

## HLC Steering Committee

### Meeting Minutes

*Fri., Jan. 18, 2013*

*8:45-10:00 a.m.*

*SC 206*

Present: Lori Baker, Dan Baun, Betsy Desy, Alan Matzner, Kathleen Ashe, Betty Roers, Will Thomas, Jan Loft, Raphael Onyeaghala, Doug Simon

Absent: Bill Mulso, Chris Hmielewski, Beth Weatherby, Deb Kerkaert, Kyle Berndt, Scott Crowell

#### Agenda

During the meeting we discussed the agenda items in a different order—II, III, V, and then I.

#### *I. Review of collated "Table of Contents" from April 2012*

##### *A. Updates from teams*

##### *B. Checking for overlap and brainstorming on additional sections*

##### *C. Brainstorming on data table needs*

Lori started off the review of the TOC by first asking everyone to do a few minutes of brainstorming on the following questions: "What do you think are signature programs/events/qualities of SMSU? –what would an outsider who comes to SMSU notice? – what do we do really well?" and "What themes should we pick up on across the self-study?" She requested they do this before looking at the TOC in-depth to see what comes to mind initially, which can be compared to what shows up in the TOC and what might need to be added. Each person then described his/her list and Lori typed up all of the responses. The collected responses are copied at the end of these minutes and include additions after the meeting from Kyle, our student representative/Student Association President, to the Steering Committee.

In beginning to review the TOC, Lori put up several guiding questions: "What overlaps do we see in the TOC across criteria, if any? What can we add to chapters? What data tables, figures, pictures would be useful to accompany the chapter sections?"

One area that was identified as showing up across the criteria is the College Now program. Lori will contact Kim Guenther to see if she has any materials or reports she can share out with the different teams rather than having each team go to her separately. Access to the NACEP report information would be useful for several teams to have.

In the time we had, we made it through Criterion 1 and 2 and had just started on 3A when time for discussion ran out. Those present agreed the activity had been very useful and agreed to continue with full Steering Committee review of the rest of the TOC when we meet again on February 8.

Notes about Criterion One included that this chapter's TOC, and the chapter's intent, is to be fairly broad and overview, as the other chapters will provide further examples of how the mission is

enacted. There will be more overall data in this chapter and not as much deep interpretation as perhaps will show in other chapters, though we will need to pull out specific examples. Ideas for specific examples include signature programs, the Strategic Plan, and our university's structure of shared governance.

Some additional ideas were brought up for Criterion 2 to consider. These included the History Center and how it is a space partially funded by SMSU; the GIS center and how it provides regional service; other services who have space on campus like the Veterans' Center, New Horizons, and Health Services and how family planning is coming to campus periodically through their office. It was noted that it would be nice to get a GIS map showing, for example, College Now sites across the state, and that Charlie Kost is working with Jim Tate on GoogleMaps already. A suggestion about the policy core component was to include transfer credit policies.

*II. Reminder: Earlybird rate for HLC Conference ends March 4*

Lori gave a quick reminder about this deadline to those traveling to the conference.

*III. Brief update on survey work*

*A. Mike and SMAC's work inputting the questions online*

*B. IRB review process*

Mike will finish putting the survey into digital form with the correct mechanisms in place so that the appropriate target audiences answer the questions intended for them, yet it will be all one large survey. Lori noted that she has asked Mike and Bill to work together on the PR for getting the survey to the appropriate groups. Alan will be working on the student survey in this same time frame. Lori sent the survey draft to the IRB committee during finals week. While doing so might not have been necessary given the current IRB standards, from the literature Lori read, more schools are doing so and it is being encouraged to model good practice and ethical standards. Debbie Van Overbeke, IRB co-chair, reviewed the survey draft and circumstances and suggested that it go before the committee for review. Lori will follow up with this process as needed.

*IV. Criterion team updates if any*

Did not address any other updates besides the work on Criterion 1 and 2's TOC ideas.

*V. Other*

During the survey discussion, Jan brought up the copyright issues that are emerging in other areas and wondered if we are creating something (the self-study) that might need to be copyrighted? Connie Howard, legal counsel for the IFO, will be coming to campus to discuss copyright issues with faculty. Lori thought that current legal practice was that copyright is automatic, but she will look into this. Lori has spoken with Vicky Brockman (president of SmSUFA) to let her know that our accreditation process will respect what the IFO asks of faculty regarding copyright of syllabi.

Time ran out for other "others." On the next agenda will be a request from Lori for any updates for the web site.

*VI. Next Meeting*

February 8, 2013, 8:45 – 10:00, SC 206