Colorado Mesa University
**HLC Steering Committee**
Friday, May 26, 2017, 1:00-3:00 p.m. – LHH 302

Present: Morgan Bridge (Chair), Jeremy Brown, Carol Futhey, John Marshall, Heather McKim, Bette
Schans, Steve Werman (Recorder: Annette Callaway)

Absent: Dennis Bailey, Jeremy Hawkins, Cynthia Pemberton, Randy Phillis, Joe Richards, Bryan Rooks

Minutes from the previous meeting of May 19, 2017 were approved as submitted.

Chair Bridge noted that the Committee will soon need drafts for Criteria Three and Five for review at the
June 1 meeting. A June 2 meeting is scheduled if needed. August 8 was tentatively planned for the next
meeting date.

Chair Bridge also reminded the Committee that each sub-component must be met; if any subcomponent is
not met, the component is not met.

Bette Schans reviewed, along with the Committee, the latest draft of Criterion Four—Teaching and
Learning: Evaluation and Improvement. Discussion/ suggestions included the following:

- 4.A.1. May be shortened to a declarative statement plus some key sentences; include a link to the
    Program Review Manual and to the table showing the Program Review Cycle. Much of this
    section is also in the Preamble. Add information on how programs that are going through an
    external accreditation are reviewed through the process of the respective agency; also refer to
    4.A.5. and link to a list of externally-reviewed programs.
- 4.A.2./3. Bette added information discussed at earlier meetings.
    Lines 34-37, does this information directly tie to the core component?
    Line 37, start new paragraph at "The Office…"
    Discussion included transcripting vs. evaluating courses.
    Line 33, add a sentence describing GtPathways; consider re-ordering what CMU evaluates vs.
    external evaluations.
    Include forms for Internships. Degree Works relates in that it helps to inform students and
    advisors of acceptable courses and transcripted credits.
    Bette will edit Lines 33-49.
    Carol showed the group an example of a spreadsheet being used by Departments to document
    course comparability.
- 4.A.4 It was noted that having lead-in statements for the various parts of this sub-component is
    important as this is a more complex statement. Morgan suggested some re-wording. It was
    asked if trademarks needed for Panopto, for example?
    Lines 67-81, create a new lead-in statement. Start a new paragraph in line 77.
    Line 83, create new lead-in statement.
    Lines 85-87, take out Early Scholars and ASCENT and rework sentence.
    Lines 88-89, these go with discussion on dual credit; incorporate information from the
    Departments' spreadsheets documenting course comparability. Create a lead-in referring to
    the Course Comparability Manual and its application across all areas, and rework paragraph.
- 4.A.5. Some programs do not have external accreditation agencies.

- 4.A.6. Reference data currently being collected on graduates. Heather will explore how to aggregate the information from individual departments.
  Bette will add another sentence to tie to pass rates.
  Lines 161-171, reviewers may already know this information; shorten the paragraph and link to a list of programs for which CMU has gainful employment information.
- Preamble to Core Component 4.B.
  Lines 211-213, Carol suggested a re-written sentence and to showcase this information in 4.B.; link to the Assessment Roadmap. Carol will work with Bette on this.
  Delete lines 200-201 and Bette will check references to years in the paragraph.
  Line 235, it was discussed whether to put the timeline in a separate linked document or leave as is; it was noted that it is more easily accessed by the reader as is.
  Lines 239-241, change the a., b., & c. to 1., 2., & 3. Tie this 3-pronged approach to HLC recommendations. Tie to the Assessment Roadmap. Department Heads are currently working on documenting activities.
  Line 488, results will be available by the end of June.
- 4.B.1. Line 694-700, could be the declarative paragraph for this part.
  Lines 695-696, add a link to examples of program sheets as referenced in text; add a link to ESSL syllabi.
  Lines 716-720, Bette and Heather are currently working on this section which will include triangulation. Charts and graphs will be included.
- 4.B.2. Lines 730-732, swap 1st and 2nd sentences.
  Lines 733 and 712, are the same information; Bette will determine the most appropriate place to include this.
  Lines 754-755, include examples regarding improvements.
- 4.B.3. Jeremy Brown re-wrote this information and will email to Bette. It was also suggested to repeat lines 530-542 in 4.B.3; Bette will explore this suggestion.
  Lines 789-804, Discussion included continuous improvement vs. assessment; program changes are not necessarily related to assessment activities. Some of this information might be included in Criterion Five. Information will soon be available regarding Capstone activities/courses.
  Lines 789-875, it was discussed whether to write this part in a more general way. A table will be added to resources including highlights of actions taken; this information should align with information from departments. Bette and Carol will work on this section.
  The Proficiency Profile (ETS) was discussed; it was suggested to include information on CMU's attempt to collect usable data and our related experiences, including financial commitment to this effort.
- 4.B.4. A declarative statement needs to be added. Information on faculty participation can be used.

Note that 4.C. will be reviewed on a subsequent date. Goals information from WGISAS will be available.


**Days until the 2017 visit as of 05/26/17:** 165 days

**Next meeting:**        Thursday, June 1, 1:00-3:00 p.m., UC 221

**Future planned meeting dates**:
        Friday, June 2, 1:00-3:00 p.m. in Lowell Heiny 302 (if needed)
        Tuesday, August 8, time and location TBA