

Colorado Mesa University
HLC Steering Committee
Wednesday, September 14, 2016 -- LHH 302

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

Introductions: Some members were new to the committee thus everyone introduced themselves.

Minutes from the August 16, 2016 Steering Committee meeting were approved as submitted.

General discussion followed regarding writing evidence statements that will be acceptable to the HLC team:

- Dr. Bridge provided handouts from HLC training she attended recently.
 - Writing Evidence Statements
 - Sample Evidence for Criteria
 - Criteria and Core Components: Evidence Present and Needed
 - This is the form which the HLC visiting team members will utilize to examine evidence submitted, and to identify questions to ask during their visit.
 - If there exist gaps, the team may ask for more information/evidence during the visit.
- Dr. Bridge provided examples of 3 arguments for the committee to evaluate (included in email with the agenda). The committee was asked to evaluate the 3.
 - Argument 1 re 5.A.5.: In addition to the one evidence item listed, the committee suggested additional evidence to include implementation plans, budget planning, minutes and rosters from training sessions, to tie to Strategic Plan, refer to how student and program outcomes feed into planning, spell out the process. The committee thought this argument was bad.
 - Argument 2 re 4.B.1.: The committee thought this example somewhat provided evidence but would want to demonstrate that this has actually been done. The argument should answer questions such as: Is it improving student learning outcomes? Is it effective? How do we prove this? What is our process and are we including reports and results? Are we meeting our stated goals? (Some school include outcomes for every course in their catalogs.) The group agreed that this is better than Argument 1, but still lacking.
 - Argument 3 re 5.A.5.: This lacks information on how the budget planning process works at the Department level, and how budget planning connects or ties to student learning. The group agreed that this example is almost complete
 - Dr. Bridge reminded all that arguments must be succinct, clear, and specific. They must indicate the evidence with proof. Evidence PDFs can be linked to the argument for additional necessary information.
 -

Dr. Werman reported progress on Criterion Three, Teaching and Learning: Quality, Resources, and Support; most work is currently being done on 3.A and 3.B, with C., D., and E. to follow soon.

Discussion followed on general progress of writing arguments.

- Committees are gathering materials; work is progressing on vita and qualifications collection; some committees are focusing on specific, more critical core components and will shift focus to the rest of the components soon; some components are in rough draft while others are further along.

Dr. Schans reviewed progress on Criterion Four, Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement, by Core Component.

- Evidence information had been added by Dr. Schans to the Criterion Evidence Worksheet (posted on the R drive in the HLC_Steering_Committee_2017 folder).
- Some suggestions for sources of evidence were provided in the meeting and added to the worksheet to include:
 - 4.A.2. – Add catalog descriptions and syllabi.
 - 4.A.4. – Include samples of program sheets with Student Learning Outcomes.
 - Include information regarding rigor in curriculum manual; Refer to 2013 report to HLC for discussion of rigor.
 - Computer software and tutoring were additional topics suggested for inclusion.
 - 4.A.6. – Explore admission rates into advanced degrees
 - 4.C.2. – Include WGISAS information/recommendations.

Other discussion included how upper division course transfer evaluations are done.

- It was noted that evaluations are done on a case-by-case basis, as well as utilizing catalog descriptions and syllabi when available.
- Re-evaluations over time may not be feasible; the possibility of looking at evaluations every 5 years was mentioned.
- It was noted that Mr. Marshall analyzes housing data and Jody Diers may serve as a resource regarding changes and results.

Future Criterion Committee meetings:

- Committee chairs are asked to let Dr. Bridge know if someone is needed to record and report minutes for meetings.
- Committees are generally planning 1-2 meetings to look at what has been written as a first draft, and subsequently meet regarding a second draft.
- Committee chairs were asked to let Dr. Bridge know when they plan to meet.

Estimated days until the 2017 visit: (not reported)

Next meeting: Thursday, October 13, 2016, 3:00 – 5:00 p.m. in Lowell Heiny 302

Future meetings:

Wednesday, November 9, 2016, 3:00 – 5:00 p.m. in Lowell Heiny 302

Wednesday, December 7, 2016, 3:00 – 5:00 p.m. in Lowell Heiny 302