

Colorado Mesa University  
**HLC Steering Committee**  
Wednesday, August 26, 2015 -- LHH 302

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

Absent: Brigitte Sundermann

Minutes of Previous Meeting: Minutes of the meeting of Tuesday, June 29, 2015 (emailed) were approved with one correction: #2.c. is corrected to read "Every department is represented in [Criterion Committees] 3 and 4."

**Agenda Item #:**

1. **Proposed timeline.** The proposed timeline (emailed) was discussed. No changes were suggested at this time. Note that the timeline should be labeled "tentative."
  - a. Chairs were asked to wait until after Monday, August 31, to contact committee members to set up meetings.
  - b. Chairs were given a list of information that may be helpful at first Criterion Committee meetings.
2. **Focus this fall.**
  - a. Chairs were reminded that actual evidence gathering should come after identification of specific evidence needed to document that criteria are being met. Requests for identified items/data/proof should be sent from Criterion Chairs to Morgan or Carol. Requests will be prioritized, discussed at the Steering Committee meeting in December, and then given to appropriate departments/divisions to begin collection of information/data.
  - b. Academic Affairs staff will start uploading known needed items such as catalogs, Trustee minutes, etc.
3. **Pittsburg count as starting point.** The word count from Pittsburg State University's Assurance Argument was discussed.
  - a. All were reminded to be selective when writing to meet the word limit of 35,000.
  - b. The Monitoring Report will be an additional 5,000 words.
  - c. PDFs with cover sheets can be linked from within the body of the report and will not count in the total.
  - d. Remind Criterion Committees that edits/cuts may happen later at the Steering Committee level.
4. **Committees to keep meeting minutes.** Let Morgan or Carol know when Criterion meetings are scheduled; Academic Affairs staff will take minutes if possible.
5. **Website discussion.** A new web page will be started for the 2017 visit and report, with items from 2013 to be archived. A possible title for the report can be discussed during the process.

Recommendations from the 2013 process were discussed and must be addressed in the Monitoring Report.

- a. Numbers 1, 3 and 10 will be folded into CMU's planning process.
- b. The committee was encouraged to read again the HLC report from the 2013 visit—what CMU met, did not meet, and concerns. The current process will address what has happened and progress made since then.

6. **Faculty Data Collection template.** A summary of full- and part-time faculty vita information will be entered in a spreadsheet by faculty to match their faculty vita. (template emailed)
  - a. Discussion included the level of detail to be collected and qualifiers (e.g., conference participation vs. presenting). It was suggested that it may be better to collect more detail to anticipate what HLC will want; info can be aggregated later if preferable.
  - b. Vita should include one's entire CMU career. It was suggested to go back to 2003 with the option to go further back. Some categories might include activities prior to CMU.
  - c. Changes/additions/suggestions to the spreadsheet template should be submitted to Carol or Morgan within a week.
  
7. **Campus survey.**
  - a. If another faculty survey is done, it was recommended to examine possible questions carefully to determine if meaningful information will result.
  - b. A "quick strike poll" was suggested and can be further discussed.
  - c. The survey done prior to the 2013 visit will be discussed at the September 30 meeting.
  
8. **Review Assumed Practices.** Previously referred to as Minimum Expectations, it was explained that Assumed Practices (emailed) are "givens" that describe how an institution should be functioning.
  - a. An Assumed Practices Inventory spreadsheet will be sent to the Steering Committee; Criterion Committees can discuss and indicate on the spreadsheet if the practice has been met, partially met or not met, and what supporting evidence should be included.
  - b. The spreadsheet can be made available to the visiting committee.
  
9. **Let campus know of upcoming visit.**
  - a. Previously, members of the Steering Committee had visited individual departments, Academic Council, Faculty Senate, ASG, and as many other campus groups as identified.
  - b. Carol and Morgan will discuss ideas; email suggestions to them.
  - c. The 'Did you know...' emails were well-received both on- and off-campus.
  
10. **December 14 meeting time.**
  - a. An extended Steering Committee lunch meeting during the week of December 14 was discussed (in lieu of an extended meeting in January of 2016).
  - b. By then, Criterion Committees should have determined evidence needed or that they plan to highlight.
  
11. **Other.**
  - a. Frequency of Criterion Committee meetings was discussed. One suggestion was to meet every other week during the first semester for buy-in and because some members may not be able to attend every meeting.
  - b. Criterion Committee members should be reminded that this process is for the purpose of continuous quality improvement.
  - c. Faculty teaching schedules will be sent to Steering Committee members for planning.

**Estimated days until the 2017 visit:** 813

**Next meeting:** September 30, 2015, 2:00-3:30 p.m. in LHH 302