

HLC Steering Committee  
Meeting # 11  
Tuesday, January 31, 2012  
4:00 p.m. Student Center, Room 308

Attendees: Ted Buck, Marilyn Buck, Bryan Byers, Clare Chatot, Nancy Cronk, Rodney Davis, Alan Hargrave, Bernie Hannon, Kay Hodson-Carlton, Chip Jagers, Leisa Julian, William Knight, Dan Lutz, Michael Maggiotto, David Perkins, Barb Phillips and Greg Wright

Not in Attendance: Hollis Hughes

---

---

Discussion:

Marilyn Buck

- Marilyn Buck and Michael Maggiotto have met with Student Affairs and Business Affairs to discuss the Self-Study process. They have asked these groups to encourage others in their areas to schedule one of these meetings. The goal is to meet with all offices on campus.
- The university has been in contact with HLC (Higher Learning Commission) about a visit but they are not doing this kind of visit prior to the annual meeting at the end of March.
- The university is looking at masters degree faculty teaching master students. The guidelines on this say that the faculty with a masters must show extraordinary skills to be qualified to teach masters students. Bob Morris is evaluating this and will create a report to avoid any problems. The university will need to do a similar report in the IT area.

Michael Maggiotto

- The annual reports and assessment evaluation for MCOB (Miller College of Business) and TC (Teachers College) can be found on their websites.
- Bob Morris has his areas adding information to SharePoint.

Committee Chairs reported the progress of their subcommittees:

- Criterion One—*Mission* Clare Chatot (Dan Lutz)
  - 1AB—this group (1A1) has a nice summary of the 2007-2012 Strategic Plan.
  - 1A2 is working on collection.
  - 1A3 is waiting to respond to Criterion 5C1.
  - 1B2 is looking to highlight language in the current mission statement and then will look for examples.
  - 1C has nice summaries for all three strategic plans and will start writing soon.
  - 1C2 is more example oriented.
  - 1D assigned sections to be outlined
  - Clare plans to start writing over spring break.

- Criterion Two—*Integrity* Nancy Cronk (Chip Jagers)
  - This group remains actively engaged asking questions and searching on line.
  - 2A is taking a very broad sweep of university policies. The committee suggested that this group should focus on the handbook and the policies listed and then determine if the university is following those policies. If they are not following procedure do these policies need to be changed or updated?
    - Marilyn Buck gave an example of the field trip policy. It says in the handbook a field trip cannot be scheduled the first week or the last two weeks of the semester and cannot cause a student to miss another class. If this happens a different assignment must be given and not force the student to go on the field trip. The question is; are we following that policy?
    - Other policies the committee thought should be looked at were the withdrawal policy, final exam policy, grade change policy, P & T (Promotion and Tenure) policies, hiring faculty policies etc.
    - The issue here is that we develop policies in a particular way and we follow through. The university wide policies are consistent.
    - The handbook states that the Salary and Benefits Committee is to get the documents approved by the appropriate senate and this was not being done. That has been corrected and this year they have been properly approved.
- Criterion Three—*Academic Programs-Quality, Resources, and Support* Bryan Byers (Alan Hargrave)
  - 3A/3C are gathering information in preparation for creating an outline.
  - 3B/3D—Howard Hammer is on this subcommittee and is also on the UCC committee so he has been very helpful in telling the UCC (University Core Curriculum) story. There have been two cores during this accreditation period and both will need to be addressed; explaining the transfer to the new core and why this was done.
- Criterion Four—*Academic Programs-Evaluation and Improvement* Kay Hodson-Carlton and David Perkins
  - This group followed-up with what they reported at the last meeting. They brought the whole subcommittee back together and assigned a template to gather Criterion Four data from each area.
  - Kay Hodson-Carlton created folders on the SharePoint site for each subcommittee member to upload their completed templates.
  - This group working backward from spring break decided when they need to have the assessment information in order to start writing during spring break. They asked their subcommittee members to have at least one template completed and uploaded to SharePoint by the next meeting (February 15) and to have them all uploaded by the following meeting (February 29).

- It was left up to the individual subcommittee member to decide if they needed one summary per department or several.
- David Perkins' concern that the subcommittee would complain that this is something that the Assessment Chairs should have done was not a factor. The subcommittee members took their assignments very seriously and asked many questions but did not voice any objections. Marilyn Buck said the subcommittees should be commended for their work and we should let them know their work is appreciated.
- Criterion Five—*Resources and Planning* Rod Davis (Bernie Hannon)
  - There are three or four members of this group meeting with Phil Repp today to collect information.
  - 5A is in the best shape and he could start writing a draft.
  - 5B—The Governance section still needs some work. Rod Davis plans to set up a meeting with Barb Phillips, Board of Trustees, to collect information.
  - 5C/5D—The sections on planning and evaluating do not seem to entail as much work but they will be moving forward on it more in the coming weeks. Michael Maggiotto pointed out this area will need to encompass three strategic plans (2001-2006, 2007-2012, and the one currently being written). This group will need to address the evolution of our mission statement.
  - Managing expectations, Rod Davis did not feel that he would have a draft of this criterion completed by spring break.
  - Rod Davis was concerned about the amount of overlap in each criterion's draft. He was told that there would be overlap but the report would be written in one voice and it would be the job of the writer of the final report, Ted Buck, to decide what constitutes too much overlap.
- Federal Compliance—Leisa Julian
  - Leisa Julian is still trying to track down the financial ratios. The AID (Annual Institution Data) update was discussed. Randy Howard will be key for providing the financial part of that report.

#### General Discussion

- Assessment of the core is on SharePoint via link to Becky Amato's ilocker account. There are adjustments being made to that assessment and they have been asked to document those adjustments.
- It is the intent of the committee to have a draft available to share by fall 2012.
- There was a discussion about the documents that the committee will link to in their drafts. Where will these documents will be located, are they searchable, and if they should have similar names. Alan Hargrave felt there was a need to methodically name files to make them easier to find. Dan Lutz said that there are several pdf files in SharePoint and a pdf can be linked but nothing within a pdf can be linked. The committee decided that they should get a subcommittee together, before the next meeting, to research and put a plan together to name and store files to be used in the final report. Dan Lutz, Alan Hargrave,

Bill Knight, and Ted Buck will be on this committee and Marie Douglass will arrange the meeting for them.

- The final document will be electronic and there is a limit of 200 pages with links included. It will not include an interface in which to add materials. It will be a drafted document.
- Ted Buck gave a report on the Communications process. In recognizing the two elements that we are working with, participation and awareness, Ted has been working on some possibilities. He is working with providing wallet cards with the new mission statement. For Students he is looking at providing a place that can consistently have short statements that are relevant to the university. Some examples are the Communications Center, Blackboard on the student site, The Dailey News, or Facebook. They have considered a trivia challenge, and will be checking with Cardinal Communications Managers to see what ideas they may have. Alan Hargrave suggested that they look at the university happenings highlighted to the Board of Trustees by the president.
- As part of the process, the provost continues to make a report to the Board of Trustees on what this committee is doing towards accreditation and educating the board on the criterions.

The meeting adjourned at 5:25 p.m.

Next Meeting:

Tuesday, February 14, 2012

Student Center, room 308