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Steering Committee

Highlights and Issues
During the month of March, the steering committee met twice. The focus of the meetings was centered around the discussion of the progress from the previous month, the issue of overlapping data and ultimate responsibility of standards, and the importance of assessment and access to information. President Vancko and Provost Nader attended the meeting on assessment and access to information, and gave much emphasis to the importance of building a campus culture of assessment. Co-chairs Hamblin and Rhodes also had a meeting with the working group chairs to discuss Dr. Klinman’s February visit and her suggestions for the self-study and design, the discussion of supporting documents and a repository, and any questions or issues that the chairs wanted to bring up.

Progress Made
The Self-Study Design was revised by the co-chairs with the recommendations from Dr. Klinman, the steering committee members, and administration. The areas updated included:

- Institutional Overview: added section on flagship programs;
- Nature and Scope: given more emphasis/explanation on the special topic and on the issue of sustained growth;
- Intended Outcomes: given more attention to the unique outcomes;
- Timeline: changed to reflect the new evaluation team visit from Fall 2011 to Spring 2012, and updated intervening time with more specific dates for self-study report draft goals;
- Working Group Members: updated to reflect current members;
- Process, Reports, and Evaluation: updated section on suggestions for evaluation team, including flagship programs and masters aspirations, updated section on organization of chapters to include working group reports; and
- Working Group Charges: some charges updated to remove overlapping standard coverage and add areas that were missing.

A Gaps List was created in Confluence to address gaps in data that needed to be passed on to the appropriate departments. A Repository was created to inventory all documents used for the self-study. This repository will continually be updated with links to the electronic version, a call number for the print version, and a checklist of the Standards of Excellence it refers to. A web page is also in the process of being created. It is hoped to be up and running by the end of April.
Plans for the Coming Month

- Submit redesign of Self-Study to Middle States liaison;
- Provost Nader, co-chairs Hamblin and Rhodes, and steering committee liaisons Meckel and Liddle to attend Middle States workshop on Creating a Campus Culture of Assessment at MVCC (April 8-9);
- Continue to meet to discuss progress of working groups and any issues;
- Continue to update repository with documents; and
- Create Middle States web page and post documents for campus access.

Working Group 1

Working Group Highlights and Issues
Our last meeting was held on March 10th and at that time members gave updates on progress on research questions. Discussion also ensued regarding overlap and areas where we seemed to lack information. Several members offered suggestions to fellow committee members on where to find various resources. Committee members were asked to post to Confluence their progress by early April. Next meeting is scheduled for April 22, 2010.

Working Group 2

Working Group Highlights and Issues
Group continues to work well together with good meeting attendance. Committee members signed up in pairs to interview 20 different units on campus about their assessment procedures and planning processes. Each member will end up interviewing 4-5 units plus Cabinet members. At our March 24 meeting we shared experiences from the first round of interviews (everyone met with at least one unit). The process and evaluation rubric seem to be working as designed. Communication from the SC liaison is helpful. Co-chairs attended a meeting of all working group chairs and co-chairs earlier in the month.

Progress Made
Will be based on data compiled from interviews with units and review of assessment data.

Research Highlights and Issues

Inventory of Resources Discovered
All documents received from the units will be inventoried by the person collecting the items and given to the steering committee for the common repository.
Discovered Gaps in Data
Not yet

Plans for the Coming Month
Complete all interviews, including the Cabinet, by end of April. Begin to analyze data for trends. Meeting scheduled April 21.

Working Group 3

Working Group Highlights and Issues:
Working Group #3 has continued to make adequate progress. The team has remained focused on their respective questions, while keeping the characteristics of excellence in mind. The possibility of overlap between the various working groups has become a concern, but should be addressed by the upcoming matrix/grid that is being developed. Group meetings have recently been scheduled for new time periods, in order to allow members that previously had conflicts to attend. At this point, it appears that the core team has evolved and the necessary resource members have been identified. Overall, the team members are dedicated and morale is at an acceptable level.

Research Workload Distribution
Mark Schneider has taken on Question 4, as the member who was working on that question is no longer involved.

Progress Made
Research Questions
The charge questions have been finalized and group members have been busy researching their respective questions. In some cases, enough research has been completed for draft write-ups to begin. In other cases, further reference materials are needed in order to thoroughly answer the questions. Also worth mentioning, the committee’s chair has been cross-referencing the refined questions with the pertinent characteristics of excellence. In the event of any gaps between these two areas of focus, some additional responsibility allocations may be necessary.

Research Highlights and Issues
To help with the gathering and organization of our research, we have also worked on better organizing the confluence pages associated with our group’s efforts. Deb Underwood has taken the lead on this task, which has been beneficial and helpful to the overall team. Additionally, the group has recently added content, such as an electronic form (pdf) of the Master Plan, to make needed information more readily available.
Discovered Gaps in Data
Members of the group have questioned the effectiveness of the “Maintenance Services Student Survey” that has been used for the past several years to assess campus maintenance services and the work order system. The overall group decided that it would be beneficial to develop a refined survey in an attempt to obtain more accurate findings.

Plans for the Coming Month
- Continued focus on WG3 reference materials/sources for questions
- In some cases, begin draft write-ups towards answering questions
- Develop new student survey regarding student opinions towards maintenance services
- Ensure that questions cover the pertinent Characteristics of Excellence

Working Group 4

Working Group Highlights and Issues
The committee has been meeting bi-weekly and making progress with standards, research questions and historical issues.

Research Workload Distribution
See minutes

Progress Made
Research progressing well – see minutes and confluence pages/attachments.

Plans for the Coming Month
We will continue to meet bi-weekly and hope to complete all our research by the end of the academic year.

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
The group has divided into five subgroups.
Progress Made

Timeline – each group will have their questions answered by our next meeting May 3rd.

Research Highlights and Issues

Inventory of Resources Discovered
Discussed at our April 5th meeting

Discovered Gaps in Data
Discussed at our April 5th meeting, any needs will be brought to our May 3rd meeting

Plans for the Coming Month

- March – April subgroups continue research
- 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 6 met twice during the month of March. Group members have been active in completing their assigned research questions and working on their initial draft reports. Three main issues affected our working group during the month of March. First, the groups struggled initially the inability find and access the necessary data and reports. This has, for the most part, been resolved. Another issue that has unfortunately developed has been the inability or unwillingness of some group members to complete the tasks as assigned. This has brought down the morale of the group and slowed the overall progress somewhat. The revision of the self-study design has also presented a new set of challenges concerning the three standards of excellence that our working group is responsible for covering, which will be addressed after the current assignments are completed.

Research Workload Distribution

Our Working Group is still focused on completing the assigned tasks and delegation matrix below. Group has been given late April deadline to complete their research workload distribution.
Progress Made
In most cases, the research, reports, and data (periodic reviews, program reviews, course syllabi, honors course data, course policies, General Education data, Freshman Seminar data, etc.) have been obtained and many of the questions have been answered. Working Group members have begun to work on (and in some cases) post drafts of their initial reports.

Characteristics
At this time, our working group has been focused on answering the research assigned question which are spread across three of the standards of excellence: Standard 11 (Educational Offerings), Standard 12 (General Education), and Standard 13 (Related Educational Activities). Once these initial tasks are completed in May, the group will go back to address the other research questions within each standard that it was assigned to ensure full compliance.
Research Highlights and Issues

Inventory of Resources Discovered

All resources discovered have been posted on Working Group 6 confluence page

- SUNY Delhi College Catalogue Fall 2009—Spring 2010
- SUNY Delhi College Mission Statement
- Academic Programs and Services Handbook
- Academic Program Requirements from various majors found on SUNY Delhi Website
- Program Advisory Committee Memo
- Bloom’s Taxonomy
- Short-Form Course Proposal Form
- Long-Form Course Proposal Form
- Process for New Programs and Curricula
- 2001 Middle States Institutional Self-Study
- 2007 Periodic Review Report
- Middle States Commission on Higher Education, Characteristics of Excellence
- Revised Honors Course Proposal Form
- Course Information Sheets from intro to philosophy, freshman seminar, human heredity and manufacturing processes
- Program Reviews from intro to philosophy, freshman seminar and human heredity
- Honors program website:  [http://www.delhi.edu/academics/honors/](http://www.delhi.edu/academics/honors/)
- Various student, student life, and academic policies listed on SUNY Delhi website  [www.delhi.edu](http://www.delhi.edu)
- SUNY Delhi General Education Assessment Plan
- Program reviews from 5 areas:
  - Math/Science
  - Professional Golf Management
  - Certificate in Auto Tech
  - AAS Nursing
  - Bachelor's Degree- Travel and Tourism
- Non-Credit Program Procedure (Business and Community Service Office)
  - Business and Community Service Council Report
  - Current Master Schedule of Classes
  - 2001 Master Schedule of Classes
- Information on Freshman Seminar
  - Math placement flowchart
  - developmental English data- Lynn Domina
- English 100 for ESL students data-Sharon Ruetenik
  - Developmental Math data- Jan Sohns (also the decision to eliminate MATH 095)
  - Decision to change from ASSET testing to Regents scores
Plans for the Coming Month

In the coming month, our working group will conclude the research phase of the process and begin writing the individual reports on the assigned topics. Beginning in late April and continuing through May, the group will then read through each other’s reports to critique work and discuss what revisions are needed and gaps exist. Once that part of the process is finished, we will then revisit the three standards of excellence that our group is responsible for to examine any areas that were overlooked and make sure that they are addressed.

Working Group 7

Working Group Highlights and Issues

The past two months have been busy and satisfyingly productive. The working group started by getting background information on areas of which we were less knowledgeable, namely Academic Advisement. After conducting interviews with the relevant parties, we compiled the information in a child page to our Confluence working page. Having established this background, we moved on to our research questions, distributing them to the appropriate contacts for each area of Academic Support and following up with personal interviews. As of 04/02/10, group members have met with the following individuals for the corresponding Academic Support Services:

- Pam Peters, Resnick Library
- Linda Weinberg, Students with Disabilities
- Sharon Ruetenik, ESL Students, Writing Center
- Carmel Banks, Tim Camann, Tutorial Services
- Michele DeFreece, Learning Center, EOP

Research Workload Distribution

Each member of the working group was assigned to a particular area of research (e.g. the library’s research and access services, EOP, tutorial services, etc.). Everyone has touched base with their contact person, and most of the initial interviews have already been collected.

Progress Made

Characteristics

The standards we seek to address through our research are as follows:

- Standard 8: Student Admissions & Retention
- Standard 9: Student Support Services
- Standard 11: Educational Offerings
- Standard 13: Related Educational Activities
- Standard 14: Assessment of Student Learning
**Historical Issues**

Previous Middle States studies have targeted the academic jeopardy system, academic advisement training, EOP, ESL, and information literacy programs as areas for improvement. Our interviews have sought to address these issues and we are currently in the process of gathering documentation to show what progress has been made in the last 5-10 years.

**Research Questions**

The research questions we have sought to address are as follows (those followed by *s are questions that have yet to be addressed in a significant way):

1. Are academic support services available and accessible to all students and how do we assess these services?
2. Does the institution effectively communicate the academic support services to the campus community?
3. How do we effectively assess the quality and effectiveness of academic support services?
4. How has the impact of technology affected the services provided?
5. How are we meeting the academic support service needs of our ever-growing off site and on-line student population?*
6. How are all students, including distance learning students, being provided comprehensive and accurate advisement and how is the quality of these services assessed?
7. Do the learning resources, including the library and Learning Center support the diverse educational programs and diverse needs of our students?
8. Do faculty and learning resources foster a sense of "information literacy"? How is this achieved?*
9. How do academic support services contribute to retention?
10. How do we ensure that students achieve key learning outcomes?*

**Research Highlights and Issues**

**Inventory of Resources Discovered**

The research materials we have compiled to date are as follows (these will be formatted in MLA Format for the next monthly report):

- **Student Opinion Survey - Academic Support Services**
- **Student Opinion Survey - Additional Questions**
- **Student Opinion Survey - Historical Comparisons**
- Academic Advisement annual survey results
- **Interview with Pam Peters, Library Director**
- **2003 LibQual Survey**
- **2007 Honors Library Survey**
- **Resnick Library Assessment Team (LAT) 2008 Report**
- **Library Instruction Session Requests Data**
Information Literacy for the Curriculum
Interview with Michele DeFreece, re: EOP
SUNY Delhi Report of Preliminary Findings – Educational Opportunity Program
2007 Educational Opportunity Program Summer College Student Evaluation
Fall 2008 Educational Opportunity Student Enrollment Report
Fall 2009 Educational Opportunity Student Enrollment Report
Interview with Carmel Banks, Tim Camann, Sharon Ruetenik & Michele DeFreece, re: Tutorial services
Fall 2009 Math Center Report
Spring 2009 Tutorial Program Report
Fall 2009 Tutoring Program Report
Interview with Linda Weinberg & Sharon Ruetenik, re: Students with Disabilities & ESL Students
2009 ESL Assessment Summary Report
Guidelines for ESL Accommodated Testing
Spring 2008 Accommodated Testing Statistics
2005 - Fall 2009 Student Disability Detail Report

Discovered Gaps in Data
Though we are still evaluating the research materials we have collected thus far, the gap in data that we will be addressing immediately is the lack of historical perspective. In many of the interviews the working group members obtained information from recent years, but we now need to explore what information is available for all the years since the last Middle States study.

Plans for the Coming Month
Five areas of academic support services need to be researched further: CIS, Academic Advisement, Records & Registration, Library Instruction & Information Literacy, and Career & Transfer Services. Working group members will also follow up with their contacts to obtain historical documents, preferably digital copies. Given the recent influx of research documents, as co-chair I will be organizing the incoming materials and assessing what gaps will need to be filled in the future. The working group will be meeting after Spring Break, so LouAnn and I will determine the next step by that time.
Working Group 8

Working Group Highlights and Issues
The group met on March 16th. Attendance has been good. We have one new member to our working group who we will try to make contact with again, to see if our meeting times are convenient for him and to allow him to join our sub groups. We have still not seen our student member due to scheduling conflicts.

Research Workload Distribution
Our sub groups have been on target and to date, initial reviews on the following have been done: Counseling and Health Services, Athletics and Intramurals, University Police, Judicial Affairs, DC4 and Student Life.

We decided to follow the format of the DC4 questionnaire that Kathleen Dezur and Tim Ludden used, for consistency purposes. Once the initial investigations of the assigned areas are complete we will evaluate for the need for further question to each area.

Progress Made
At this time the following areas have been reviewed and preliminary reports posted on confluence: Counseling and Health Services, Residence Life, University Police/Judicial Affairs, DC4, Athletics/Intramurals and Student Life.

We are collecting supporting documents and had a discussion about the Student Opinion survey and its use in reviewing our areas.

Research Highlights and Issues
We are making good progress in our investigation. The subgroups seem to be completing their reviews on time. All information is being posted on confluence for us to easily access.

Jeff was able to obtain a copy of the Student Opinion Survey, so that each sub group can look at their areas of research.

We talked about including staffing and degrees to show that the institution hires “qualified” professionals in our final report.

Plans for the Coming Month
Preliminary reports for our April meeting due are: CADI, Book Store, Student Activities. Remaining units for review are: Financial Aid and Orientation. Our next scheduled meeting is April 6, 2010 in the Archives Room.
Working Group 9

Working Group Highlights and Issues

- Working group #9 continues to meet on the first and third Monday of each month from 3:00pm-4:00pm.
- Members continue to be vocal and actively participate in their progress on their research questions and where the information they have gathered may relate to other members areas of research. Open discussions of our subject area have been productive in providing members of the group with information and direction.

Research Workload Distribution

- Each working group member is continuing to research the questions they selected and two members have picked up a 2nd question that resulted when the final draft of the questions was furnished by the steering committee.
- Each member has taken on the task of reviewing the Characteristics of Excellence and the Standards in order to list which they feel correspond directly with their area of research. This was done as a means of making sure that the final writing our group produces in response to these areas of research directly relate back to the Characteristics of Excellence and Standards that are noted under our working group.

Progress Made

- Group members are continuing to post documents to the ‘Draft of Answers’ page we put on WG9’s Confluence so that they can share information gathered between meeting and also have a place to save the answers to their research questions. The intent is then to utilize these documents as the group undertakes the writing of its’ final report.
- Working group members are continuing to conduct document research and one-on-one interviews with subject area experts.

Research Highlights and Issues

- Our working group continues to look at the historical issues and relate those back to current research questions in regards to where the campus has addressed previous recommendations. This information continues to be a topic of discussion as members review the documentation they review.
- One concerning issue that remains involves the overlap of research questions between working groups and the confusion over which questions that may overlap are which groups responsibility. We would like some clarification if the final draft questions under our group are indeed our responsibility or are questions still being removed from one group and given to another. We had a recent situation where it was communicated to a group member by someone from another working group that a particular question was no longer our working group’s question. If indeed a research question was being removed from WG9 this was not communicated to the chair or steering committee liaison for our group. The absence of clear
directions for the management of duplicate questions at this stage of the process appears to be leading to some frustration on the part of working group members in our group.

Plans for the Coming Month

- Bi-monthly meeting will continue
- Working group members are committed to putting into writing their findings and posting them to the draft page for our working group.

Working Group 10

Working Group Highlights and Issues

- Due to numerous demands on her time, Jackie Howard (Veterinary Science representative) is no longer a member of Working Group 10. However, Jackie continues to be available to answer questions about the Veterinary Science program as needed.
- While there is no conflict among current team members, due to workload many members have not been able to attend meetings regularly or contribute to the group by working on research questions within our Confluence pages.
- To accommodate off-campus members, 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.
- Members continue to work on their research questions, gathering enough information to write the narrative. The major effort during the past month has been identifying relevant standards for each research question.
- There is less concern about duplication of efforts with other working groups. Within the group, several research questions clearly overlap. However, this does not appear to be a problem regarding completing work and will be discussed as appropriate in the report.

Research Workload Distribution

- A core group of team members continue to spend a considerable amount of time working on our research project. The majority of time during the past month seems to have been spent on identifying the appropriate standards and essential elements that relate to each of our 14 research questions.
- Research questions were assigned to mixed, varying teams within WG 10 based on interest, areas of employment/special knowledge, and need. However, due to the nature of this special topics group, it has been necessary for most members to look over each of the research questions, adding information as appropriate.

Progress Made

Characteristics

Working Group 10 (Online and Off-Campus Leaning) has been clearly identified in the revised self-study design as a special emphasis area that will examine the college’s strategic growth in online
education and niche off-campus programs. According to the standards crosswalk in the revised self-study design, Working Group 10 also has a primary responsibility for demonstrating SUNY Delhi’s adherence to Standard 13 (Related Educational Activities), shared with Working Group 6 (Education at Delhi).

Also according to the revised self-study design, it is noted that within the final institutional document Working Group 10 will have its own chapter, supplemented by information from the other working groups working on distance learning questions. Other than this, we are working within our teams on clearly identifying the characteristics within Standards 1, 3, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, and 14 (our listed relevant standards within the self-study document) that apply to each research question.

**Historical Issues**

During the past three years SUNY Delhi has significantly expanded online degree and course offerings, recently adding the first fully online Bachelor of Science in Nursing program in New York State – a fast growing program. Over the past several years, the college has also greatly expanded its off-campus programs at three area campuses: Schenectady County Community College, Tompkins Cortland Community College, and Onondaga Community College. Due to the recent and fast-paced growth, SUNY Delhi’s major issue concerning historic data is that very little exists; both online and off-site courses and programs are relatively new to SUNY Delhi and have never been addressed during Middle States accreditation. These findings will be addressed in our narrative.

**Research Questions**

Each research question has a child page that can be viewed, edited, commented on by all. Although each research question is assigned to specific teams, as noted above everyone is encouraged to view and edit each question as appropriate. The biggest challenges this month regarding research questions have been:

- Motivating team members to spend time working on questions.
- Identifying the relevant standards and fundamental elements within each standard that are related to each research question.

A significant amount of time this month has been spent on relating each individual research question back to individual standards and identifying the significant fundamental elements within each. Given the 14 research questions, multiple standards relating to most of the questions, and limited number of group members available to work on them, this task felt overwhelming. To help with this, our computer information services members developed tables to assist working group members in determining whether each research question is in compliance with the related standards and the respective fundamental elements. Some teams are using these tables as a tool to provide a visual aid in identifying relevant standards and elements, and then determining whether SUNY Delhi is in compliance within each of our programs and other online courses (BSN, BBA, Off Campus, and Other). From these tables, findings and recommendations are being addressed on a separate
confluence page. The goal is to complete this page to share with the Steering Committee. Ultimately it is anticipated that the findings will be shared with the Cabinet, particularly those findings that are non-compliant with the standards. Narratives are also being developed.

**Research Highlights and Issues**

In general, the consensus within the group’s research process is that while there is some evidence that there is compliance with the standards programmatically, within many research questions there are significant differences between programs and courses. For example, according to SUNY Delhi general policies all faculty should be hired, trained and supported and all courses should have assessment and evaluation procedures. The BSN and off campus programs have clear and specific policies and procedures related to faculty, student assessment, and course/program evaluation that appear to be followed. However, within the Liberal Arts & Sciences and Veterinary Science courses there is little evidence to suggest that online course quality is monitored.

Also of note: As the following questions are being researched by other groups, information related to them via Working Group 10’s research questions will only be briefly included, as it is assumed the other groups will thoroughly investigate them:

- Working Group 1 has a stated research question of, “How does the institution meet the academic support service needs of the off-campus and online student population?”
- Working Group 8 has a stated research question of, “Does the institution provide effective services to diverse populations, including: on-campus, commuter students, online and off-campus education?”
- Working Group 9 has a stated research question of, “With regard to online and off-site students: how are retention rates and student service needs assessed, analyzed, and utilized for programmatic improvement?”

Inventory of Resources available online at:

https://confluence.delhi.edu/display/Coms/Group+10+Inventory+of+Supporting+Documents

The group is still working on identifying information gaps, which are being added to our Findings and Recommendations page located at:

https://confluence.delhi.edu/display/Coms/WG+10+Findings+and+Recommendations

**Plans for the Coming Month**

Each team member has been asked to significantly develop their narrative within the research questions for review by the entire working group at our next meeting on April 7th. Team members have also been asked to identify any research gaps and present that list to Mary Pat to bring to the Steering Committee by the April 7th meeting.
The working group will be reviewing and discussing the revised self-study design, with the goal of identifying any significant changes that need to be addressed and/or included during the next month.

The team would like to complete a draft of our report by the end of April, so that additional concerns and issues can be addressed in May and a final draft completed in June.

**Working Group 11**

**Working Group Highlights and Issues:**

Working Group 11 met on the following dates during the month of March, 3/1, 3/8, and 3/22. The 3/1 meeting was sparsely attended as it was during winter break. We have been reviewing other working group questions in order to identify possible overlaps in research. A planning and resource template has been created and is being used by each member for the area that they are currently researching and documenting. Preliminary work for first assignments was scheduled due March 22nd. Most members needed more time due to work conflicts or scheduling conflicts with functional supervisors that they needed to speak with.

I feel that lack of confidence using confluence has hindered some members. Brian and I are working with those that need extra help.

**Research Workload Distribution:**

The following assignments have been made decided and are in progress. (Pam Hilton, State Operations), (Pat Heath Salaries, Fringe, OTPS, CADI working with student member Bryan Melendez), (Dave Loveland, Facilities, Maintenance, Capital Construction and OTPS,/Energy), (Dan Klossner, Centralized Budgets and Contracts, SUNY Recharges, Annual Program Cost Analysis), (Susan Poc, Budget & Planning Process & Communication), (Residence Halls DIFR Kathy Hibbard), (IFR's Shawn Brislin), (Adriene Clifford, Business and Community Service), (Long Term & Strategic Visioning, Jared Yando), (College Foundation, Alumni and Grants Susan Mackay). This is a big undertaking however the group believes that this documentation and data collection is necessary for answering research questions and addressing standards. It also seems that much of this information will be useful to the campus in the future.

**Progress Made:**

We’ve made great progress in the following areas. IFR’s and mandatory fees, Residence Halls and the DIFR, Business and Community Service, Centralized Budgets and contracts, SUNY Recharges. Our exact progress can be monitored on our documentation page: [https://confluence.delhi.edu/display/Coms/Working+Group+11+Documentation](https://confluence.delhi.edu/display/Coms/Working+Group+11+Documentation)
Historical Issues:
Shawn is in the process of preparing a list of historical issues. WG11 plans on going over this list at the next meeting and formulating a plan for addressing each of them.

Research Questions:
Research Questions haven’t changed since the last progress report. Again our plan is to focus on defining and documenting areas of budget and resource allocation and use that information to answer or questions and address our standards.

Plans for the Coming Month:
We have already met once in April and gone over each member’s progress. Our next meeting is scheduled for April 19th. We plan on completing an inventory of historical issues, and formulating a plan to address each one. We will begin work on researching campus reserves and what they are used for and we will also try and finish up our initial documentation and research so that we can begin to address standards 1,2,3,4 and 7.

Working Group 12

Working Group Highlights and Issues
Membership issues continued to plague the group. After two more resignations, the group lacks representation from the Business & Hospitality Division. Though it means more work for the remaining members, at this point it makes little sense to try to replace these individuals. Questions that arise relative to the B&H program can be taken to the division dean or designee for answers.

Progress Made
After beginning the process of describing/documenting the programs for assessing student learning across the campus, the group had to pause after receiving a communication from the Provost regarding a task that he wanted the group to undertake. After obtaining clarification, the group has undertaken an immediate evaluation of all recent program review reports to determine whether or not they are doing a good job of incorporating data on student learning outcomes and to report our findings to the Provost for action, if needed. (This task is essentially a refocusing—with a sense of urgency—of the work the group had already begun.) The chair and liaison developed a template to guide everyone’s analysis, and group members were divided into pairs, assigned responsibility for reviewing specific program reviews reports, and given a deadline of April 23. Unfortunately, this process has now been complicated somewhat by the resignations mentioned above, and the group chair and liaison will be meeting in the next day or two to address the issue.
Research Questions
New sections (History, Assessing Student Learning, and Assessing General Education Outcomes) have been added to the rough draft of the working group’s final report. These sections are largely descriptive in nature. Analysis and incorporation of relevant outcomes data will come later.

Research Highlights and Issues

Inventory of Resources Discovered
More than 50 supporting and guiding documents were located and posted to the group’s Confluence page for use by all. These include College Assessment Reports, Freshman Seminar data, General Education plans and reports, program review reports, and many other potentially useful documents.

Plans for the Coming Month
Plans for coming month: Complete the review of program review reports as directed by the Provost, and analyze and evaluate the findings for incorporation into the group’s report. Continue developing other sections of the rough draft of the working group report.