

HLC Steering Committee

Meeting Minutes

Fri., September 6, 2013

9:00-10:00 a.m.

SC 206

Present: Lori Baker, Beth Weatherby, Scott Crowell, Jan Loft, Bill Mulso, Alan Matzner, Kathleen Ashe, Lori Wynia, Deb Kerkaert, Betsy Desy, Will Thomas, Chris Hmielewski

Absent: Dan Baun, Doug Simon, Raphael Onyeaghala, Joshua Anderson

Guests: Susan Jones

Agenda

- I. *Updates from Lori*
 - A. *Meeting with Facilities staff*
 - B. *Radio interview next Tuesday*
 - C. *HLC 2014 conference proposals due Sept. 30*

Lori B. briefly noted the agenda items listed above. One-third of the Facilities staff meet once a month, until the whole staff has rotated through. Lori will be attending the next three meetings to provide information about the upcoming HLC visit. She is being interviewed on KMHL on Tuesday for one of the first community notices about accreditation.

II. *Introduction overview—comments, suggestions*

Lori B. apologized for the awkward title of “introduction overview,” but she was deliberate in that phrasing to help her distinguish the overview section from the rest of the introductory sections that will also need to be in the introduction, or else set up as separate preliminary chapters before the criterion chapters. (These include a description of changes since 2004, the university’s response to concerns raised in the last review, and a description of the process the university used to accomplish the self-study document and prepare for the review team.)

She explained that the subsections in the overview were based on her review of a number of other university self-studies and the typical clusters of information that were provided. She also noted that this first draft is intentionally somewhat lacking in thematic flourishes and transitions, until the rest of the self-study is drafted and the specific themes emerge. She asked that the committee look at the large-scale issues with the draft, such as whether important topics were missing or if the order of primary sections seemed to flow, and focus the conversation on those items rather than proofreading and word choices. She asked that those proofreading and lower-level edits be sent to her and she will incorporate them.

A number of suggestions and questions were raised by the committee. They included the following:

- Looking at the external consultant review that was commissioned by the System Office several summers ago for any helpful pieces

- Considering how the order of introducing key events on campus might create an unintended emphasis
- Corrections and additions regarding facilities
- Timing of when to pull data, especially student data, to update the information in the introduction as currently drafted; a separate update will need to be available to the review team when they visit
- A suggestion to hold a focus session with Gary Gillen (Admissions), Pat Carmody (Registrar), Alan Matzner (Data Management), and Beth Weatherby (Provost) later on to ensure accuracy
- Add off-campus *undergraduate* programming and consider what terminology we will use consistently when referring to off-campus/distance learning efforts
- Consider the College Now description (how much needs to be explained in the intro vs the criterion chapters) and link to its site
- Athletics has some information to add about the growing student athlete population and their mission statement
- Add more about faculty service to the community and examples of student organizations
- Faculty response to the MnSCU Faculty Forums was recognized as being the best in the system, and perhaps there might be information in that response to use

Several possible themes began to emerge in the discussion:

- *Access*: The access SMSU provides for its students and for the region (examples to add include Summer Bridge and Upward Bound)
- *Hub*: SMSU interacts very vigorously with local government, the community, and the area schools and aids the economic development of the city and the region; SMSU is at the hub of many activities and partnerships
- *Partnerships*: Rather than “serve” the region, SMSU engages in meaningful partnerships across the region (perhaps a commitment to K-12 partnerships could be its own paragraph)
- *Interdisciplinary*: interdisciplinary partnerships within the university community are also highly visible

Overall, Steering Committee members felt that the draft of the introduction did a good job of capturing the important aspects of the university and was appropriate.

III. Changes since 2004 -- additions

Time ran out to address any suggested additions to the “Changes since 2004” list, but Lori B. asked that all send their additions to her.

IV. Other

Lori B. mentioned two items: 1) she is presenting at the National University Technology Network next week with a colleague from UNLV about the implications online/offsite accreditation reviews have for the creation of documentation and universities’ websites; and 2) she is working on updating our own accreditation web pages. Steering Committee agendas and minutes are complete through last spring semester.

V. Next meeting Friday, Sept. 13; please review draft of Criterion 1: Mission chapter (sent to you by next Tuesday, Sept. 10)