Sonoma State University
WASC Steering Committee

Monday, October 26, 2015
Minutes

Agenda

1. Review of Visit by WASC Institution Liaison

2. Review Standard 1 feedback from ACT

3. Review status of Steering Committee progress on Standards 1-4

4. Discussion of the 5 core competencies – feedback and assessment schedule

Minutes

1. Welcome

Co-Chair Rich Whitkus – called meeting to order at 3:05pm. Minutes from the September 28 meeting were distributed. Co-Chair Richard Senghas asked that going forward, the minutes reflect a clear distinction between Richard Whitkus and Richard Senghas. It was agreed that Richard Whitkus will be referred to as Rich and Richard Senghas will be referred to as Richard. Introductions were done for the benefit of Jill Hunter, the new Administrative Coordinator for Academic Programs who will be taking notes at the meetings and coordinating the collection and dissemination of accreditation information. Rich requested that accreditation documents be copied to her (hunterji@sonoma.edu).

2. Review of Visit by WASC Institution Liaison

Rich reported on the October 21, 2015 visit by Christopher Oberg, the WASC Liaison to SSU for the current accreditation cycle. He noted that he had emailed the PowerPoint presentation given at the forum, and then handed out a condensed version he prepared containing the key points.

There is only one report written which will be due in spring of 2017. There is one onsite visit by the reviewing team. The report should be written as more of a documentary story backed up by data as opposed to a report. It should be candid and frank, brief and succinct, clear and precise, and simple and direct, not exceeding 50-75 pages. The report will be accompanied by appendices of a reasonable size containing the evidence referred to in the report. There are nine components, one of which is optional. The components are summarized below:

- Component 1 - Introduction to SSU
- Component 2 - Compliance: IEEI form to be completed for the institution as a whole, and for each program individually
- Component 3 – Meaning, Quality and Integrity of the Degree (MQID, a new component)
- Component 4 - Student Learning (Outcomes) and Core Competencies
- Component 5 – Student Success
- Component 6 – Quality Assurance and Improvement: Program reviews and evidence
- Component 7 – Finance and Future: explores how we can we sustain what we are doing
- Component 8 – optional essay, not required but may be included if it is to our benefit
- Component 9 – Conclusion and Reflection, A Meta Perspective (probably the most critical)

Discussion continued and it was noted that we can get either a 6, 8, or 10 year re-accreditation.

3. **Review status of progress on Standards 1-4**

A) Standard 1 feedback from ACT – Rich handed out a summarized report of the ratings in columns (3) and (4) on the worksheet for Standard 1 that were generated by the ACT sub-committee. The method he used was to determine the mode for a group of individual ratings. In Standard 1, the ratings by ACT indicate that items 1.1, 1.3, and 1.8 are in good shape, and of the others, item 1.4 is the most critical and will need more time to be addressed. The ACT sub-committee will complete the rating and comment process for each of the four standards.

By the end of the semester the feedback from all committees will be similarly reported and compiled into a single document. It was noted that the ratings are categories and not statistics, so calculating the mode from a group of responses is more appropriate than using an average rating. Reaching a group consensus on the rating is also an appropriate method.

B) Standard 3 workgroup - Laurence Furukawa-Schlereth handed out and went over the Standard 3 worksheet that was completed by their work group – consisting of Melinda Barnard, David Crozier, Jason Wenrick, Tammy Kenber, and himself.

Some of the key points noted were regarding recruiting & compensation, capital program in flux and absence of a discussion about physical plant in the report, the Presidential transition, and item 3.5 listing graduate programs & tech only. There was discussion, and feedback was provided for Larry to take back to the work group. It was noted that in column (6) of the worksheet, the reviewing team evaluates evidence in the shaded areas and the institution provides the links to the evidence in the un-shaded areas.

ACTION ITEMS: After more discussion about 3.5, Rich indicated he would inquire about this with Christopher Oberg. Richard recommended that the workgroup forward their completed Standard 3 worksheet to the Senate Budget sub-committee.

C) Standard 2 workgroups – Representatives from the Schools reported on the status of their progress in completing the Standards 2 worksheets. Some of the Schools have submitted them, but most have not. Discussion included sharing about the process that each School is using, and looking to sources outside of the School. Comments will be synthesized & combined into common themes for the final worksheet and for use in writing the report.

ACTION ITEM: Rich requested that the completed worksheets be forwarded to him prior to the next steering committee meeting on November 30 with at least a few days of lead time to collate the data.

Richard reported that the Senate is planning for a discussion regarding the Core Commitments and preparing for the accreditation report at the faculty retreat in January. He noted that one key item that will tie into the discussion is the Presidential search process and transition, and that information gleaned during that process could be used in the report. Sean also spoke about some of the transitions happening in IR with the student success dashboard and Blackboard Analytics, and how that would be useful in compiling data for accreditation.

4. **Discussion of the five core competencies – feedback and assessment schedule**

Rich presented the schedule by semester for assessment in the five core competencies (Writing/CLA, Critical Thinking/ Information Literacy, Qualitative Reasoning, and Oral Communication), and related them to the accreditation cycle. It was clarified that Critical thinking and Information Literacy are 2 different objectives assessed at the same time.

The committee discussed the tools being used by the institution for assessment, the completed and planned assessment in each core competency, and implications with regard to the timing for preparing the institutional report. For example, there will be some areas where completion of the assessment will be close to the report deadline.

It was noted that a rubric for assessing the Writing/CLA core competency is going to ready by spring 2016. Discussion continued about existing metrics that are already developed and in use by the Schools that can be used as a starting point, and the plan to have an assessment officer within each School.

Next Meeting is on November 30, 2015 in STEV 1041

Meeting adjourned 4:35 pm – minutes prepared by Jill Hunter