

MINUTES

C4 Committee Meeting – October 20, 2006

Present: Rod Henshaw, Jessica Lang, Russ Lovell, Ericca Pollack, Kathleen Richardson, Jim Romig, Laura Schwarz, Chrystal, Stanley, Ron Torry

Agenda: General Updates
 Subcommittee Reports
 Whole-Group Discussion

Minutes:

1. Romig distributed C4 sections of HLC Self-Study Reports from Iowa State and from Loyola Chicago, together with brief topical summaries of their reports.
2. Romig also distributed “Working Draft 0.1” of a summary table for the C4 Report (to update/replace the working report outline previously distributed). He suggested organizing committee work first around establishing “assertions” and then around “needed evidence” statements (see attached). Subsequent discussion brought committee agreement.
3. Each subcommittee reported:
 - a. Schwarz reported that Subcommittee A intends to conduct a survey of deans offices and student leaders regarding support for learning programs. The draft assertions (item 2 above) were discussed, and the full generally agreed that they represent a good start.
 - b. Pollack distributed a Subcommittee B working document with a listing of “activities” strikingly parallel to the draft assertions and a review of existing/requested evidence. She suggested that a focus on graduate education is needed in this component discussion.
 - c. Richardson distributed Subcommittee C “Report No. 1” and described a series of information/evidence gathering interviews with various university units. The interviews focused on curriculum and co-curriculum development, evaluation, and improvement efforts.
 - d. Torry distributed a Subcommittee D draft report covering the draft assertions. Discussion showed support for the report.

4. Following discussion, the full committee came to the following agreements:
 - a. The report Working draft 0.1 is a good start. The focus should be on first establishing assertions, then gathering needed evidence, then drafting extended/supported assertion statements.
 - b. Henshaw and Romig are to set up a WIKI or a Blackboard Discussion Board for full-committee work on creating Working Draft 0.2 , especially the table of assertions (by component).
 - c. Subcommittees will review draft 0.1 assertions, expand and modify them as necessary (each component should have 5-10 assertions), and continue working on evidence. A revised-online assertion table will be developed for review at December 1 Meeting.
 - d. After December 1 meeting, subcommittees should be able to move forward on draft statements.