

Accreditation Self-Study Steering Committee Notes
June 9, 2004, 2004 - 11:30 am – Olmsted Main Floor Conference Room

Attending: Ronald Troyer, Chair; Sentwali Bakari, Jean Berger, John Burney, Rod Henshaw, Lon Larson, David Maxwell, Paul Morris, Vicky Payseur, Sue Wright

The meeting focused on important issues that arose from the retreat and next steps to be taken in the self-study process. The following notes are in somewhat arbitrary order.

Next Steps and General Issues

High Priorities

1. The explication/elaboration of the Mission Statement is a high priority.
 - A. It was agreed that this is not a good point at which to take on a revision of the statement. Revision would be likely to take a year to complete. It may be that discussion during the next year or so will lead to revision of the statement.
 - B. We also must determine how to “measure” mission outcomes.
 - C. Specific points in the web version of the Mission Statement will be hot-linked to various parts of the explication.
2. Committees must be appointed quickly. Each chair is asked to submit to Sue a list of the individuals (or positions) whom they would like on the committee. Some explanation of why these people are needed on the committee would be helpful in case there are multiple requests for single individuals. Sue will draw these together for S-SSC to review.

➡ Lists are due to Sue by June 23rd at the latest (earlier would be good).

The S-SSC will review the recommendations at the June 24th meeting.

3. Committee Tasks:
 - A. Develop first-year time-line
 - B. Initiate inventory of what “evidence” is in place and what needs to be developed.
 - C. John Burney suggested possible first tasks for each of the committees:
 - C-1. Mission explication
 - C-2. Environmental scanning (while they wait for the mission info)
 - C-3 &4: How to sequence learning and co-curricular activities.
 - C-5: Identify relevant constituencies and what information needs to be gained initially from them.
4. We also need to:
 - A. discuss further the potential role of an assessment council/group.
 - B. initiate work on a Communication Strategy. We need to bring Lisa Lacher and Brooke Benschooter into that conversation.
5. Getting others involved- we briefly discussed how to take a mini-version of the retreat to campus. Each session must involve people from multiple units and various responsibilities.

Immediate Tasks

1. David, Ron and John will draft an explication/elaboration of the Mission Statement. They will base this on comments related to John’s Mission presentation and other input through the conference.

The draft will be run by the S-SSC, then retreat participants will be asked for input. In the fall various governance bodies will be asked for input.

2. David will write thank you notes to all retreat participants.
3. Sue will send follow-up notes to all discussion leaders reminding them to submit notes from their discussions. They also will be asked to provide summary sense of some of the points of conversation.

Issues

1. In the wake of the dissolution of IPRC, we discussed the need to establish clear planning responsibilities and roles for various groups.
 - A. The Retreat discussion has implications for the Strategic Plan. It made clear ways in which the planning and self-study processes are integrated. President Maxwell will use notes submitted from the retreat as he drafts revisions to the Strategic Plan.
 - B. It was suggested that the Self-Study Steering Committee could assume a coordinative role in planning.
 1. While, we must be careful not to seem to be usurping responsibilities from other groups, it is entirely reasonable that this group would evolve into a long-term planning body that would transcend the self-study period.
 2. S-SSC would look at data and raise questions to be answered by various existing planning groups (Cabinet, SAC, Deans Council, Faculty Senate, Student Senate, All-Staff Council, etc.).
 - C. The President briefly discussed the role of the new President's Advisory Council (PAC). He noted that while there are regular opportunities for administrators to make input to him, he does not often have an opportunity to talk about ideas with the general faculty and staff. He sees it primarily as an idea and feedback group, where discussion can occur without consequences.
2. Naming the process: Several times it has been suggested that we don't want this process to be identified only with accreditation. It needs to be understood as initiation of an ongoing, integrated planning and review process. Thus, we discussed possible names, but discarded each. We will ask Lisa and Brooke to help us come up with a name for the process.

Next Meeting: Wednesday, June 24, 2004, 8:30 TO 10:00, Provost's Office or Old Main Conference Room (208)