

Steering Committee Meeting
March 29, 2006—4-5pm—SUB 302

Present: Julie Waechter, Barbara Medina, Georgia Grantham, Teri McCartney, Guy Farish, Di Machado, Stuart Hilwig, Mary Valerio, Paul Tigan

- I. Approval of March 1st Summary
 - A. Guy Farish handed out minutes from previous meeting.
 - B. Will Zoomerang be available for next year? For program evaluations?
 1. Contact Mark S. with interests in using Zoomerang.
 - a. Wanted to buy larger license for the future
 - C. Will edit “marginalia” out of 3d.
 - D. Minutes approved by silent decree.
 - E. Paul will post on the site.
- II. Surveys
 - A. Mission, Vision, and Institutional Goals survey sent to adams.edu student email boxes.
 1. Not sure if it was sent to graduate students?
 - B. Also sent to the chamber of commerce email list.
- III. Style and the Drafts
 - A. It really matters when it comes to the Core Components and how we speak about them.
 1. Mary Breslin recommended that we don’t address them lock-step as many of the initial documents sent to the HLC
 2. How do we make it easier for the team to read the document?
 - a. Should we actually put the core components in the drafts?
 3. Many voices make the document appear to be a team document?
 4. Do we need to change the drafts right now so they all align one way or another?
 5. If people have not gone in order, they did it for a reason—editing it to put it in order would take away that effectiveness.
 - B. Heavily prescribing meaning to every paragraph, sentence, etc, would make our interpretations seem inflexible.
 1. But, we don’t want to have to make them work too hard to get through their basic checklists.
 - C. Voice does matter and we shouldn’t shy away from their differences.
 1. Can we get to some sense of conformity for the sake of the reader?
 2. What is the direction of the HLC? What have they said?
 3. The writing committee has to have a communal understanding of the structure of the document so there is consistency.
 - a. We don’t want to get to the point where the only common language is legalese.
 - D. Are we comfortable giving the writing committee the decision-making authority to make the document a unifying piece of literature?
 1. Yes. If the writing committee doesn’t do it, who will?
 2. Order and designations
 - a. Not every draft has gone down the list of criteria.
 - b. Can other sections operate in different ways?
 - E. This issue is best revisited when all the drafts are available.

1. All drafts should be ready in some form by end of May
 2. Writing Committee will come back with recommendations sometime by late May.
 - a. Drafts of all criteria will appear in Steering Committee member in-boxes in mid-May.
 - b. More-or-less-complete-as-much-as-we-have-version-of-the-self-study will be reviewed for voice, consistency, structure.
- F. The HLC has developed a new paradigm—we should too.
- IV. Current Drafting
- A. Criterion 4 will be delivered to in-boxes around Monday.
1. Please review and bring back to Teri McCartney as soon as possible
 - a. Missing Content
 - b. Inaccurate Content
 - c. Logic
- B. Criterion 2 will be ready after the group gets back from the Chicago meeting
1. Please read, review, and send to Frank Novotny as soon as possible.
- V. Seven people, including Lee Halgren and Mark Cavanaugh will go to the Chicago meeting of the HLC.
- VI. Next Meeting
- A. Wednesday, April 12th, 2006. 4:00pm, SUB302