

Colorado Mesa University  
**HLC Steering Committee**  
Wednesday, November 4, 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.

**Agenda Item #:**

1. **Approval of Minutes of Last Meeting.** Minutes of the meeting of Wednesday, September 30, 2015 (emailed) were approved without any corrections.
  
2. **Report from HLC Meeting.**

Chair Bridge reported and shared with the group information regarding appropriate evidence as a key subject addressed in a recent HLC meeting she attended.

  - a. Key questions to ask criterion and steering committees: What is appropriate evidence and does it support the argument(s).
  - b. Evidence:
    - i. should be clear/precise vs ambiguous/contradictory; should tie directly to the topic/question addressed.
    - ii. should be corroborating/supplementary/supporting
    - iii. can be circumstantial, which may not necessarily be sufficient on it's own, but supportive of other evidence.
    - iv. should not be buried in layers.
  - c. Use triangulation.
    - i. If evidence is given in another criterion argument, cross-reference and add corroborating information when truly effective.
    - ii. Can be more than hard facts; include anecdotal information, provide a broader picture, tie all subcomponents together in the summary.
    - iii. Get people to open forums; are we who we say we are and do we do what we say we do?
  - d. Chair Bridge provided a handout addressing each component with suggestions on what other schools have used.
  
3. **Review Focus for Fall.** Discussion included:
  - a. Criterion committees should first think about what arguments to make, then determine strongest evidence, then corroborating information.
  - b. Look at from an objective viewpoint as someone who doesn't have history/context.
  - c. Be specific and precise to avoid confusion.
  - d. Make best use of words to stay within limit.
  - e. Have supplementary documents ready.
  - f. It was noted that many institutions are struggling with financial challenges. APQPP in our near future will be an opportunity to re-evaluate/look at academic and financial challenges.
  - g. Information from the 2013 report need not necessarily be repeated, but definitely add new/current evidence when effective. Do not directly reference the 2013 report.
  - h. HLC will look at Assumed Practices if there is concern that a core component is not being met.

- i. The HLC visiting team will be on campus 1½ days (the following afternoon and morning will be used by the team to write their findings).
4. **Short Reports from Each Criterion Chair.** (in order reported)
- a. Steve Werman – CR3 – Have had good discussions of A-C, D & E to come (arguments, not yet evidence). Will meet 11/15 to finish outline, then will weed-out, prioritize, delete, etc. Should have a good outline done by Thanksgiving break with some work done by email. Will solidify the outline in December.
  - b. Joe Richards – CR5 – (Similar to CR3.) Evidence not formally addressed yet, but is being considered. Will have 2 more meetings in November.
  - c. Randy Phillis – CR1 – (Much the same.) Expecting outlines next week for core components and Randy will pull together into one document by about Thanksgiving break. Meeting again Nov. 13 and Dec. 4. Evidence seems fairly clear/straightforward. (It was noted that the Strategic Plan should be done soon.)
  - d. Jeremy Hawkins – CR2 – Fairly straightforward; 2 A, B, C & D were addressed this week; E will be addressed in a few weeks. The list provided by Chair Bridge will be helpful.
  - e. Bette Schans – CR4 – Have met since last Steering meeting; created an outline and are including evidence. Will meet next week. Discussed assumed practices; not sure of the extent of formal agreements across all programs for internships and clinical placements.

Other discussion:

- a. It was noted that in the year before the HLC visit, CMU can submit an improvement plan/project. It was not clear if this is optional or mandatory; this can be addressed with Jeff Rosen (Vice President for Accreditation Relations and our liaison with HLC) who will be at CMU on January 14 and will spend time with the Steering Committee.
  - b. All documents given to the visiting team should be placed in the Assurance System Evidence File (previously known as Resource Room). Committee can seek clarification on items— e.g., should all faculty vita be uploaded?
  - c. HLC is planning for the Assurance System to be used for future purposes and more continuous uploading of information from schools.
  - d. Fall 2016 will be the timing of some of the evidence and committees should write with that time point in mind.
  - e. Goals in December are to discuss as a group all arguments and outlines, watching for duplications, and to identify questions for Jeff Rosen to address on January 14.
  - f. Report limit is 35K; the Monitoring Report is 5K. Criterion Committees should be reminded that some information may end up being removed to stay within these limits.
5. **Faculty Data Collection.**  
The committee reviewed a sample online faculty data collection form presented by Heather McKim. Discussion included:
- a. Time frame for faculty to report on vita form and data collection form—Previous collection had faculty go back to 2003. The can go back further than 2003 if they choose, as well as include information from previous institutions.
  - b. Committee should ask itself, “What are we looking for?”
  - c. Teams will help determine what we would like to request.
  - d. Data will provide good information for “Did You Know” emails.
  - e. Ask Jeff Rosen to give examples of experience that would count if a faculty member does not have a terminal degree.

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

**Next meeting:** December 14, 2015, 11:30 a.m. – 4:30 p.m. in LHH 302