MIDDLE STATES STEERING COMMITTEE
February 10, 2012
FOB Conference Room 9:30 a.m.

Present: J.D. DeLong (via Skype), Patty Todd, Dave Norenberg, Christa Kelson, Mary O'Horo-Loomis, Karen Spellacy, Terry Waldruff, Carli Schiffner, William Barnes, Brandon Baldwin, Mark Howlett, Sarah Todd, Bruce Alexander, Michelle Currier, Feng Hong, Martin Liu, Sue Law

Absent: None

Guests: None

1. Approval of December 9, 2011 minutes.
   Minutes approved as written.

2. Report from MSCHE Conference in December – Sarah Todd, Carli Schiffner and J.D. DeLong

   Sarah stated that there is a lot to do especially in regards to assessment and student learning outcomes (SLO). We need to look at how resources are allocated to achieve goals. There can be no more “going to do”. We need well developed plans on how we are going to do things. We have gaps in assessment. Assessment is out of compliance and we are addressing that. What is Middle States Steering Committee going to do? It is not our responsibility to correct the problems. We need to review what we are doing, identify what is working and not working and make recommendations when possible. The College has had ten years to address this. Some colleges have an Assessment Director whose sole responsibility is assessment. That may be one of our recommendations since adding assessment to other duties has not gotten the job done.

   In regards to assessment practices, one college asked faculty to list what students learned in their course and created an assessment rubric to assess outcomes. This did not require anything new and was very easy for faculty to do. This was rolled into overall assessment.

   Carli agreed with everything Sarah shared. We do need to imbed assessment in course outlines. There is a critical thinking collegiate learning assessment tool that will be purchased for this spring. We have been getting things in order but we still have much work to do. We need to do evidence collection for value added outcomes.

   J.D attended a session on how to conduct a self-study. He felt reassured that we are doing an adequate process. SUNY Potsdam’s draft was recently submitted and their visit is only two months away. SUNY New Paltz was held up as a standout and their draft was only three months prior to their visit so our time line is very reasonable.
Timeline reviewed again and we are still on track. Feng Hong noted that Dr. Frempong is an ABET Accréditer and he might serve a mock site reviewer.

3. **Self-Study Questions Update**

J.D. reviewed all the self-study questions. Dr. Schneider, our MS Liaison, had noted that any substantial changes in the self-study questions would need to be reviewed by MS. Some questions were reworded but there were no substantial changes so no need to resubmit the self-study.

4. **Work Group Recommendations for Self-Study**

J.D. asked each member to respond to the following questions. What are the broad themes? If you see things that are being done, please make a note of it.

   a. What theme(s) emerge for each standard or overall in the Self-Study?
   b. Are there things recommended that we are already doing?
   c. What are the most important themes and/or items to include as recommendations?
   d. Are we missing any important recommendations?

Carli noted that for Standard 2 & 3 we need to be blunt. One session done by Alfred State at the conference discussed how they created transparent budget process allocating OTPS monies using the strategic plan. The VPs were able to look at the overall plan and able to combine 3-4 planning efforts and link plans together.

Brandon Baldwin had a correction for a recommendation made. Carli said that was being done. She will share with J.D. accountability issues on campus. Two areas had same problems and they have made some progress.

5. **Update on Self-Study Draft**

As J.D. noted earlier he has reviewed questions for any major changes and we have none. He has created one master document. All appendices are in table format and duplicates have been. Recommendations have been compiled by characteristics of excellence. He is
in the process of drafting an executive summary. He plans to have a draft available by March 9th and would like committee review by our next meeting March 16th. Some sections will need substantial revisions. We need to be down to 100 pages for the final submission.

6. Committee to Prepare Document Room

Discussion on what the document room will look like. Think in broader terms for student work beyond paper. What other things should be included? For example, a model of the Steel Bridge would be a great addition. The document room doesn’t have to be all electronic. We need to make sure we have everything that is linked to self-study and an index that is tied to specific characteristic of excellence.

Carli suggested we use a conference room at the hotel be available as well. The Alumni House might be a good option for the site reviewers vs. a hotel. Karen suggested work from the Scholarly Celebration. Christa suggested that committee faculty members could discuss at school meetings saving presentations for the document room. The committee agreed that this should be done and asks each faculty member to talk with their school.

It was agreed that Michele Currier, Mary Bucker, Sarah Todd, Bruce Alexander would be in charge of creating the document room

J.D. co-chairs Dave Norenberg and Patty Todd, Dr. Kennedy and Carli received the bio information regarding a tentative selection for our MS chair for the site visit. After email discussion everyone felt he was an excellent fit. The tentative chair is Dr. William J Martin, Senior Vice President at the Pennsylvania College of Technology. J.D. reviewed his background with committee. J.D. has sent our approval to MS but has not heard back. We will have a preliminary visit this fall before the actual site visit in spring 2013. Continue to plan for a Mock Review in mid to end of April. Carli may have somebody in mind and will reach out to her for this mock visit.

Next Meeting—March 16, 2012 (Friday) at 9:30 a.m. (FOB 620)