

**Middle States Executive Committee Meeting
Notes
February 1, 2018**

Attending: Dr. William Bealing, Dr. James Delle, Dr. Sara Grove, Dr. Billy Henson, Dr. Karen Johnson, Dr. Gretchen Pierce, Dr. José Ricardo, Dr. Tracy Schoolcraft, Mr. Justin Sentz, Dr. Rick Ruth, Dr. Daniel Velez, and Ms. Shirley Smith

New Steering Committee Member

The group welcomed Dr. Danny Velez, Ship's new Chief of Staff, who will be assisting with the Middle States process.

Spring 2018 Activity Schedule

Dr. Pierce reviewed the Spring 2018 activity schedule noting the draft due dates shown below. She asked Workgroup Chairs to submit whatever drafts they have on those dates even if they are incomplete. Drs. Pierce, Ricardo, and Schoolcraft can assist Workgroup Chairs if there is missing information or if additional documents are needed to write the drafts.

Date	Activity	Party Responsible	Is a Meeting Needed ?
February 1 (previously scheduled for Feb 2)	Follow-Up Meeting from December 15	Executive Committee	Meeting scheduled
February (Weeks one and two)	Data Collection and Analysis Meetings	Workgroup Members as Assigned by the Chair(s)	No meeting
February (Weeks three and four)	Draft Writing	Workgroup Members as assigned by the Chair(s)	No meeting
February 28	Standards First Draft Due	To be submitted by Workgroup Chairs to Drs. Pierce, Ricardo, and Schoolcraft	No meeting
March (Entire Month)	Review of All Drafts	Drs. Pierce, Ricardo, and Schoolcraft	No meeting
April 6	Feedback to Workgroups	Steering Committee	Meeting scheduled
April 9 - May 11	Revising Standards Reports	Workgroup Members as Assigned by the Chair(s)	No meeting
May 18	Standards Final Draft Due	To be submitted by Workgroup Chairs to Executive Committee	No meeting

Committee Composition

Members reviewed changes in the committee composition. The composition is as follows:

- Tracy Schoolcraft, Administration Co-chair
- Gretchen Pierce, Faculty Co-chair
- José Ricardo, Faculty Co-chair

- Workgroup #1 – University Mission and Goals
 - Liz Fisher, Chair
 - Brian Wentz
 - Marcie Lehman
 - Michelle Foreman
 - David Lovett
 - Lori Davis
 - Nicole Hill
 - *Student tba*
- Workgroup #2 – Ethics and Integrity
 - William Bealing, Chair
 - Christopher Keyes
 - Kim Weikel
 - Linda Chalk
 - Carlesha Halkias
 - David Topper
 - Brian Ulrich
 - *Student tba*
- Workgroup #3 – Design and Delivery of Learning
 - Billy Henson, Co-chair
 - Justin Sentz, Co-chair
 - Sherri Bergsten
 - Han Liu
 - Robert Stephens
 - Jason Barauskas
 - Carolyn Callaghan
 - James Mike
 - *Student tba*
- Workgroup #4 – Student Support
 - Karen Johnson, Chair
 - Michael Coolsen
 - Freddy Siahaan
 - Blandine Mitaut
 - Laura Kownacki
 - Barry McClanahan
 - Anita Weaver
 - Jamonn Campbell
 - Jen Milburn
 - Donta Truss
 - Fred Horn
 - Deah Atherton

- Workgroup #5 – Educational Assessment
 - José Ricardo, Chair
 - Ford Brooks
 - Sally Paulson
 - Viet Dao
 - Dudley Girard
 - Lynn Baynum
 - John Kooti
 - *Student tba*
- Workgroup #6 – Planning and Improvement
 - James Delle, Chair
 - Carol Wellington
 - Robert Ziegenfuss
 - William Oberman
 - Adam Roth
 - Jamie Rhine
 - Mindy Fawks
 - Brian Johnson
 - Daniel Velez
 - *Student tba*
- Workgroup #7 – Governance and Administration
 - Sara Grove, Chair
 - Melissa Ricketts
 - Azim Danesh
 - Kate McGivney
 - Anthony Winter
 - Linda Miller
 - Jeffrey Coy
 - Roger Serr
 - Robin Maun
 - Evan Redding
- Workgroup on Communication
 - Kim Garris, Chair
 - Megan Silverstrim
 - *Additional members tba*
- Workgroup on Compliance
 - Rick Ruth, Co-chair
 - Jennifer Haughie, Co-chair
 - Cathy Sprenger
 - Stefanie Elbel
 - Mark Pilgrim
 - Amy Diehl
 - Steven Burg
 - Alix Rouby
 - Ashley Grimm
 - Trina Snyder

Student Involvement in the Reaccreditation Process

Workgroup Chairs were encouraged to ask students to serve on their workgroups. The group also discussed asking professors, who are teaching courses related to Middle States standards, (perhaps Drs. Ted Carlin, Lonce Bailey, and Doug Birsch) to identify students who will gain valuable experience from their involvement in workgroups. Also, perhaps professors could assign a section of the MS report as a class project. Students may begin serving now or they may wait until the Fall 2018 semester. Student duties could involve reading draft reports, or specific chapters of the reports, and providing feedback from the student perspective. Students could also be called upon to play a skeptic role. Although one challenge for students will be for them to review information from a ten-year period knowing that they have been on campus for a shorter time, it will still be important to have student input. Seniors and residence directors will have a longer perspective and their assistance will be sought. One additional possibility may be to offer a stipend to new graduates for their assistance in reading chapters during the summer following their Commencement. In addition, we could seek student feedback on the reaccreditation process through the Student Senate, the Orientation Team, and the Peer Mentors in the First Year Experience Program.

Dr. Schoolcraft was interviewed by Shannon Long, News Editor for the *SLATE*, earlier in the day, for an article that will provide students with information about Ship's reaccreditation process.

Missing Data

There has been some confusion about what information is needed for the Middle States process. To clarify, we need both completed rubrics as well as assessment reports.

Workgroups were asked not to move documents from one folder to another; however, copying files to a second folder is acceptable as some information is needed by more than one standard. Workgroup Chairs were asked to contact Dr. Ricardo if they are unable to find information in the Middle States folder; he will contact the appropriate person or office for the information.

Consideration is being given to putting some reports in TracDat. More information to follow on this topic.

To clarify, we usually need data for three years. Also, not all data needs to be copied to the S drive; instead, we can provide links to the website. It is understood that not all minutes are public. For example, APSCUF minutes are private; this is understood as a standard practice. On the other hand, Faculty/Management minutes are public.

Revised Data Analysis and Interpretation Guide (DAIG)

The revised DAIG document was distributed prior to the meeting and will be made a part of these notes. Workgroups are not required to use the DAIG format but will find it helpful to have their reports in Middle States format and language found in DAIG. Dr. Ricardo's workgroup has been following DAIG and has found it useful in identifying gaps in information.

Writing the First Draft for Assigned Standard

Chairs were reminded to write their reports in narrative form rather than using bullet points. Also, workgroups were asked to retain copies of their DAIG documents, rubrics, etc. used in writing the reports.

Workgroup were reminded to include sections about Requirements of Affiliation and connections to the University's Strategic Plan.

As previously noted, Drs. Schoolcraft, Pierce, and Ricardo will write the final report in one voice. Also, while each workgroup will include not more than three recommendations, the final report will have only three to five recommendations in total.

As a reminder, the following recommendations have been adapted from the 2017 Middle State Pre-conference Workshop Notes.

1. The self-study is in fact a research paper not an encyclopedia. Therefore, the narrative of the chapters must be more analytical than descriptive.
2. The chapter must be brief, but substantial: 10-15 pages (single-spaced) not including footnotes, tables, etc. **Required font size is 12.**
3. The chapter must provide **no more than three recommendations** for improvement. How can Shippensburg better attain its institutional priorities? Drs. Pierce, Ricardo, and Schoolcraft will narrow down the recommendations to three in total for the entire university.
4. The chapter must explain how Shippensburg meets the specific standard and the corresponding *Requirements of Affiliations*. In the body of the chapter, appropriate reference to the *Requirement of Affiliations* must be included. The reference should have appropriate supporting evidence (i.e., documents).
5. The chapter must be evidence-driven. It should not make assertions without proper evidence, but a particular piece of evidence should only be used if it is vital to understanding the self-study. In other words, you will need to be selective in which documents you actually reference in the chapter. The examples you select will then be included in the Document Roadmap [or Evidence Inventory]."
6. The chapter should not present data that are too complex to interpret. Tables and charts must be user-friendly. **Requested the use of Excel files.**
7. The chapter should always link key findings to the mission and the strategic plan (i.e., University Priorities).
8. The chapter should always present currently existing assessment information: the more current, the better. **Recommended we use three years of data with an end date of fall 2017.**
9. The chapter must include a table highlighting key use of assessment results. As a suggestion, in a three-column table, data could present:
 - a. The outcomes triggering the need for intervention.

- b. The intervention strategies.
- c. The improved outcomes.

10. The rubric used to collect and assess data on the standard can be used as a template to write the chapter. That is, the different criteria are the sub-headings of the chapter.

11. It is worth noting that the final content of the Self-Study may not have all of the content and/or language provided by the workgroups.

The meeting was adjourned.

Notes recorded by Shirley Smith