of ineffective ones;
- implementation of water-testing laboratory- expansion/improvement of programs in the sciences; and
- the development of internships related to specific curriculum and program offerings.

**Research Questions**

The following research questions are being looked at by our working developed as areas of interest to the college:

**Standard 11: Educational Offerings**

- Are curricular and programmatic goals consistent with the college mission and institutional goals? If so, how is this congruence demonstrated?
- What is the process for developing new programs and curricula?
- How has our external accreditation process expanded? What are the criteria for seeking external accreditations?
- Are course, program, and college policies clearly and accurately described in SUNY Delhi's official publications, and on SUNY Delhi's website? What is the process to update such documentation?
- Do course syllabi clearly articulate learning objectives and outcomes?
- Regarding honors courses: Are there adequate offerings? How do they fit into the college mission? Is the process for developing these courses the same as that for traditional offerings?
- What is the process for implementing change in curricula based on suggestions from advisory councils?
- Is the implementation of new educational initiatives consistent with the college mission and institutional goals?

**Standard 12: General Education**

- Is the general education curriculum consistent with the institutional mission? Does the general education curriculum incorporate the study of values, ethics, and diverse perspectives? If so, how does it and what is the measure for accomplishing it?
- How are individual curricular and degree program goals and objectives related to core knowledge and skills (general education)?

**Standard 13: (Related Educational Activities)**

- How does the institution attempt to meet the educational needs of non-traditional students?
What kinds of educational offerings are available for students not fully prepared for college level work?

**Inventory of Resources Discovered**

- Humanities and Social Sciences Program Review, 2005
- Academic Policies and Services Handbook
- College Catalog
- Periodic Review Report, 2007

**Plans for the Coming Month**

- Discussion of issues related to information acquisition, along with data and documentation for answering research questions.
- Continued progress towards answering assigned research questions, and posting information on Working Group Confluence page.

**Working Group 7**

Not Available

**Working Group 8**

**Working Group Highlights and Issues**

Working group 8 has met four times since the beginning of the semester. Attendance at meetings has been acceptable and group members have been actively involved in process as we move forward. We have one group member who is unavailable to meet during our regularly scheduled meeting time but she is working “behind the scenes” on tasks to which she had been assigned. Our student member is also unavailable to meet at that time due to a conflict with an academic class and we have discussed ways in which to best utilize her as the group develops its final product. We recently had another member added to our group however he did not attend our meeting this past week and has not contacted either the chairs or the liaison. He will be notified of our next meeting time when we send out a reminder for our next meeting on March 16th.

**Research Workload Distribution**

Since our working group has been assigned to conduct an investigation into non-academic or co-curricular support services on campus our first goal was to determine the specific services on campus we would be examining. It was determined that the following areas fell under our purview: Athletics and Intramurals, DC4, Counseling and Health Services, Orientation, Student Activities, Residence Life, University Police and Judicial Affairs, Book Store, CADI and Financial Aid.
Each area was assigned to an investigation team of 2-3 working group members to investigate and report back to the entire working group. The teams were asked to obtain answers to the research questions that were developed as part of the Self-Study Design Process in addition to obtaining any supporting documentation for the area being investigated. Each investigation team is expected to turn-in (print or email) written answers to each of the research questions as they pertain to the area investigated. These reports will then be posted on Confluence. After being posted on Confluence, group members can read, comment on areas of strength/weakness or raise additional questions pertaining to that area.

Once initial investigation of all the assigned areas is complete we will evaluate the material and formulate follow-up questions and perform a secondary evaluation which will include any supporting documentation.

**Progress Made Historic Issues, Research Questions, Etc.**

To date three of the investigation teams (Athletics and Intramurals, Counseling and Health Services/Orientation, and DC4) have reported answers to the research questions. It is expected that at least 2 additional teams will have reported answers to the research questions in the next 2 weeks. We will continue this process until each team has reported. We have been holding off on collecting supporting documentation since we are still unsure of where in Confluence electronic documents should be uploaded to and how paper documents are to be filed in the archive. We have asked that an “archive” be developed and publicized in which all supporting documentation can be placed so that each working group has access since several of the documents will be required by more than one group.

**Research Highlights and Issues**

We have made good progress towards answering the research questions that were developed for our working group as part of the self-study process. We are currently in a period of information collection. Since we have not started a discreet evaluation of this information yet, there have been no specific issues raised. We expect to need copies of a number of reports from each of the areas being investigated and as soon as an archive is developed it is our hope that we can upload these documents.

The supporting documents we expect to require include unit plans for each of the areas being investigated and the student opinion survey.

**Plans for the Coming Month**

As discussed at our last meeting, the month of March is very busy for many of the group members. We expect to meet at least twice; the next meeting is on March 16th. Each “investigation team” is expected to continue working on their assigned areas. While we will be meeting fewer times in March than in February, it is expected that we will continue to make progress toward answering our research questions. A detailed investigation of the full Student Opinion Survey conducted in spring
2009 will be conducted this month since the SOS addresses many of the same areas we are studying. A copy of the full Student Opinion Survey is necessary for this investigation to take place.

**Working Group 9**

**Working Group Highlights and Issues**

- Working group #9 has met a total of four times between January 14th and February 15th. The group has agreed to meet on the first and third Monday of each month from 3:00pm-4:00pm. Meeting canceled March 1 due to winter break. Next meeting March 15 at 3:00pm.
- Group dynamics have been very good. Each member is vocal and participating in the discussions. Open discussions of our subject area have been productive in providing members of the group with information and direction.

**Research Workload Distribution**

- During the initial meeting on January 14th the group was divided into three areas: admission, retention, and graduation. Each member of each grouping was asked to look at the first draft of the research questions and suggest edits.
- By the second meeting thirteen research questions had been created or revised from the first drafts and each individual was permitted to select the one(s) that they wished to work on.
- Once the first draft of the Self Study report was given to Dr. Klinman, WG9 members were asked to re-review their research question and make note of any edits that may have been done by the Middle States Chairs.

**Progress Made**

- A ‘Draft of Answers’ page was put on WG9’s Confluence page to allow all group members to save and share any data that they have found. Working group members have conducted document research in addition to one-on-one interviews with subject area experts.
- Positive comments as to how forthcoming and helpful the campus community has been when asked for data or asked to share their time to answer questions.

**Research Highlights and Issues**

- Stressing the importance of staying focused on our group’s subject matter, especially retention; how does what you are researching relate to retention.
- Be certain that members do not lose sight of the characteristics; that it is not all about just answering the research questions.

**Discovered Gaps in Data**
Campus is lacking documented technical standards for most programs. Program objectives are present.

**Plans for the Coming Month**

- Bi-monthly meeting will continue
- Overlap within WG9 itself and overlap with other working groups must be reviewed to help eliminate redundant data

**Working Group 10**

**Working Group Highlights and Issues**

- Team members have been working without conflict.
- Our meeting times seem relatively easy to arrange, and Clark has been able to arrange conference calls where multiple team members are able to call in when they cannot physically be present at meetings.
- Several members have been able to spend a considerable amount of time on their research questions, gathering enough information to write narrative (the group is assuming this will be necessary).
- Due to the nature of this working group’s special topic, it is difficult to divide the questions into specific “areas”. Therefore, the team has been using time within meetings to consult with each other about areas of confusion, questions that need clarification, etc.
- Time constraints to work on research questions seem to be the most common challenge of team members at this time.
- There is concern about duplication of efforts with other working groups.

**Research Workload Distribution**

- Work seems to be evenly distributed and team members are all assisting one another with assigned questions.
- Research questions were assigned to mixed, varying teams within WG 10 based on interest, areas of employment/special knowledge, and need.
- Most challenging issue within research questions (and that takes time to answer for each working group that poses the same questions) has been other groups seeking information from our team members. This appears to be a duplication of efforts.

**Progress Made**

**Assigned Characteristics**

- The online and off campus special topic appears to be relevant to nearly all of the Characteristics of Excellence, as indicated at the top of our Confluence WG page. This has been a little overwhelming to work with, as we need to have working understanding of all of them and how
they interact within our research questions. It is understood that the chairs need to find a method for synthesizing the characteristics and appropriately applying them within each research question. This is in progress.

- Team members have been able to find resources related to the characteristics, but are currently unsure of how much deeper to dig. Specifically, what does each team do with the information collected? As indicated above, some people have been able to start writing narratives (group is making assumption this is the next step). Direction and feedback about where the group is headed is desired.

**Historic Issues**

- The issue concerning historic data is that very little exists; both online and off-site campuses are relatively new to SUNY Delhi.
- Does WG 10's historic information need to be revised into narrative form?

**Research Questions**

- Each research question has a child page that can be viewed, edited, commented on by all. Although assigned to specific teams, everyone is encouraged to view and edit as appropriate.
- Research Question #14, “How are assessment activities related to distance learning integrated into the institution's broader program of assessment?”, is only question currently posing some concerns in how to define the question. There was some discussion whether there was overlap with RQ 13, however, we concluded that this question addresses institutional integration, as opposed to programmatic assessment.
- A “Research Question Findings and Recommendations” page has been established in order to have a single location to add and review suggestions.
- A great deal of useful information and data has come from the BSN documents provided by Mary Pat. Information from BBA is forthcoming, while Tracey has been providing off-campus documentation.
- Information that has been difficult to obtain thus far focuses on research questions that require executive level data (business plans, budgets, etc.).

**Research Highlights and Issues**

**Inventory of Resources Discovered**

WG 10 has an entire child page dedicated to our inventory of resources, available at: https://confluence.delhi.edu/display/Coms/Group+10+Inventory+of+Supporting+Documents

Please advise if all documents should be listed here in the progress report as well (seems like unnecessary replication, but if need please inform and the WG will be happy to provide).

**Discovered Gaps in Data**

Again, some data that would be helpful in answering some of the research questions does not exist due to the newness of the online or off campus programs (i.e.: Surveys, Benchmarks). Also, it is not clear whether there are specific goals for some online and off campus programs and growth. The
WG members will discuss this at our next meeting. It is possible members will need to conduct interviews to determine if gaps are real or perceived.

**Plans for the Coming Month**

In the month of March, WG 10 wants to provide some concrete direction, in the form of specific assignments to complete and deadlines for teams working on research questions. Examples of other online self-study groups will be reviewed and discussed, for ideas about how best to proceed with our own research.

**Working Group 11**

**Working Group Highlights and Issues**

**Meeting Schedule**

Working Group 11 has met on the following dates.
- January 14th
- Monday Feb 1st
- Monday Feb 15th
- Monday Feb 22nd
- Monday March 1st
- Monday March 8th

It was decided at our first meeting on January 14 that Monday's at noon was a common meeting time. Working group 11 has several faculty both on and off campus as well as a student representative so finding a common time was not all that easy. We initially were meeting every other week however we have met every week for the last three since it has been decided that we will attempt to focus on documentation of budget and funding.

Working group 11 is currently using dimdim a free conferencing service to hold meetings with our off site member. The Chair has extended the invitation for any members to attend using this service if there is ever a time when they cannot be available on campus. So far this service has worked fairly well. There have been times that we don't have audio, as a back up working group 11 uses a VoIP speaker phone.

**Meeting Minutes and Attendance**

Working group 11 meeting minutes and attendance of all meetings can be found [here](https://confluence.delhi.edu/display/Coms/Working+Group+11+-+Meeting+Notes).

**Progress Made**

Our initial meetings were spent discussing the Middle States process, as well as discussing each of the Standards of Excellence and how each standard related to our working group. We worked on
coming up with our research questions and the committee was asked to look at each question and give feedback. Committee members were also asked to re-read the Standards of Excellence and read the 2001 self study and 2007 document as they pertained to our working group.

After it was decided that the committee was satisfied with each question we broke a few of them out and assigned to members. A few members were able to talk with other parties on campus in an attempt to get clarity or answer the questions outright. At this point 2 additional members were assigned to working group 11, so some background and initial confluence training had to be given.

After two meetings discussing the research questions, it seemed as though the group, (Chair) included wasn't quite ready to tackle these questions. Working group 11 has a very diverse membership and none of us really understood how budgeting and funding was done on campus. This especially was true when you factor in State Ops, CADI, and the College Foundation.

It was decided in late February that our liaison would give the group a budgeting 101 which would give the members a better idea of how budgeting and funding took place or at least let the group take a broader look at its complexity. This talk took place at our 2/22 meeting.

**Current Work**

After the 2/22 meeting it was decided that the groups initial focus will be on documentation. The groups documentation page was created in an attempt to organize and define all of the areas in the college where budget and funding happen. It would also be an area to define key terms and act as a depository for supporting documentation.

At the 3/1 meeting we decided to break documentation into three groups.

- State Operations
- CADI
- College Foundation/Grants

Initial work was assigned to members who could attend.

**Documentation Page Protocol**

It was decided that if possible a child page would be created for any bullet point on the page. On the new page the committee would define the term and document the process. Once that is done any supporting documentation can be attached to the page as well.

**Planned Outcome**

It is the Chair and liaison’s belief that once this documentation is complete. The working group as a whole will have a better understanding of college's complex finances. This should lead to the group being in a better position to answer our research questions and deal with the corresponding standards of excellence.
Working Group 12

After some initial membership issues due to a couple of resignations and a no-show, membership has stabilized and the group is working ahead in a purposeful manner. The following is a brief summary of our work in the weeks since the working group orientation in January.

- Research questions for student member devised (input from entire group)
- Primary areas of responsibility identified & workload distributed as follows:
  - Deb Adelman—Nursing
  - Nick Benjamin—Student questions
  - Janet Billek—Institutional data on transfer & any employer/alumni/student surveys
  - Rick Golding—Hospitality
  - Susan Greenwood—Liberal Arts & Sciences/General Education (Math/Science)
  - Jim Lees—Golf & Plant Sciences plus Natural Resources, Recreation & Sports
  - Steve McKeegan—Technologies
  - Michael McKenna—Liberal Arts & Sciences/General Education (English/Humanities); synthesize group input & “write”/edit report
  - Kathleen Ogborn—Veterinary Science plus Natural Resources, Recreation & Sports
  - Penny Pardoe—Liberal Arts & Sciences/General Education (Social Sciences)
  - Bill Raynor—Business & Computer/Information Technology

- Relationship between program/course objectives and the mission & goals of the College examined (input from entire group). Approach to addressing the issue determined & initial draft of this section of report written. In addition, four programs selected for detailed mapping of program objectives to institutional mission & goals.
- Process of describing/documenting the programs for assessing student learning in each division begun based on individuals' areas of responsibility.

Plans for coming month

Continue process of describing/documenting academic assessment programs as mentioned above. Once completed, begin synthesizing the information and analyzing the outcomes data.