

Colorado Mesa University  
**HLC Steering Committee**  
Wednesday, October 13, 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)

Minutes from the September 14, 2016 Steering Committee meeting were approved as submitted.

Suggestions, observations/general discussion followed regarding writing the argument.

- Dr. Bridge emphasized addressing the following questions:
  - Did the argument convince you the component was met?
  - Which type of evidence was used to “prove” the argument?
  - If you were the outside peer reviewer, knowing only CMU from the context of the Assurance Argument, would you be persuaded the component/subcomponent had been met?
  - If the argument did not convince you, how would you rewrite the argument and what evidence would you want to see to convince you the criteria were met?
- The group discussed information/topics that should definitely be included in the argument; some examples are:
  - Essential Learning
  - Academic Honors
  - Co-Curricular activities/efforts
  - Anything related to the 12 recommendations from the last study
- Suggestions/comments regarding progress on writing arguments included:
  - Subcommittees may want to complete a draft, and then look for gaps.
  - Some rough drafts should be completed by the end of the semester to stay on schedule.
  - Longer meetings can be scheduled for January to review drafts.
  - Drafts of Criterion 1 and Criterion 2 can possibly be reviewed in December with copies sent to Dr. Bridge by the end of November.
  - Word count should be kept in mind, but is not the main concern at this point.
  - Meetings on December 7, January 10 and January 11 were discussed.

Dr. Schans provided copies of the current draft of Criterion 4-Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement, Core Component 4.A.

- The group was asked to review it as if they were not associated with CMU.
- It was noted that any duplication with information in other Criteria can be discussed at January meetings; also, there can be references to other Criteria/Components instead of repeating the same information.
- Observations from the group regarding 4.A. included:
  - Writing is straight-forward and direct.
  - Description of transfer process might be expanded to address how we can prove what we say; links might be considered.
  - Possibly explore expansion of the description of the Assessment process (e.g., include description of how assessment info comes to the committee, committee reports, committee members meeting with faculty, follow-up actions/activities).

- Consider possible rewording of 4.A.4. to clarify that not all pre-requisites are evaluated every year.
- All were asked to send Dr. Schans additional suggestions and comments.

The group agreed to cancel the meeting originally scheduled for November 9.

**Days until the 2017 visit:** 388

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

**Future meetings:**

Tuesday, January 10, 2017, full day (exact times TBA), Lowell Heiny 302

Wednesday, January 11, 2017, full day (exact times TBA), University Center 221

Note of Correction: After this meeting, future meeting times were changed to:

Wednesday, January 11, 2017, 3:00 – 5:00 p.m. in Lowell Heiny 302

Friday, January 13, 2017, 11:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m. in Lowell Heiny 302