WSCUC Steering Committee

Date: July 5, 2017 | *Time* 10:00am – 11:30am

Attendance

Holly Menzies, Andrew Chavez, Bill London, Michael Willard, Jessica Dennis, Michele Dunbar, Benjamin Lee, Parviz Partow, Amy Bippus, Andre Ellis

Not in attendance: Laura Whitcomb, Karin Elliott Brown, Jennifer Miller

Call to Order.

The meeting was called to order at 10:04.

Announcements

- N/A

Approval of Agenda and Minutes

Ben motioned to approve the agenda. Andre seconded the motion and the agenda was approved. Jessica motioned to approve the minutes from June 21. Michael seconded the motion and minutes were approved.

Review of Essay 4

The leads of Essay 4 requested that the Steering Committee review the CFRs associated with the essay. The committee members provided the following feedback:
- CFR 2.2 may be covered in both Essays 3 (second part of CFR 2.2) and 4 (first part of CFR 2.2). Evidence to be included in Essay 4 may include: curriculum mapping and degree roadmaps as a structure for entry-level requirements; CSU system-wide changes to the developmental math and writing requirements; Writing Across the Curriculum and changes to WPE.
- CFR 2.2a - We will want to include examples of how we are teaching and assessing core competencies at the program level, not just at the institutional level. The second part of this CFR is addressed in Essay 3.
- CFR 2.2b - There is some evidence that this CFR is being met, though there are some programs that may need to develop their graduate program learning outcomes. The essay team suggested that Karin review this CFR to ensure it is accurately and adequately addressed in the essay. It was suggested that the team include information on tenure density to address the guideline for CFR 2.2b.
- CFR 2.7 → Some aspects of this CFR are addressed but not all parts are addressed. Most accredited programs do look at licensing and placement and examples should be highlighted in Essay 4. In program review, departments are asked to review their graduation and retention rates and may reflect a shift towards considering these issues more systematically

The Steering Committee also gave general feedback on the Essay.
- The Assessment Organizational Chart should be reviewed by the Steering Committee.

- Tables should be standardized across the institutional report.
- The GE Assessment Table needs a legend that defines the color-coding system. Michele mentioned that she would share the PowerPoint that includes the legend.
- The committee suggested that since the report is limited in length, each essay should begin with a summary of what will be covered in the essay to help the reader understand the essay's structure, as there may not be enough room to include transitional paragraphs and sections.
- Most of the discussion on Conversion + should be included in Essay 1.
- Oral Communication assessment examples should come from departments outside of Communication Studies. Members suggested including examples from business, such as Nina O'Brien's Assessment Faire presentation on Competence vs. Confidence.
- The Assessment Team may want to consider adding items on the assessment of GLOs and ILOs to Annual Assessment Reports completed by departments.
- Andrew will send out document that organizes each CFR by essay.

5-10 Minute Reports from Team Leads (if any)

- Essay 6 → Andre reported that Essay 6 is divided into three sections: Program Review, Assessment, and the Use of Institutional Review Data.
- Essay 3 → Michele reported that she and Michael are compiling a list of all programs with senior capstones, undergraduate research components, and/or community engagement requirements. They are also coding all PLOs and mission statements and reviewing the MQID survey responses. There will be some MQID examples that can be inserted into other essays once the analyses are completed.
- Essay 1 → Parviz reported that Essay 1 and 2 are still being revised. Essay 1 is also currently being reviewed by Robert Lopez in Public Affairs.

Questions or Concerns for the Steering Committee

- Is it possible for to request that a WSCUC consultant review the institutional report before we submit the final essay? Andrew will follow up with Karin to get the answer to this question.
- The team asked whether they should highlight the CFRs included in each essay. The Steering Committee agreed that each essay should list the relevant CFRs at the beginning of each essay (see CSU San Marcos Institutional Report for examples).
- How are faculty assigned to graduate programs and how can we address whether there are enough full time faculty to power these programs? The Committee will follow up with Karin and the Grad Council.

Summer Meeting Schedule: 7/12, 7/19, 8/2

Essays 5 and 6 will be reviewed on June 12th. Essays 3 and 7 will be reviewed on June 19th.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 11:13 a.m.