

SUMMARY  
HLC Self-Study Steering Committee  
November 21<sup>st</sup>, 2005—SUB 315

Present: Drs. Guy Farish, Teri McCartney, Ed Crowther, Georgia Grantham, David Svaldi, Carol Guerrero-Murphy, Frank Novotny, and Sandra Starnaman. Mr. Bill Mansheim, Mrs. Dianne Machado, Mr. Mike Nicholson, and Mr. Paul Tigan.

I. Introduction and Welcome

- A. Next Meeting—
- B. Chair's council on Monday, Nov. 28th
- C. Following Monday, Dec. 5th—HLC, TEAC, Board of Trustees
- D. Dec. 12<sup>th</sup>?
  - i. Dr. Farish would be *delighted* to meet that day at 3pm in SUB 315.

II. Document Room Index

- A. Follows current programs in Banner
- B. Documents already being cataloged
  - i. Dr. Farish will facilitate in non-electronic documents, etc.

III. Other Items

- A. Dr. Farish handed out previous meetings, current prospectus
  - i. Is Dr. Hilwig part of Criterion I?
    - 1. Is on, Dr. Crowther represents HGP for Criterion III
  - ii. Trustees invited to attend, many encouraging responses
  - iii. Local Trustees most likely to be involved directly, but keep trustees in the loop with emails, etc.
  - iv. Dr. Geiser not a member of Criterion IV
  - v. Dr. Guerrero-Murphy wonders about her role on the Steering Committee?

IV. Surveys

- A. HLC survey—"Third Party Comment Process"
  - i. As required by the process—Dr. Farish handed out information from the HLC website.
- B. Criterion I Survey
  - i. Mike Nicholson handed out a copy of their current survey questions.
  - ii. Issues
    - 1. Should the Vision statement only be in the Strategic Plan? If not, we know it's not going to be well-read and well-known.
      - a. Committee agreed to post it more widely
      - b. Recommended to put link on adams.edu front page
    - 2. How do we prioritize it and other mission documents
  - iii. 28 questions—too long for a survey?
    - 1. What are the most important questions? Review them?
    - 2. Are some more appropriate for some constituent groups than others?
    - 3. Make sure that you only give the audience one question for each part.
      - a. If people really don't like it, don't give them 4 chances to "ding it"
      - b. Make sure there is balance between the different parts of the survey—same number of questions for mission, vision, etc.
      - c. Whether good or bad, the results are meat for the self-study.
    - 4. The point is to gain an honest reflection of the attitude on campus towards the documents.

- iv. What's the best mechanism to edit this?
  - 1. Send surveys to the group for editing
  - 2. Make sure they are sent to Kim Kelso & Rob Demski in Psychology.
  - 3. The current draft is intentionally wordy in order to be edited heavily.
- v. Wording Issues
  - 1. Use something more inclusive than the word *is*—does ASC *strive to be* ...
  - 2. Use something more personal than ASC—"your colleagues", "the students"
- C. The next version of the Criterion One survey is due later in the semester.
  - i. Some concern about how things are being titled when they are turned in
- D. Send comments on the Criterion One Draft Survey to Mike Nicholson.
- E. Alumni Survey
  - i. First Survey will go to Alumni six months after they graduate
    - 1. Some telemarketing will happen to encourage participation.
  - ii. Five years after they graduate?
    - 1. Creating legacies within the Alumni community.
  - iii. First draft should be ready in January
- V. Freeze Dates for Documents
  - A. Comments have come back on Strategic Plan—won't change much from here.
    - i. Approved by Trustees as living document
  - B. Academic Strategic Plan
    - i. In draft form, could still be changed significantly
    - ii. Still needs to be vetted by the Provost Council
    - iii. Should be finalized by end of January.
  - C. Academic
- VI. Next Meeting—December 12<sup>th</sup>
  - A. Endeavor to review the Criterion I survey by that day
  - B. Spring Semester Meeting Schedules