Criterion 5 Committee Meeting Minutes

Criterion 5 – Focus Group A
September 30, 2022, 2:00pm-3:00pm
Houston Hall 103

Members Present: David Collins, Lucy Graham, Christi Hein, Adam Rosenbaum, Kyle Stone, Steve Werman

1. Committee Chair Rosenbaum called the meeting to order at 2:00pm.

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.A.1: "Shared governance at the institution engages its internal constituencies- including its governing board, administration, faculty, staff and students- through planning, policies, and procedures."
    -   Concerning what to add, committee members mentioned weekly administrative meetings at WCCC, the process of the Handbook Revision Committee, and the language in the Faculty Senate Bylaws.
    -   There was also some consideration of how to include the university staff in this discussion of shared governance. Options including emphasizing staff involvement in the Academic Affairs Council or the work of "process improvement" supervised by Tamra Krizman. It was likewise noted that President Marshall's "leadership team" includes staff supervisors. The Professional Personnel Employee Handbook might elaborate on some of the ways in which staff members can participate in shared governance.
    -   Additional evidence to consider: Student Services conducts weekly staff meetings and the Faculty Senate includes a representative of CFAC, the Colorado Faculty Advisory Council.
    -   Concerning what to omit, one committee member questioned whether CMU's organizational structure needs as much attention, especially since earlier sections of the document will address the Board of Trustees and how the administration is set up. This allowed for a broader discussion of how to organize the assurance argument and save space in Criterion 5.

4. The members of the focus group discussed the draft for sub-component 5.A.2: "The institution's administration uses data to reach informed decisions in the best interests of the institution and its constituents."
    -   Concerning what to add, one committee member asked whether this was the place to discuss the Campus Climate Survey and the coordinated response to it. Rosenbaum indicated that he was reserving this material for Core Component 5.C, which concentrates on planning.

- Another committee member pointed out the existence of the Higher Education Opportunity Act Disclosures, which might provide useful information for this sub-component.
- Focusing on the work of the Office of Institutional Research, Planning and Decision Support, the committee discussed how to bolster that section of the draft. In addition to pointing out how easy it is to request data from that office, it may be helpful to produce documentation in the form of program reviews with data generated by IR.
- In thinking about additional examples of the administration utlizing data, the committee highlighted the work of the Enrollment Task Force and the Retention Committee (previously known as the Working Group to Improve Student Academic Success).
- It was also noted that the phrase "various administrative personnel" was too vague.

5. The members of the focus group discussed the draft for sub-component 5.A.3: "<u>The institution's administration ensures that faculty and, when appropriate, staff and students are involved in setting academic requirements, policy and processes through effective collaborative structures.</u>"
    - This part of the discussion began with a committee member identifying a potential issue: academic departments sometimes have their own policy manuals and protocols. Discussion ensued about whether this was the case in every department, and if true, were these documents available. While some departments have their own policies for performance evaluations or work-study students, it was unclear how common this was. The committee decided to hold off on further deliberation of this issue, as it was ultimately unclear whether such departmental policies were products of collective planning.
    - The committee also debated about where to put the discussion of the email retention policy. Would it work best in 5.A.3, or, since email retention is not strictly speaking an academic policy, should it shift up to 5.A.1? Rosenbaum decided to reconsider the placement of this piece of evidence.
    - Additionally, members of the committee recommended including more coverage of the various Curriculum Committees and their collaborative work. However, we need to keep in mind that Criterion 3 might cover this topic too.

6. The meeting ended at 3:01pm.