

September 2023 Criterion 2 Meeting

September 15th 2-3:00 pm in person meeting in Escalante Hall 101

Minutes taken by Eric Elliott, Criterion 2 Chair

Members Present: Eric Elliott, Margot Beckett, Sarah Lanci, Rick Livaccari, Dan Meyer, Sean Flannigan, KyoungHwa Oh, Greg Baker, Ed Bonan- Hamada, Kelly O'Connell, and Elizabeth Sharp

Meeting called to order by Chairperson Elliott at 2:00pm.

1. Chair Elliott talked about the importance of accreditation, and why we were doing what we were doing as a committee.

From the U.S. Department of Education Website:

- The goal of accreditation is to ensure quality in institutions of higher education.
- Accreditation in the U.S. involves accrediting agencies, like the Higher Learning Commission (HLC), not governmental agencies, as occurs in some other countries.
- For students to receive federal student aid for postsecondary study, the institution must be accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency.
- Accrediting agencies develop evaluation criteria and conduct peer evaluations to assess if criteria have been met.

2. Chair Elliott, talked about upcoming Site Visit: October 2-3

- Chair Elliot encouraged everyone to attend the site visit open forums (most likely on Oct 2 morning/afternoon). We will most likely be meeting with Criterion 1 Committee
- We may be asked to corroborate on
 - how the criterion was made
 - To see if faculty agree with what the criterion says
 - talk about the parts that relate to your program (your contributions)
 - In relation to the big picture, does the university do what it says it does

3. The process of creating Criterion 2:

- Chair Elliott walked through a refresher on how we all created Criterion 2 argument
 - Started with a shared Excel spreadsheet where we each added evidence ideas
 - Evidence was then put into lists and when we next met, we worked to flesh out the areas that seemed to need more evidence.
 - Chair Elliott then put the lists into sentence form in a shared document for each sub-component where the committee members read through them, editing and adding information.
 - Each component was then put into a full Criterion 2 rough draft that was edited as a shared document.
 - That rough draft then went to Dr. Bridge and if she felt areas needed more evidence, Chair Elliott reached out to people individually.
 - There were 2-3 more edits after that by other committees and Chair Elliott.
 - Then the university put up the criterion links in Mavzone for committee members to read and give feedback to Dr. Bridge

- The final version was submitted to HLC and then locked on Sept 11th

4. Chair Elliott talked about some cool highlights of things from Criterion 2 that he learned while working on this committee about CMU that he didn't know before.

- CMU participates in the State's Transparency Online Project, a system established in 2009 that is intended to reduce the time and cost associated with open records requests and to maximize convenience for state citizens in accessing state financial information.
- The University also has a Coordinator of Inclusivity and the CMU Diversity and Inclusion Working Group who present to groups within the University to ensure diversity, equity, and inclusion are top priorities on campus.
- The 2021 Impact Study estimates that in FY 2019-20, 848 the University was responsible for infusing more than \$269.5 million directly into the regional economy, and when indirect spending was considered, the total exceeded \$539 million. Further, approximately 877 additional jobs beyond the 2,192 employed full- or part-time by Colorado Mesa University are due to the institution's spending in the region.
- In 2020 the Board of Trustees adopted A Resolution Concerning Free-Speech Expression and explicitly stated support for the University of Chicago Foundation Principles for Free Expression and Open Discourse (Chicago Statement)
- The Foundation for Individual's Rights and Expressions (FIRE) has given Colorado Mesa University the speech code rating Green. Green light institutions are those colleges and universities whose policies nominally protect free speech.
- The University created two institution-level student learning outcomes (SLOs) to address the importance of personal and social responsibility and the ethical use of information. The first SLO addresses personal and social responsibility: "Reflect on and respond to ethical, social, civic, and/or environmental challenges at local, national, and/or global levels." The second SLO addresses information literacy: "Find relevant sources of information, evaluate information critically, and apply the information appropriately and effectively to specific purposes." In addition to these specific institutional student learning outcomes that are designed to be

5. The meeting was adjourned at 2:30 pm by Chair Elliott.