

HLC Steering Committee

Meeting Minutes

Wed., Feb. 9, 2011

3:30 – 4:45 p.m., FH 219

Present: Lori Baker, Beth Weatherby, Lyn Brodersen, Dan Campagna, Kathleen Ashe, Doug Simon, Betsy Desy, Corey Butler, Bill Mulso, Deb Kerkaert, Chris Hmielewski, Dan Baun, Alan Matzner,

Absent: Ben Dolan, Scott Crowell, Betty Roers

Agenda

- I. Overview of Assurance Section and progress report from May 2009
 - A. Provost Weatherby—updates on actions taken, actions needed

Provost Weatherby led the group through main points from the previous assurance report and updated the group on actions taken or still needed. Main points from this overview included the following:

- Using this as an opportunity to recast the strategic plan, as the current cycle ends in 2011; the Provost will be calling the Strategic Planning committee together and will use the 1) New ten Student learning outcomes, 2) five HLC criteria, and 3) four Strategic Directions from MnSCU to help build an operational plan that will outline who is accountable for various areas and provide timelines.
- The biggest piece needing attention and HLC action in the previous round was the gen ed program. The new program has been approved and is in the catalog. This is a big step that is complete and that provides the structure for moving forward with assessments. The Progress report to HLC was accepted.
- Careful monitoring of resources and finances: we can document careful attention to this.
- Progress is somewhat limited on diversity, particularly faculty and admin. We have a diversity plan that is 5 years old and are working on a new one in conjunction with the Chancellor's office. The Provost is also on a system-wide committee regarding this issue.
- We have improved regarding the Federal compliance complaints section; we now have a method for dealing with complaints that is centralized in Dean's office.
- Though nothing was noted about the mission in the previous round, we have also been through the Brown and Gold Task Force's work and have revised the mission.
- Physical plant facilities are something that always require ongoing attention
- Data-based decision-making was an issue throughout the report. We have made a lot of progress since then in Student Affairs, IT, Library, Admissions, and Registration. Program Review timelines and structures allow data review every year. We need to stay on track with the 5 year program review cycle.
- Grad-program area was discussed for its organization. While Dean Campagna will need to continue to review, improvements have been made; there is now a separate Graduate Council and a separate Graduate Curriculum committee.

- Teacher Education notes: there had been concern in the past report about administrative work as service in faculty loads; there is now a 100% position dedicated to working with licensure issues and some reassigned time for the graduate director of Education.
- Acquisition of equipment was an issue noted. Funds from the Foundation addressed some needs and provided funds for matching grants. The Student Technology fee money and stimulus monies have helped fund various needs.
- Previously we did not have a technology plan; we have a MNSCU one now and it is on the system-wide agenda for updating.
- Before next meeting, the Provost will summarize in an easy-to-read format the major pieces of progress to point out and the major pieces to keep moving forward. The Provost noted that we are starting early in the accreditation process and have a good amount of time to address any remaining concerns.

B. Dean Brodersen—updates on LAC, assessment initiative

Dean Brodersen reviewed the progress made on assessment issues, especially as they relate to the new Liberal Education Program (LEP—please note this is a new acronym and name, necessitated by MnSCU in order to avoid any confusion with the Minnesota Transfer Curriculum[MnTC]). Main points include the following:

- Committee on Institutional Assessment (CIA) meeting tomorrow; will go every other week
- Looking at an e-portfolio system for students to demonstrate progress on the 10 learning outcomes
- Talking about a framework for likely identifying two outcomes to focus on assessing each year; starting with
 - o Communicating effectively
 - o Critical thinking
- Using NSSE as baseline (last done 5 years ago) as one of the methods; will be administering again this year
- The CAT test on critical thinking will be another piece
 - o Several faculty have gone to training
 - o The 1st test was administered in Jan in First Year Seminar (FYS)
 - o Will do post-test in April
- Working w/ CIA and appropriate faculty to develop rubrics (Some drafted, under consideration)
- All-University meetings were held in the past (Fall ' 09) to help define how work in all different areas contributes to outcomes

II. Subcommittee structure—discuss draft, revise as needed, and vote

The proposed structure was approved by consensus with one small change. Lori suggested changing the title of the data team to “evidence team.”

III. Understanding the criteria and setting tasks for the subcommittees; decide on initial deadlines

All steering committee members were assigned to lead a committee, with a faculty member and an administrative member sharing duties on the criterion teams. It was decided that each leadership team would review the team duties and needs before the next steering committee. At the next meeting, needs will be discussed and a uniform call-out for faculty and staff members to join each team will be developed. Lori suggested, based on an example she read about from last year's HLC conference, a nomination process for students to be invited to join the teams. This adds prestige and would help identify motivated students who want to participate. The group agreed, and Lori will draft a nomination memo.

IV. Revised timeline draft—to be added to

Lori provided handouts on a possible model for the teams to follow in their planning work and an expanded timeline. The expanded timeline was briefly reviewed in tandem with the model for committees. Emphasis was placed on the teams conducting their work over the course of next year and finishing by the end of next spring semester. While this seems early, time is needed to complete a full draft of the study and allow for multiple reviews of the draft.

V. "Self-study design" considerations

The Provost shared information from an HLC conference session about how university can use the self-study design process to its advantage. The homework for the next meeting includes considering audience and purposes of the self-study, items which are necessary in the self-study design document.

VI. Resource room—help with organizing

The resource room will be located in Founder's Hall on the second floor. We need to consider this a "holding place" as the review team will need a larger space when they visit. Lori asked for help in organizing the resource room. Kathleen volunteered. All of the administration has keys, as does Chris Anderson, so it should be relatively easy for someone to drop off an item for the room.

VII. Data collection considerations

Dan reported on various options for dealing with our electronic resource needs, depending on their purpose. For "data dump" needs, we could utilize the T-drive ; off-campus access possible. For collaborative workspace, there are several possibilities such as Sharepoint or a MnSCU version. Cloud-based options would cost per month per user. Accreditation management systems such as Taskstream would also cost per user but we could limit the of users. LiveText is something being used already by Education that could be expanded. Livetext is being demo-ed on Feb. 16th for CIA; we will ask to see the accreditation component at that demo. In terms of an e-resource room, we can set access points to certain people. It was decided that at the next meeting we would schedule a

review of the accreditation management systems and would set up the T-drive for the immediate needs of the steering committee and criterion teams.

VIII. HLC Conference planning

The Provost noted that it is important to have an SMSU presence at the HLC conference. This year the budget allows for the self-study coordinator (Lori), the data collection point person (Alan), and the Deans and Provost to attend. Others are welcome if they are able to use their own travel funds.

IX. Next Meeting: Monday, March 14, 3:30, FH 219

A. Please come with ideas about what our *goals* and *audiences* for the self-study should be

B. Please come with updates about your subcommittee planning/meetings

X. Other

The existence of university standards for graphics was noted; they were recently revised. A university style guide for writing is being developed. We can use these guides for the creation of the self-study.