

# HLC Steering Committee

## Meeting Minutes

*Wed., March 14, 2011  
3:30 – 5:00 p.m., SC 207*

Present: Lori Baker, Alan Matzner, Beth Weatherby, Chris Hmielewski, Dan Campagna, Scott Crowell, Dan Baun, Bill Mulso, Lyn Brodersen, Betsy Desy, Kathleen Ashe, Joe Stremcha, Betty Roers

Absent: Doug Simon, Deb Kerkaert, Corey Butler

### Agenda

At the beginning of the meeting, the student representative, Joe Stremcha, was welcomed and introductions were made.

- I. Handout from Provost Weatherby regarding primary accomplishments and remaining concerns from previous HLC review

Provost Weatherby handed out a one-sheet version of accomplishments and concerns from the previous accreditation that were discussed last time. She considers the list a work in progress and would like the committee and campus community to focus on what needs to be kept on the table. This sheet is a document that we can use to inform the rest of campus. Things will continue to evolve. A process will need to be developed to keep drafts of the document updated as things continue to change.

- II. Updates about your team planning/meetings

Each of the five self-study criterion team leaders reported on their work and questions since the last steering committee meeting.

#### Team 1) Mission and Integrity-- Kathleen and Lyn

Kathleen and Lyn met and sent Lori a series of questions about best methods for proceeding, which she felt would be appropriate to raise here at the full meeting since other teams would have similar questions. The Fall Strategic planning meeting time will be Wed., Sept. 21, for the afternoon. The Strategic Planning committee will have a program for that day about creating an interim strategic plan. It's possible the HLC group could have a little time that day. An idea would be to build in time to introduce web-based surveys. Questions were raised plans for the January development days and if it would be possible to have a day/time devoted to assessment planning.

In general, for all of the teams, the process for gathering artifacts (evidence documents) related to each criterion was discussed. It was suggested that each team make a list of what they think they need and post these lists on T-drive for all groups to see and compare. Beth has a lot of these docs and can get them as needed.

Other questions concerned the team make-up, wondering who is necessary and who might serve as resources. Kathleen asked how the board is involved and how or whether we are compared to the MnSCU other universities. It was suggested that Steering Committee members look at what Mary wrote last time and what other MnSCU universities have done.

Team 2) Future -- Bill and Chris reported that they will dig into this.

Team 3) Student Learning -- Dan and Betsy

They reported that they will meet soon, but Betsy has done some work. Betsy shared her draft of ideas she had generated concerning each core component, and reported that she and Lori had met once to brainstorm on the draft. While the group reviewed parts of the document on the screen, Betsy noted that she had several questions based on her work so far, including the following:

- Whether the LEP would be included here or in Criterion 4.
- What can we do with the PDPs if anything—how might that info be of use? Perhaps similar info can be culled from department annual reports.
- What do we do with the info we collect—how to evaluate? Who does the evaluation/analysis?

Beth suggested that if every team had something like Betsy's draft to work from, the cabinet and staff could be helpful in filling in the blanks. In terms of this team's make-up, suggestions from the steering committee included having someone from grad programs; a dept chair; student affairs to help with co-curricular elements; LEP cross-over; distance-learning; students. Dan C. suggested this team keep in mind the five groups of students/programs—online, 2+2, learning communities, on campus, graduate.

Team 4) Acquisition, Discovery, Application of Knowledge -- Corey and Lyn will report next time

Team 5) Engagement and Service -- Doug and Betty

Doug and Betty met and threw out ideas of all that might be included. They had a question about outside funders and how to include them in review. Chris noted that Athletics is very involved in civic engagement via Division II requirements. The need to include Student Government and their various outreach activities in this section was noted. Lyn will give Betty a copy of the Civic Engagement survey. Betty asked how much will we need to go out and do focused surveys like about the Whipple,

etc. Beth suggested that Bill will need to be involved because of University Relations. Beth suggested that a section of the presidential workplan sent to MnSCU every year would be a good starting place. Beth will send this to Betty. Bill suggested we could consider how to use the Southwest Marketing Advisory Center as we are working through the surveys issue. Beth noted the need for a way to standardize surveys. Bill has a list of stakeholders from the service region that he can share.

### III. Consolidating membership needs of teams

#### A. Faculty/staff call for participation

Lori will put out the call this semester for people to commit for next year; the committee agreed to the following description of what volunteers would be signing up for: minimal involvement this spring, 1-2 meetings; at the most bi-weekly meetings (1-2x per month) next year; adding in a disclosure that team might be limited or people might be asked to work with another group if too many sign up for one group; include note about student nomination process. Lori will work with Chris to coordinate the call across the different union memberships. Deadline will be April 4<sup>th</sup>. We will ask the dept chairs to help remind folks.

#### B. Student nomination process and memo text

The nomination procedure and memo draft was approved. (Following the meeting, Joe provided an excellent suggestion for reordering of some information.) Additional discussion centered on possible ways to create other forums for student input. We will ask dept chairs to remind faculty to nominate students if necessary and have Chris put student nominations for HLC teams onto all of the M&C agendas.

### IV. “Self-study design” considerations

#### A. Ideas about goals for the self-study

#### B. Ideas about audiences for the self-study

The members of the team going to the HLC conference will look for examples of what we might include in these areas. It was agreed that much of the previous discussion held ideas for the goals and audiences of the self-study.

### V. Data collection considerations—reports from Evidence Team and CIA members regarding research on accreditation management systems

The Evidence Team will report at the next meeting. Dan B. asked whether as the teams work together and need to share more if there were any more ideas about collaborative work groups? He noted that Sharepoint would cost \$2.45 per user per month. Members will think over more and work more

with the CIA (assessment committee) as they learn more about possible technologies they might need/use.

VI. Other

Conference goers will look for ideas about how to coordinate efforts, organizational issues. Let conference attendees know questions.

- VII. Next Meeting: ~~Monday, April 18~~, Wednesday, April 20, 3:30, FH 219-SC 207
- A. Please come with reports on your team's work and plans
  - B. Conference attendees will report on the latest HLC news