

Criterion 1 Self- Study Committee  
February 20, 2006 11:00 – 12:00 noon  
Old Main 208

Members Present: David Maxwell (co-chair), Raylene Rospond (co-chair), Matt Esposito  
Venessa Macro, Wanda Everage

Members Unable to Attend: Lisa Lacher, David Miles, Rick Morrow, Bryan Klopach,  
Linda Ryan

Documents Circulated Prior to Meeting: Criterion One Working Document, - Venessa  
Macro Comments

1. Co-Chair Rospond acknowledged that Rick Morrow, faculty senate president-elect, and Bryan Klopach, Student Senate President had been accidentally missed on the membership. This has been corrected and the committee will welcome their future involvement
2. Committee reviewed Criterion 1a, 1b, and 1c
3. Committee reviewed Criterion 1a Component: The organization's mission documents are clear and articulate publicly the organizations' commitments.

The committee reviewed the list of mission and vision documents. Discussed the need to outlined dates of policies and determine if we have a standard revision cycle.

What is the revision process for the mission and vision? Will this be part of the new planning process developed by Criterion 2? Do we need to assume mission and vision are still valid each time new planning cycle is started?

4. Committee reviewed Criterion 1b Component: In its mission documents, the organization recognizes the diversity of its learners, other constituencies and the greater society it serves.

Statement of Principles is that "our required codes of belief"  
Need to update the unit diversity committees and their activities. Review result of diversity audit, track admissions and faculty data.

Refer to Preamble of Goal 4 to support our respect for human diversity.

HR processes, grievance process protective of dignity of individual's whose behavior and beliefs do not always fit expectation.

5. Committee reviewed Criterion 1c Component: Understanding and support for the mission pervades the organization.

What is our evidence that the decisions of the BOT are mission-driven? Approval of new initiatives directly related to our mission and strategic planning goals.

Evaluate change in budget and planning process and identify how they flow from and support mission. SIP process, technology priorities, classroom renovations.

Goals of administration and academic subunits are congruent with mission. Evaluate mission documents from units. Was this already done? Performance evaluation for staff and administrators are tied to goals.

6. Raylene distributed list of data desired from Criterion 3.

7. Action Steps:

Raylene Rospond will collate information and incorporate into Criterion 1 Working Document

Members asked to review data elements desired from criterion 3 and provide feedback to Raylene by end of the week.

Next meeting: March 13, 2006 9:00 – 10:00 noon Old Main 208