

Sonoma State University
Accreditation Steering Committee

Tuesday, December 6, 2016, 3:00-4:30pm, Academic Affairs Conference Room (STEV1040)

Minutes

PRESENT: Ben Ford, Emiliano Ayala, Cathy Kroll, Sean Johnson, Thaine Stearns, Laurel Holmstrom-Keyes, Carlos Kimball, Karen Moranski, and Sean Place.

Agenda

1. Writing Assignments for Self-Study Chapters (*see below*)
2. MQID, IEEI, CFR Updates
3. Student Success Survey Update (*Laurel Holmstrom-Keyes*)
4. Campus Review of Draft

Chapter 1 (Intro and Response to Previous WASC Action)	Jeri Echeverria* <i>*(will consult with faculty leaders)</i>
Chapter 2 (Federal Compliance and IEEIs)	Rich Whitkus
Chapter 3 (MQID)	Karen Moranski
Chapter 4 (Educational Quality; Core Competencies)	Karen Moranski
Chapter 5 (Student Success)	Merith Weisman
Chapter 6 (Quality Assurance and Improvement)	Kim Hester-Williams
Chapter 7 (Sustainability)	Suzanne Rivoire
Chapter 8 (Distinctiveness)	Thaine Stearns
Chapter 9 (Conclusion)	Rich Whitkus
Layout and Digital Design	Katie Musick

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

I. Agenda was approved

II. Minutes from prior meeting on 11/1/16 were reviewed.

III. Writing Assignments for Self-Study Chapters – Karen reported that the Writing Group met 1.5 weeks ago and Chapter assignments have been sorted.

1. Writers seem comfortable with their assigned chapters. Karen has spoken or met with each writer about their assignments and discussed how to proceed. Everyone is working industriously on their own assignments, it's a great writing team. Most team members volunteered for their assignments and are enthusiastic.
 - a) Each writer has two outlines for their chapter. One was drafted by Rich and Jill based information published on the WASC website. A second outline was created with specific content to address and who to contact for information related to selected content areas.
 - b) Rich has volunteered to handle the Federal compliance piece.
 - c) Katie Musick is collaborating with Sandy Destiny's office to create a professional design using text boxes and colored graphics for charts and tables to highlight content.
2. A request was made to circulate the outlines via email to the group, this will allow the committee to provide more resources to the writing team. After discussion it was agreed that it would be useful to create a Google Drive to host ongoing updates and allow for access

Sonoma State University
Accreditation Steering Committee

amongst the committee. This can be used to disseminate the outlines, and add information and drafts as they come in.

3. Chapter drafts are tentatively due on January 9, at which point they will go to Cathy for editing.

a) Feedback can begin from this first round of drafts by sharing in small groups.

4. The Distinctiveness chapter is optional, but given the amount of change on campus recently it seems like a great opportunity to look at the campus as a whole and speak to what defines us.

B. WASC emailed today with a deadline of February 22 and gave instructions on how to upload the document.

IV. MQID, IEEI, CFR Updates –

A. Almost at 100% with MQID responses. There are a few people that will need to be tracked down and a few departments that still need to turn in.

B. CFR will be useful in looking at IEEI. Some responses have come in this week.

1. Goal is to provide some broad criteria and sub components.

2. There has been some confusion as to who responds. If we still need more feedback it seems like we could try asking one more time.

3. It was suggested that this would be easier to facilitate online.

a) It could be set up like a questionnaire, the spreadsheet can be overwhelming.

V. Student Success Survey – Laurel noted that this is a Distinctiveness Survey, misnamed in the agenda. Prior to presenting the data collected thus far Laurel emphasized that the information is very, very preliminary and it's too soon to draw conclusions there will be a lot more analysis as information comes in. Laurel presented a document with some very preliminary notes on the initial themes coming out of the survey results.

A. There have been 255 respondents at this point. Target is to have about twice that responding.

B. There have been a broad range of responses. People define distinctiveness differently.

C. More women have responded than men. Among faculty responses it's about even.

D. Some of these statements are aspirational, other responses are going to affirm examples from the reports. The variety in responses suggest that we need to sharpen our vision of what distinguishes us.

E. The survey gives us a chance to point out the conflict in actual standing compared to perceived standing. We want to draw out what we are known for, and then explain that campus is working toward building knowledge.

F. The committee discussed what distinctiveness means. One example given was the Wine Business program, SSU's location is distinctive and our programs responds to that location.

G. Carlos felt that the focus should be on student success after graduation. Looking at programs does not speak to where students go afterwards. The goal of college is to graduate and he does not see that represented yet.

H. Laurel reviewed vision statements from a number of CSU's to see how they reflect/refer to themselves. It's very interesting to see how each campus frames themselves differently.

I. Discussion continued around SSU's distinctiveness.

1. Our smaller class size lends itself to amazing mentor opportunities and close faculty/student relationships.

Sonoma State University
Accreditation Steering Committee

2. It was noted that class size varies by department. However the real value may be in the fact that classes are taught by PhD's and not a grad student.

VI. Campus Review of Draft – Feedback can begin at the Faculty Retreat in 3 small breakout sections. Chapters 4, 5, and 8 would be the best chapters to get faculty input on. Drafts of those selected chapters should be emailed out 2-3 days ahead of retreat. Retreat's focus is already in line with the selected chapter topics. If the chapter authors are able to attend the group discussion that would be very valuable.

a) The type of feedback needed should be specific to what this report speaks to. It is acknowledged that this document cannot cover everything. The goal is to make sure the departments see themselves reflected accurately in the document. If they have specific vignettes to include that help to portray the story already being told that can really help to send the message home.

1) There is a larger discussion about where we will move in the future but that will not happen within this timetable, which is part of a Strategic Planning Discussion that is a year or two down the road.

2) Some of the discussion and feedback may not be included in the document but can be for our own growth and reflection.

1. Student feedback can come through Associated Students. There is an AS meeting on January 30, and if someone can attend to guide feedback/lead discussion surrounding chapters 5 and 8.

a. Cathy volunteered to attend meeting and will coordinate with Carlos.

2. If the document is circulated to departments we will be able to get staff feedback which would be very valuable.

a. Sending the document out to both units and departments will trigger staff feedback.

b. Katie Musick would also be a great person to reach out to staff for feedback.

VII. NEXT MEETING: The meeting scheduled for January 3, 2016, 3-4:30pm, is canceled.

VIII. Meeting adjourned at 4:30, minutes prepared by Kim Purdy.