

Sonoma State University
Accreditation Steering Committee

Tuesday, November 1, 2016, 3:00-4:30pm, Academic Affairs Conference Room (STEV1040)

Minutes DRAFT

PRESENT: Ben Ford, Emiliano Ayala, Cathy Kroll, Janejira Sutanonpaiboon, Melinda Milligan, Richard Whitkus, Sean Johnson, Thaine Stearns, Laurel Holmstrom-Keyes, Jeri Echeverria, Carlos Kimball, Kim Hester-Williams

Agenda

1. Timeline for Accreditation (Karen Moranski)
2. MQID, IEEI, CFR updates (Karen Moranski, Melinda Milligan)
3. Student Success Survey (Laurel Holmstrom Keyes)
4. Report from WASC Workshops (Kim Hester Williams, Karen Moranski)
5. Writing the Self-Study Report (Karen Moranski)
6. Electronic Resources (Karen Moranski)

Karen Moranski called the meeting to order at 3:00pm

- I. **Agenda was approved**
- II. **Minutes** from prior meeting on 9/6/16 were reviewed.
- III. **Timeline for Accreditation** – Karen handed out and discussed the time line.
 - A. Data compilation is being finished up this month, for the IEEI, MQID, and CFR.
 1. The MQID submissions from all programs are nearly complete with just a few programs left to get reports from – the EPC, working in groups, is finishing up the synthesis this week which will be used as a basis for writing this chapter of the report.
 2. The IEEI worksheet which is a required appendix to the Self-Study is also nearly complete, missing just a few programs. Karen has contacted the department chairs again to remind them.
 3. Requests for input on the Criterial for Review which is needed to complete the “Review under WSCUC Standards and Compliance with Federal Requirements Worksheet” (Federal Requirements Worksheet) has been slow to come in. A status sheet showing the requests made and responses received was shared with the committee, and is posted on the website. Ben is working with the various committees that fall under the Academic Senate to gather more input if possible.
 4. Federal Requirements Worksheet has questions that will need to be answered and Karen will work on that. It is another required appendix to the Self-Study report.
 5. Discussion about the ratings columns on the Federal Requirements Worksheet – data was collected from various stakeholders in the first phase of data collection in fall 2015. A consensus will be reported on the worksheet – but if there are widely differing conclusions it will require further discussion to decide how to respond.
 6. Evidence – evidence must be provided as detailed in the Federal Requirements Worksheet.
 - B. Report Writing – The writing team has been assembled and are meeting on 11/4/16 to strategize.
 1. The report submittal deadline is February 22, 2017.
 2. There will need to be a review process determined so that campus stakeholders can give input. This should happen in January 2017 after faculty return from their break.
 3. All agreed that the input requested should not be for content editing as much as a big picture review of the critical elements to assure that nothing is missing or misrepresented.

Sonoma State University
Accreditation Steering Committee

- C. Offsite Review – is scheduled for May 2017
- D. On-site Review and Visit – is scheduled for October 24-26, 2017.

- IV. Student Success Survey** – Laurel gave an update on the effort to distribute a survey to faculty, staff, and students to learn about perspectives on Student Success at SSU.
- A. Laurel handed out an assessment of data and information found on our website and discussed where there are some inconsistencies in what we say about ourselves.
 - B. Discussion with Senate Chair Ben Ford and others led to reconstructing the survey to focus on what makes SSU distinctive. This seemed more pertinent to inform the discussion about student success.
 - C. The committee discussed the value of pointing out these discrepancies, that it could be a good point to raise in our WASC report to enhance our discussion about the transformation the university is undergoing presently, moving in new directions and re-defining ourselves. The process of creating learning outcomes should be a manifestation of our identifying our distinctiveness, and should be linked to the mission and vision of the University.
 - D. The survey should go out to students before Thanksgiving if there is going to be much response before students go into finals week and the winter break. The group discussed how this might be accomplished. Sean explained that the best way to get a high response rate is to bring it into the classrooms. The Deans can be asked to select a few classes in their schools. Karen will work with Ben to identify specific faculty who would be willing to do it. The decision is that Karen, Ben, Sean, and Thaine will meet to determine which classes to survey.
 - E. Karen will meet with Laurel to finalize the surveys, and determine how to move forward with surveying the faculty and staff.
- V. Report from the WASC workshops on Meaning Quality and Integrity of the Degree, and Core Competency Assessment** – Kim Hester-Williams and Karen Moranski attended and reported on what they learned at the workshops.
- A. Kim said her biggest takeaways were:
 1. The importance of achieving re-accreditation, and the consequences of getting a special visit from the Commission, which may include re-tooling or intense self-reflection.
 2. The importance of faculty expertise built into the assessment process.
 3. Understanding the obstacles and challenges to getting faculty to participate in accreditation and assessment, especially with regard to resources and incentives.
 4. Understanding the process better to gain confidence that she has the expertise, and appreciation for being offered an incentive so that she has the time to participate.
 5. Learning that syllabi are not enough for assessment – other methods are needed, and dedicated faculty or other personnel such as an institutional level coordinator is of great importance to succeed with assessments needed for self-improvement.
 - B. Karen talked about her takeaways regarding assessment:
 1. We are doing well with our progress and have developed useful course-embedded assessment.
 2. We have accomplished most of the required core-competency assessments over spring and summer 2016. We are working on Quantitative Literacy for fall 2016, and will write about our plan and process for assessing oral communication in spring 2017. This will satisfy the requirements.

Sonoma State University
Accreditation Steering Committee

3. Learned about alternative methods for assessing Oral Communication. She met with Susan Hatfield who has expertise in this area, and heard how different types including oral presentations, interpersonal communications, and group sessions could be assessed, and how to do it. Susan may be brought in to assist with this effort in spring 2017.

VI. Writing the Self-Study

- A. Karen reminded the committee we are going to start drafting the report. She reviewed the information excerpted from the March 2016 Steering Committee minutes detailing which groups and individuals the committee identified to be the best resource for assisting in the writing of each chapter of the Self-Study.

Institutional Report Overview

*Rich presented a report outline created from data on the WSCUC website. It contains specific information on what each section of the report should address, including what CFR are applicable to each section. The Institutional Report Content Overview is located at the following link on the Accreditation Resources Webpage:
http://www.sonoma.edu/aa/ap/accred/important_links.html*

In the past writing teams were formed to draft the report. The committee reviewed the contents for this report, and discussed what groups are most appropriate for leading the effort:

Chapter 1: Introduction – Includes basic Information about the University from the administration.

Chapter 2: Compliance with the Standards - Steering Committee should take on this piece with assistance from others

Chapter 3: Meaning Quality and Integrity of Degrees – this is a newer requirement and WSCUC places a great deal of emphasis on this information. The committee considered the question of whether open forums on student success should be conducted to collect data from students and staff – the faculty had a rich discussion at the retreat in January from which valuable data was collected. The retreat utilized students from the Master’s Program in Organizational Development to facilitate the discussions and record feedback, and this technique could be repeated at the forums to collect additional data.

Chapter 4: Education Quality: Student Learning, Core Competencies, and Standards of Performance at Graduation - The recently formed School Assessment Coordinators group was identified to take a lead role on this section. It was also noted that the GE program does not have a dedicated Assessment Coordinator (AC) because GE courses are the purview of every Schools curriculum overall, but since the GE program review is coming up, the person spearheading that effort should work with the AC group in drafting this part of the report.

Chapter 5: Student Success: Student Learning, Retention, and Grades – With information culled from the faculty retreat, Laurel drafted a synopsis from the discussions that can be used as a basis for creating an institutional statement. The committee entered into a lengthy discussion about whether and how to conduct additional forums that include students and staff. A summary of the discussion is presented in item 6 (below).

Chapter 6: Quality Improvement and Assurance: Program Review; Assessment; Use of Data and Evidence – The new APARC committee and the University Program Review Subcommittee were identified as appropriate groups to draft this section.

Sonoma State University
Accreditation Steering Committee

Chapter 7: Sustainability: Financial Viability - Administration and Finance group will be asked to take the lead on this section.

Chapter 8: Institution Specific Theme (Optional) – This is an optional section of the report and the group discussed both topic ideas, and the pros and cons of including this section. We could use it to showcase something that makes SSU unique, or if something bubbles up in preparing the rest of the report that appears to need more space to be addressed - this may be the place to do that. There was also some concerns that a great deal of work needs to be done on the mandatory sections and that those should be drafted first. This section should probably be left as an extra effort, if needed.

Chapter 9: Conclusion – Rich volunteered to take responsibility for drafting this section.

Exhibits - Two documents are required: Standards Worksheet and Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators (IEEI). The former is in progress and the latter needs to be completed. Rich explained how the IEEI information will be collected (see next agenda item).

- B.** Karen asked for an update of the committee's ideas about the writing process and if there were any additional recommendations for people to join the writing team.
- 1.** Student Success, chapter 5, should include a discussion of graduation rates, past & future.
 - 2.** Jeri suggested Stan Nosek as a source for writing chapter 7, also Laura Lupei and Shawn Kilat.
 - 3.** The group discussed ideas for the optional chapter on institution-specific theme. Some of the ideas discussed were: identification as a COPLAC institution; uniqueness of our situation with respect to current changes in leadership; sustainability awards; addressing the four themes.
 - 4.** Ben Ford indicated he would participate in the writing effort.

VII. NEXT MEETING: December 9, 2016, 3-4:30pm, Academic Affairs Conference Room (STEV 1040)
Meeting adjourned at 4:30, minutes prepared by Jill Hunter