

University Council
Meeting Minutes
January 6, 2023 | 8:30-10:30am

I. Welcome | Sue Monahan

The committee met via Zoom to focus on and provide input for the Year Seven accreditation report.

II. Overview of Accreditation Year Seven Report Process | Sue Monahan, Katherine Schmidt

In advance of the meeting, Dr. Monahan provided the University Council with materials to review to prepare for the discussion. She and Katherine provided an overview of the goals for the meeting.

III. Break into Workgroups

- ***Group 1: Preamble (pp 1-3) and Response to Standard 1B3 (14-15)***

Jaclyn Caires-Hurley
Kathy Cassity
Hillary Fouts
Ana Karaman
Bill Kernan
Malissa Larson
Randi Lydum
Jenna Otto
Rob Winningham

- ***Group 2: Response to Standard 1B1 (pp 4-7)***

Chelle Batchelor
Rebecca Chiles
Melanie Landon Hays
Jesse Peters
Alice Sprague
Jackson Stalley
Judy Sylva
Dominique Vargas

- ***Group 3: Response to Standard 1B2 (pp 8-15, you can scan Table 1B2-1)***

Michael Baltzley
Breeann Flesch
Tina Fuchs
Mark Girod
Cara Groshong
Kodee Harwood
Paige Jackson
Steve Scheck

IV. Discussion to Share Workgroup Outcomes

After the allotted time to review the assigned sections of the report, each group reported back to provide a summary of their discussion in relation to the section they reviewed.

Group 1 Notes | Preamble (pp 1-3) and Response to Standard 1B3 (14-15)

The structure of the Presidential Advisory Committees, which were implemented in 2016, has provided a productive way to ensure continuous improvement through planning, prioritizing, aligning, implementing, and assessing the processes. They also discussed finding opportunities to get the most out of these advisory committees.

Group 2 Notes | Response to Standard 1B1 (pp 4-7)

We've made a more systematic and intentional shift in our organization for efforts towards continuous improvement.

Group 3 Notes | Response to Standard 1B2 (pp 8-15, you can scan Table 1B2-1)

We have become more effective in using data when setting meaningful goals, objectives and indicators to ensure student success. It was also noted that when we compare ourselves to other out-of-state comparators, we need to take into account that many students don't take full loads to complete their degrees within four years for financial reasons, which results in us having a higher 6-year graduation rate. It's not that we aren't supporting our students, it's that they aren't taking as many credits.

Moving into the next steps, the team broke into the same small groups three separate times to focus on questions that were prepared for their discussion. They utilized a Google document to input their notes and then came back together to share their feedback.

QUESTION 1: IS THERE ANYTHING THAT SURPRISES YOU?

GROUP 1

- Struck by the progress made in less than 7 years, specifically referencing the work of the advisory committees.
- The newness of the WOU Board of Trustees was a surprise for newer folks.
- Those who were at WOU during the dissolution of OUS stated that the transition appeared to be easier than the lived experiences.
- The dissolution likely made it hard to know what might be missing from the bigger picture.

GROUP 2

- In some cases, committees have fulfilled charges in robust ways. But the structure and charge is often cloudy or misunderstood, and there are not mechanisms in place for how charged are fulfilled and then accounted for.
- Are there ways to define our charges in diverse ways? It seems like with some ideas they've worked because of a top-down directive – but are the committee empowered to bring ideas and do collective work without a top down charge?
- We could look at decision making structures and how they interface with the university-wide committees.



- How do we shift the culture and still make the committees more effective?
- Recommendations: Have a clear charge and goals; determine terms of service for committee members (longevity helps), chairs of committees, and goals.

GROUP 3:

- Difference in understanding this information; very dependent on role/scope
- NSSE data and availability of this to the larger WOU community
- FYS is considered a HIP and should be 100% of non-transfer students
- Objectives/indicators felt not in alignment (e.g., flexible programs/paths – does counting course modality get at this?)
- Many of these benchmarks were set up prior to the formation of the Gen Ed committee.
- Positive student/faculty/staff interaction as an objective seems like a low bar.

QUESTION 2: WHAT ARE WE MISSING IN THIS STORY?

GROUP 1

- The hard work, time, and missteps
- The pandemic and how this affected our progress.
- Changes in presidential leadership and turnover in staff (particularly unclassified) have both had impacts on the structures.
- The lack of clarity of the roles of the advisory committees
- Accomplishments and work of the advisory committees
- How can we improve the process & structure?

GROUP 2

- Weaving some balance of the preamble into the standard would provide context.
- Changes in leadership have created different conditions for the changes we've experienced.
- Work from the PLC's might be helpful to include here to demonstrate concrete and clear examples with evidence that shows an evolution in practice.

GROUP 3

- Where student support services fit in to students' persistence and completion to graduation.
- Student engagement outside of the classroom to capture all areas (e.g., student affairs, athletics, advising, etc.) that we know are touch points that impact retention.
- Academic and Social/Emotional integration is critical – creating a new benchmark.
- Development of comprehensive campaign and its goals to reduce barriers to student success.

QUESTION 3: CONSIDER THE WORK YOU'VE BEEN DOING: WHAT IS SOMETHING THAT YOU'RE PROUD OF THAT WE MIGHT NOT KNOW ABOUT?

- ASWOU has done a lot of work this AY toward supporting the campus & community food bank

- The excellent work performed by classified staff
- The emergency training efforts that are taking place within the emergency planning team and the university as a whole
- The transparency around budget and financial process (i.e., UBAC educational sessions)
- Taking care of our physical infrastructure
- Taking care of our students to educate them on debt management and provide resources to them
- Integrating Academic Innovation into the library services which now has a full team to provide improvements and resources to programs on campus
- WOU Library provided some of the most continuous services of the Oregon Public University libraries during COVID
- Institutional Research Office has achieved a greater increase in data made available to the university (but still needs to be communicated better)
- The cybersecurity posture for WOU has been greatly strengthened
- The College of Education has shifted the context of the markets they are pursuing to better meet the needs of serving working adults
- Creative opportunities for the biology department (and others) to make changes to better serve our students
- Faculty are working hard to breakdown silos across the academic programs to work together to create pathways to degree success
- The unions have created a great foundation for better relations with legislators and develop a positive story about WOU

It was noted how critical the input of each group and the dialogue around the questions will be to integrate into the report for the year seven review.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:25am.