

Colorado Mesa University  
**HLC Steering Committee**  
Monday, August 16, 2016 -- LHH 302

Present: Morgan Bridge (Chair), Jeremy Brown, Carol Futhey, Jeremy Hawkins, John Marshall, Heather McKim, Randy Phllis, Joe Richards, Bryan Rooks, Bette Schans, Steve Werman  
(Recorder: Annette Callaway)

Writing plans for fall for each Criterion.

- Carol Futhey explained the goal for all is to have a viable draft by the end of Fall Semester, then the committee could start looking at information across committees.

General discussion re writing:

- Arguments should be narrative format; prioritize points to be made; communicate information clearly.
- Establish priorities about points you would like to make before writing; a brief outline with prioritized bullets was suggested.
- Incorporate Essential Learning changes throughout report.
- Can look for Assurance Reviews from other institutions; Morgan will be on a team to Oral Roberts University in October, 2016.
- Include a brief summary statement.
- Can save space listing criterion letters/numbers and not spelling out the text of the criterion.
- Make reviewers' jobs easier with compelling information.
- If an item does not apply to CMU, briefly include an indication of that.

Documents needed by Criterion Chairs (and discussion)

- A handout was provided listing some sources that have been requested; more may be needed.
- 2017 HLC Assurance documents are needed; these will not be loaded into the software program yet.
- Send documents to Carol to facilitate orderly gathering and uploading into the system.
- NSSE/FSSE information, pocket guide, student and faculty responses will be needed.
- Docs will need to be converted to PDF.
- Kelly Dougherty worked to match data to Excel tables; this info has been saved separately.
- Staff vita collection is underway; instructions and forms for collection of faculty summary information, syllabi, vita, etc. has been distributed.

Discussion regarding Criterion 3 (Steve Werman):

- 3.D.1. vs 3.D.2. – the second addresses students needing remedial classes.
- 3.D.1.-4. – Can this be addressed in a single larger response instead of 4 separate responses. Will visiting team easily be able to see that all 4 are addressed? Chairs should have latitude as to how to draft responses.
- 3.E.1. – Further discussion is needed regarding co-curricular programs; see NSSE and FSSE information.
- Where does the Honors Program fit?
- 3.E.2. – Not lots of organized activities, but we don't claim that there is.

- Service learning – some is not credit; Viewbook discusses service learning; what is the difference between service learning and volunteer activities? Service learning is monitored learning and volunteer activities are simply “activities.”
- Community engagement has not been tracked recently; previously Cindy Lueb tracked. Student Services may have sound data for 2015-16. Athletics has data.

It was requested that Criterion 3 committee add/address the above information and resend their draft to the Steering Committee.

It was also noted that there may be extended meeting(s) in January, similar to those in 2013, to review all Criterion reports.

**Estimated days until the 2017 visit:** (not reported)

**Next meeting:** TBD