

Sonoma State University
Accreditation Steering Committee

Monday, March 28, 2016, 3:00-4:30pm, Academic Affairs Conference Room (STEV1040)

Agenda

1. Accreditation input – CFR 1.8
2. Overview of Institutional Report
3. Student Success open forum in fall 2016
4. IEEI – Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators

Minutes

PRESENT: Andrew Rogerson, Richard Senghas, Richard Whitkus, Emiliano Ayala, Deborah A. Roberts, Cathy Kroll, Janejira Sutanonpaiboon, Thaine Stearns, Matthew Lopez-Phillips, Neil Markley, Laurel Holmstrom-Keyes, Jason Wenrick

Co-chair Richard Senghas called the meeting to order at 3:00pm.

1. **Minutes** from prior meeting on 2/29/16 were reviewed and approved.
2. **ALO Report** – Rich reported on the status of the Criteria for Review assignments.
 - A. Assignments have all been forwarded to the individuals, groups, or offices that were identified at the last Steering Committee meeting, along with a detailed letter explaining what was needed for input. Rich has also made presentations in person at committees including ACT, FSAC, and EPC, and will visit the Senate Ex-Com on 4/7.
 - B. Feedback is requested by summer 2016.
 - C. The cover letter provides details regarding what is needed, but in general, it should be emphasized that the response answer the following questions for each Criterion:
 1. *How/what does your group or committee do to accomplish it?*
 2. *How is it being done well?*
 3. *What are your aspirations for where to go, or improve? Why? How?*
 4. *Is anything in need of attention? Why? How?*
3. **Steering Committee Response to Criteria for Review, # 1.8** – Rich noted that this criterion has been assigned to the Steering Committee for response – it reads: *The institution is committed to honest and open communication with the Accrediting Commission; to undertaking the accreditation review process with seriousness and candor; to informing the Commission promptly of any matter that could materially affect the accreditation status of the institution; and to abiding by Commission policies and procedures, including all substantive change policies.*
 - A. The committee gave the following feedback for CFR # 1.8:
 - 1) The campus has a responsible person who is the Accreditation Liaison Officer.
 - 2) The Accreditation Steering Committee is co-chaired by the Provost and Chair of the Faculty, and members include the Senate Analyst. The Steering Committee is linked in through these individuals who provide a conduit for information back and forth – an open channel for communications.
 - 3) Time and resources are being dedicated to the accreditation review process.
 - 4) Is there periodic reporting? Yes, there are regular communications received from and provided to WSUCC. The campus held an open forum with the WSCUC liaison in fall 2015.
 - 5) We tend to ramp up as the report & visit approaches, but WSCUC expects us to engage in this work continuously. We could do this better. The work could be folded into a standing committee – in fact, the new APARC committee has the responsibility for oversight in their charge.

Sonoma State University
Accreditation Steering Committee

- 6) Are we abiding by policy and procedure? It is important that we know what they are and what substantive change means. Links to WSCUC resources are on the Accreditation website: http://www.sonoma.edu/aa/ap/accred/important_links.html
- 7) Where is accreditation related information and communications regarding WSCUC kept? It is on the Accreditation website and Academic Senate website – we need to make sure people know where: http://www.sonoma.edu/aa/ap/accred/University_Accreditation.html and <http://www.sonoma.edu/senate/>
- 8) We have dedicated resources to School Assessment Coordinators and are creating a culture of assessment that includes oversight by APARC with broad representation. APARC committee will have a webpage – it is under construction. ACT is also involved in accreditation activities, and the SSU ALO is on both committees.

4. Institutional Report Overview

- A. 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
- B. 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. As 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.
 - 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

Sonoma State University
Accreditation Steering Committee

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).

5. Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators (IEEI)

- A. Each Program needs to contribute data for the worksheet. A request will be sent out. Richard made suggestions regarding the wording of the request – it should indicate that it is originating from faculty governance. Rich will incorporate this suggestion. The required data includes the following:
- 1) State whether there are formal learning outcomes. WSCUC says that GE program learning outcome can be used in the absence of institutional level learning outcomes.
 - 2) State where learning outcomes are publicized (catalog)
 - 3) Indicate how they are measured, other than GPA (varies)
 - 4) Identify who interprets the data, and what is done with it
 - 5) Explain how are the findings used
 - 6) Academic Programs will provide the information on last program review date.
- B. Lengthy discussion continued about the status of Institutional Learning Outcomes at SSU. Nothing has been formalized but progress has been made. The question of formal development should involve APARC, the faculty, School Assessment Coordinators, administrators, and others. If ILOs are to be developed, it will be a long term process, beyond the current accreditation cycle. Richard noted that since APARC is not yet formed, this question should be proposed at the Senate ExCom meeting, and brought up to EPC.

6. Student Success open forum in fall 2016

- A. All agreed that:
- 1) There is merit in conducting an open forum to collect data from the entire campus community for the accreditation report;
 - 2) Focusing the forum on the topic of student success is a good idea; and
 - 3) Utilizing the Organizational Development Master’s Program students for note taking (similar to the faculty retreat) would be pursued.
- B. The group had a lengthy discussion on how the forums should be conducted.
- 1) There were varying ideas about whether to have separate forums for staff, and for students at different levels. Someone suggested that students come from very different perspectives when they are just beginning their education than when they have some experience behind them. Others felt that offering an open forum to all stakeholders and getting a mix of opinions and ideas would generate a more balanced perspective. This seemed to be the consensus of the group.
 - 2) The forums need to be conducted in early fall (target late September) and there should be at least two planned in order to allow all who wish to participate an opportunity to attend.

NEXT MEETING: Monday, April 25, 2016, 3:00 pm in the Academic Affairs conference room
Meeting adjourned at 4:08, minutes prepared by Jill Hunter