

SUMMARY  
HLC Self-Study Steering Committee  
October 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2005—4-5pm—Student Union Building, Room 318

Present: Drs. Guy Farish, Teri McCartney, and Stu Hilwig. Mr. Bill Mansheim, Mr. Mike Nicholson, Mrs. Di Machado, Ms. Barbara Friese, and Mr. Paul Tigan

- I. Welcome
- II. Meeting Schedule
  - a. **Meetings will be switched to twice a month rather than once a month**
  - b. More time needed focusing the project as we gear up towards the writing section
- III. De-briefing Mary Breslin's Visit
  - a. Overall, the visit went very well and was reassuring of our progress thus far.
  - b. Specific Comments:
    - i. It's important that we address every core component in each criterion
    - ii. Be Creative!
      1. The Northern Colorado report was very mechanical and lock-step
      2. It's important to make the design and outcome very tailored to ASC
        - a. Don't conform to the examples provided by the HLC
        - b. Concentrate on the strengths, mission and focus of ASC
        - c. Will we be here in 10 years? The answer should be yes!
        - d. Will you be better in 10 years? The answer should be yes!
    - iii. Be evaluative, not descriptive
      1. On every core component of every criterion
    - iv. **Make sure you specifically ask to be reaccredited in the self-study report.**
    - v. Crosscutting Themes—forgettaboutit?
      1. These were an attempt by the HLC to tie the different criteria together
        - a. The HLC has understood them to be redundant considering the nature of the criteria.
        - b. The criteria already overlap so much that the crosscutting themes are often addressed incidentally.
    - vi. Examples
      1. **As with everything in the report—Clear, Concise, and Complete.**
      2. Make sure they are sufficient, but not too exhaustive.
      3. Use the web and the resource room as a back up to the final report.
- IV. Steering Committee Responsibilities
  - a. Keep the Sub-Committees on task and communicating with one another.
    - i. How do the Sub-Committees keep the Steering Committee up to date?
      1. The steering committee should be in the loop when drafts from the sub-committees are handed along to the writing committee.
      2. **Should summaries be emailed to the steering committee at those points?**
      3. **Perhaps an outline of the drafts when they are passed along to the writers?**
  - b. Keep everyone on task today by making future steps very clear.
    - i. The action of today sputters if there aren't specific deadlines in place.

**ii. Different groups and committees should be motivated by understanding their role in the larger picture of the self-study.**

V. Other Concerns

a. The Feedback Loop

- i. This was a term that Mary Breslin used very emphatically. How do we show evidence of it at the department level?
  1. It's a question not just how you collect data, but how the data that is collected is used to improve the program.
- ii. The methods do not have to be uniform across the campus. Each department is going to be different—that's okay.
- iii. "Accomplish standards without creating standardization"
- iv. All claims of your feedback loop must be supported by evidence. Show, don't tell.
- v. Student Permissions?
  1. If you are using student work as evidence in your report, make sure you have their written permission.
  2. Anonymous student work should be okay.

**b. One Page Summary/Outline Due for Next Meeting**

- i. Each criteria should bring the committee up to speed on their work
  1. What's been accomplished
  2. What's planned for the future
  3. The committees that are close to drafting their chapter should give some idea of what they will and will not include in their draft.

c. Surveys

- i. There was some concern earlier in the process about survey overload, but this does not seem to be a concern any longer.
- ii. The college has acquired survey software that should help with the design and implementation
- iii. Resident Experts in Psych and other departments will help with methodology
- iv. Known Surveys
  - 1. Criterion I—Need to move forward ASAP.**
  2. Criterion V—Planned, little detail.
  3. Surveys for Community members, Constituent groups—Further on up the road.

- v. Steering Committee should still act as clearing house for these surveys

d. Major Review Milestones?

- i. Steering Committee should develop and distribute intermediate milestones for smaller projects so the whole project does not lose its entropy.
  1. According to our current schedule, we do not have months to spare.
- ii. Some talk about another planning retreat for the middle of the spring semester.
  1. Details to follow.

VI. Final Points

- a. We need to encourage campus participation in the review of the planning documents
  - i. Institutional Strategic Plan is ready for review
    1. Provost will email campus again asking for comments
    2. Please encourage colleagues to review the plan

- ii. Academic Strategic Plan is close to being finished.
      - 1. This will need to be review by faculty as well.
  - b. The big goal is to get the campus in the habit of reviewing these documents and taking stock in what they say?
    - i. How can they be motivated to do this?
  - c. Send ideas and comments to Guy Farish.
- VII. Adjournment.