1. **Introduction:**
   To start the session, there was a recap of the recent Senate Meeting. The Senate was very engaged regarding reaccreditation and there was a good dialog.

2. **Community Address**
   A discussion took place regarding the appropriate time for a community address to occur. The major concern was whether or not to have the meeting before or after April 15th. The reason behind this dealt with the upcoming WASC Annual Meeting. Although having the address held before the meeting would mean less preparation for the presentation of concepts involved in the Institutional Proposal, to hold it after this date would be cutting the timeline too close to commencement. It was decided to leave it in the air for one more week. A question was raised regarding the make-up of the community. It was answered that the community included the students, staff, and faculty of the university. It was also determined that we would need to see what space is available for the meeting. Another question was raised: “To whom does the Institutional Proposal need to be shown?” The answer was that we, as the Steering Committee, are given a lot of leeway with the proposal at this point since it is still very much in draft form.

3. **Annual Meeting Discussion**
   A discussion took place with regard to registration. It was determined that the committee did not need to maximize attendance to the WASC sponsored workshops since it was discovered that there would be 50 concurrent sessions being presented by several different institutions in addition to the workshops. Therefore, registration for the WASC workshops was decreased from the original number represented by the previous week’s sign-up sheets.

4. **Institutional Proposal Themes**
   For this part of the meeting, a roundtable discussion of potential themes took place. It was opened with an inspirational story concerning a first generation college student and their experience with the studio mode of instruction used heavily in the architecture and design programs. This spurred the rest of the group to begin discussions regarding modes of instruction at an institution wide level as a potential theme for the Institutional Proposal. Such concepts as personal mastery, professional development, life callings, spiritual competence, an infusion of multiculturalism, and “Millenial” generation students were all brought up, all of which concerned the changing landscape of Woodbury’s student make-up. One of the members brought up that what is most important to the students and faculty of the university should be the most important concepts represented in the reaccreditation process. It was determined that these concepts are being addressed, but at an individual rather
than institutional level. Following this, the concept of collaborative learning was discussed as a possible theme for institutional change as related to the classroom environment throughout the various departments.