Department Chairs Meeting Minutes: 3-14-2005, 9:30-10:30
Hensel Hall Board Room

1. Introduction
The meeting was initiated through a discussion of the 9 Criteria for review selected by WRSC. The chairs were informed of both where we were at in the reaccreditation process (Institutional Self-Review, Phase I) as well as where we are going (discussion of the Educational Effectiveness review and the C&PR review).

2. Discussion of Educational Effectiveness
A FAQ sheet was passed out and the chairs discussed what is next in the reaccreditation process (i.e. Educational Effectiveness Review and Capacity and Preparatory Review). A discussion of the framework that WASC will be using to determine our Educational Effectiveness ensued. Question: “Are the criteria for Educational Effectiveness similar to NAAB?” Answer: Yes, but they are unlike NAAB in that they are less prescriptive.

The Educational Effectiveness Indicators Results were passed out. The chairs were asked, “What do we expect students’ learning outcomes holistically to look like?” Question: “Is this something that is new regarding WASC expectations?” Answer: It is fairly new. Further response: There is a requirement from WASC for the evaluation of “Educational Effectiveness”. This evaluation should no longer be fragmented in nature.

Next, a discussion of the Indiana University – Perdue University - Indianapolis 6 standards took place and their promotion of the “golden ruler”. Of course, this is not something that Woodbury should simply copy, but it is a good example of Purdue conforming to institutional standards as well as reflecting their unique nature in their adherence. Excellent example of how the Reaccreditation process can benefit the university in a positive way.

Next, results from the community survey were discussed, especially answers to the question, “What makes Woodbury unique?” There was much debate regarding problems with the answers as well as the question itself. “Is this the right question to be asking?” “What do the results mean?” A response to the debate was that there are commonalities that emerge out of our differences in opinions regarding this issue; the problem is that nothing is currently embraced. There is an overall lack of initiative.

This debate spurred a discussion of the Mission Statement of the University. “What are our driving forces as an institution?” “Could this be used as a theme for reaccreditation?” Question: “Will there be a problem adopting changes in the face of reaccreditation?” Answer: If the community resoundingly embraces the idea, then the answer is that change will happen and change will be beneficial to the institution in the long run. A comment is
made that exit exams have been implemented in the School of Arts and Science. Due to this comment, a debate ensued on what constitutes proper examination. Should there be exit exams, or should these exams test out abilities as effective educators rather than the abilities expected of the students? Question: “How can we stop the mission statement from sounding like 300 people wrote it?” “Could we create a realistic mission statement?” Answer: That is what we hope to find out.

3. Closing
For the next meeting, it was commented that Tuesdays are better than Mondays for availability.