

Criterion 5 Committee Meeting Minutes

Criterion 5 – Focus Group C

November 14, 2022, 3:00pm-4:00pm

Lowell Heiny Hall 219

Members Present: Tyler Anderson, Ram Basnet, Elliot Jennings, Sean Phelps, Adam Rosenbaum, Kristin Santos, Jun Watabe

1. Committee Chair Rosenbaum called the meeting to order at 3:00pm.
2. Rosenbaum reiterated the plan for Fall 2022, confirming that he was drafting the assurance argument for Criterion 5 while periodically meeting with smaller focus groups to discuss individual Core Components.
3. The members of the focus group discussed the draft for sub-component 5.C.1: “The institution allocates its resources in alignment with its mission and priorities, including, as applicable, its comprehensive research enterprise, associated institutes and affiliated centers.”
 - One committee member approved of the focus on three different university institutions which each represent a different theme related to the institutional mission and priorities.
 - Discussion then turned to the question of whether it was necessary to mention other university centers that do not receive subsequent attention.
 - Regarding what to cut, the focus group concluded that we could jettison certain sentences that provide rhetorical structure without highlighting additional facts.
4. The members of the focus group discussed the draft for sub-component 5.C.2: “The institution links its processes for assessment of student learning, evaluation of operations, planning and budgeting.”
 - One committee member discussed the order of the examples. Given that the language of the sub-component places assessment before evaluation, planning, and budgeting, perhaps we should begin with the assessment examples.
 - Rosenbaum explained that assessment will receive a disproportionate amount of attention in the assurance argument after being flagged as an issue during the previous HLC visit. Although there is an entire criterion covering that topic, it is important to link assessment findings to budgeting.
5. The members of the focus group discussed the draft for sub-component 5.C.3: “The planning process encompasses the institution as a whole and considers the perspectives of internal and external constituent groups.”
 - One committee member recommended shortening the section on the presidential search, which contains copious details.
 - Another suggested that the three paragraphs on advisory councils for academic programs could be combined into a single paragraph.

- Someone else noted that students were present during the August Strategic Plan event, which we could mention in the document.
6. The members of the focus group discussed the combined draft for sub-components 5.C.4 and 5.C.5: “The institution plans on the basis of a sound understanding of its current capacity, including fluctuations in the institution’s sources of revenue and enrollment.” & “Institutional planning anticipates evolving external factors, such as technology advancements, demographic shifts, globalization, the economy and state support.”
 - In this case, much of the discussion centered on the combination of the two sub-components. Is there a precedent for this? Do we need to make it clearer to the reader that this is happening? Does the combination help to lower the word count?
 - One committee member asked for clarification on the coverage of Maverick Store budgeting. After Rosenbaum elaborated, he conceded that this paragraph could be more focused on budget planning rather than saving students money.
 7. The members of the focus group discussed the draft for sub-component 5.C.6: “The institution implements its plans to systematically improve its operations and student outcomes.”
 - One committee member asked whether the first paragraph was necessary, considering that Early Alert and FYI have been in place for years.
 - Together, the group decided that we could cite these examples if we emphasize that those initiatives have evolved over time, often becoming more ambitious.
 8. The meeting ended at 3:47pm.