

Accreditation Self-Study Steering Committee Notes
October 27, 2005 - 8:30 am – Old Main Conference Room

Attending: Ronald Troyer, Chair; Sentwali Bakari, Klaus Bartschat, John Burney, Tom Delahunt, Lon Larson, David Maxwell, Lou Ann Simpson, Sue Wright

1. Communications Plan: Ron and Sue met with Brooke Benschoter to discuss the proposed Communication plan.

- A.** It was agreed that a task force will be appointed, made up of Tracey Kelley from Marketing, Ronda Menke from Journalism and Mass Communication, and a student (and potentially a couple of others). Sue will meet with them as appropriate. The Task Force will be charged with developing “key messages” to bring to the Steering Committee, stories for On-campus etc.

The key messages and other stories will not be “about accreditation.” Rather they will focus on university initiatives. They will be asked to look at stories that might arise from the strategic plan related initiatives, examples of “mission-driven,” initiatives etc.

- B.** Tracey Kelley will be asked to attend Steering Committee meetings and some other key activities related to the Self-Study.
- C.** Ronda Menke will be asked to take the lead in increasing student involvement and awareness related to the Self-Study.
- D.** Venessa Macro has been asked to include some information about the self-study in training for new staff.

2. Strategic Plans: David Maxwell noted that we need a campus communication plan related to Strategic Plan progress. The Steering Committee will focus on this as an agenda item.

3. Criterion 3:

- A.** John Burney discussed the fact that Criterion 3 has divided into 4 work groups.

- 1. Summer Work Group:** The first is working with Lon Larson and Criterion 4 on completing the Summer Workgroup recommendations.

- 2. Assessment Group:** The second is working with the University Curriculum Committee gathering assessment plans. They are working toward development of a culture of evidence.

- John shared a sheet developed for A&S that emphasizes using data to make revisions. They will start to collect evidence about how the plans are being used.

- John distributed a copy of the Portland State University summary of outcome information. We will develop a similar grid.

- 3. Effective Teaching**

- 4. Effective Learning Environment**

- B.** Some discussion focused on the fact that we must communicate carefully as we move forward on the assessment. We must raise awareness about the issues before offering solutions. It is important to not offer solutions to problems of which people are not aware.

4. **Criterion 2:** Ron Troyer summarized activities of the Criterion 2 Committee.
- A. Guidelines for updating and revising strategic plans has been developed and distributed by Committee 2. They should not be interpreted as defining what is to be included in the strategic plans, rather they suggest some general procedures. David Maxwell suggested that it would be helpful to suggest that the format should reflect the University plan – with goals, objectives, and strategies.
 - B. The committee now is discussing planning at Drake. We do not have a clear structure of planning. Rather, planning is to some degree dependent on the commitment of individuals. We discussed the history of planning groups in recent years at Drake.

The first draft of Strategic Plan 2001 was very much based on issues identified in program review; it was bottom up. Recent planning is more top down.

- C. It was agreed that we should not develop a planning structure that stifles energy and reduces involvement. However, we must ensure that planning is done effectively and consistently. It must be institutional without being bureaucratic.
 - It must be structured such that planning is seen as an opportunity to look to the future, to be creative. We must find some way to get people to think about the future – eg., how their disciplines will change.
 - It was recognized that to some extent planning is episodic. Change does not always occur with the same intensity. The planning procedure must monitor progress, and must assess the strategic plan to determine whether it still is the correct plan.
 - Various ways that we might achieve this goal were discussed. These included:
 - planning a one day conference “Dreaming Drake of the Future.”
 - Having a kick-off for the next round of planning – eg; have a debate about assumptions of Vision 2025; or a rethink of academic structure.
 - We must tie faculty development funds more fully to the Strategic Plan.
 - Demonstrable Outcomes must become a defining characteristic of Drake.
5. Criterion 1: David Maxwell indicated that Raylene Rospond now is Vice Chair. He and Raylene have met, defined issues and will be calling a meeting. They have identified forms of evidence for Components 1a and 1b, but will need to examine components c,d, and e.
6. Criterion 4: Lon reported that Criterion 4 is focusing on General Education proposals.
7. Criterion 5: It was reported that Criterion 5 met on October 24th. They are starting work on defining areas in which the University needs to develop clearer connections, and probably will divide into subgroups to start to identify evidence for the various components.
8. The President noted that he is doing a “wrap” for *Blue* that will take issues of the mission to parents. This was noted as an example of “evidence” of making constituencies aware of the mission.

Scheduled Meetings: Following is a list of scheduled Self-Study Steering Committee Meetings for fall semester. Meetings may be canceled if there is no business for the committee.

Nov 10	8:30-10:00 am	Old Main 208
Nov 17	8:30-10:00 am	Old Main 208
Dec 8	8:30-10:00 am	Old Main 208
Dec 15	8:30-10:00 am	Old Main 208