

February 21, 2007

To: Members of the HOAP (Help for Outcomes Assessment) group

cc: Lane Glenn

From: Ellen Wentland

Re: Fourth meeting of 2006/07 academic year – February 21, 2007

Attendees: Rose Dittmer, Joanna Fortna, Rick Lizotte, Paulette Redmond, Ruth Young, Anne Zabriskie

Paulette Redmond and I talked about the new role that the Academic Affairs Committee is going to play in the program review and outcomes assessment processes. This committee has agreed to consider topics related to proposed changes in these processes, and to then make recommendations to Lane Glenn. This is a positive development because it means that there now exists a formal venue to have issues considered, providing a basis for subsequent decision making and action. The fact that Paulette and Rick serve on the AAC as well as being members of HOAP is a plus because they will have been a part of the possibly more in-depth HOAP discussions, and could represent the thoughts expressed in the AAC. In that sense, they will be a valuable link.

Because Anne Zabriskie's program is scheduled for review next year, she asked in general about timelines and what the process entailed. I reviewed the various steps, and mentioned that the 07-08 group will be contacted soon to start the process. Anne suggested that coordinators who had already done program reviews be included in this meeting to share their experiences. She thought they would be a good source of information for those just starting. I agreed and told her I would contact these coordinators regarding being part of this meeting.

We talked about the possibility of coordinating program reviews and accreditation reports, and I told them we were working on this. Joanna suggested that developing a timeline that includes reference to accreditation schedules might be very useful – for the purposes of coordination of information gathering and flow. She suggested I contact Bill Zaninni to help with this as he had helped design a very useful timeline for the Finance Committee.

We talked about the new strategic plan currently under development. Joanna's information is that it could be finalized by the end of May. At any rate, the new strategic plan will need to replace the old one in the *Guide* and in materials related to program review, so I will watch this.

Group members inquired as to whether this year's review process felt different to me as compared with last year's, and I commented on that. Last year, the reviewers were able to meet, for the most part, as a group, so there was a real team feeling that developed. This year, schedules couldn't be as readily coordinated, so there was more separate work. On the other hand, this year's reviewers were able to benefit from the work done last year, and often consulted last year's reviews to see how certain questions were addressed. This year's group also had the benefit of having many of the "snags" worked out, such as better chart design. Last year's group identified many of the issues which then were worked out as we went forward.

Members felt that the outcomes effort had gotten off the ground, and was proceeding well. Now that program review has been "plugged" into Academic Affairs and college committees such as AAC, the work also seems to be getting more integrated into the college structure, which is a good step forward.

I will contact group members in March for a next meeting.