1. Discussion of Annual Meeting
With regards to the Annual Meeting, the group talked about concurrent sessions, travel arrangements, meeting with our WASC liaison, Richard Winn, and dinner arrangements on Thursday with the architecture department and the San Diego faculty.

2. Discussion of Themes
Committee members discussed the current iteration of the themes for the institutional proposal. A question was raised on whether theme #1 (educational identity) was different from theme #3 (development of student success). There was a decided difference, although the committee did agree that there was a lot of overlap between all of the themes. A concern was raised that the themes were not as specific as they should be, especially in comparison to other institutional proposals (e.g. BYUH). But Woodbury’s themes were determined as different from other institutions’ themes due to the fact that we were not at the same stage as some other institutions who are perhaps further developed.

One committee member provided handouts regarding student health and the metaphor of health in student and institutional development. There was debate as to whether this metaphor was too broad. It seemed to be agreed that broadness was not necessarily a bad quality and that the metaphor of student health could go either way (specific or broad). This was important since it broadened the reaccreditation process to include both co-curricular and curricular objectives.

The chair of the committee relayed to the rest of the group that the draft for the themes and the goals and outcomes was due at the end of the week. She received a consensus from the group that the themes were appropriate and in the future needed additional tailoring. Therefore, it was determined that input from the rest of the group would be factored into the final draft, but general discussions regarding the draft of the themes would have to be put on hold until after the Annual Meeting.

The meeting therefore concluded in a discussion of some final comments and suggestions for the themes. For example, “Identity” would need some historical perspective in order to achieve relevance. “Teaching Effectiveness” dealt with teaching methods and assessing what it is that we, as faculty, would like students to know through the higher education process. It was decided that theme #2 (teaching effectiveness) and theme #3 were distinct based upon their focus. It was determined that theme #4 (institutional alignment) was all encompassing of the other themes and that its focus should be on how we can align institutional resources with the ideas that will become apparent in
assessing our educational identity. The question was raised, “Are we providing resources for this to happen?” The meeting concluded rather informally since it went over its allotted time.