SELF-STUDY STEERING COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
February 19, 2009

Attendees: Amy Penne (co-chair), Paul Sarantakos, Kevin Hastings, Pam Lau, Dr. Linda Moore, Dr. Kris Young, Ruthie Counter, Kim Mills, Rita Myles, Dr. Seamus Reilly, Randy Fletcher, Terry Adcock, Sue Schreiber, Dave Leake (co-chair)

1. Center Brainstorming Sessions
The criterion chairs were asked to reflect on each of the five brainstorming sessions held at the Center for Excellence for Teaching and Learning. Notes from each of these sessions now exist on the self-study web site under “virtual resources.”
Thoughts from the discussion included:
• This was an excellent way to “get the word out” about the self-study and the five criteria.
• People were interested. Some attended several sessions before deciding on where they would like to contribute.
• It was good to get buy-in. Some signed up to help on the spot.
Sessions such as these will be repeated in a similar format to critically examine chapter drafts when those are available.

2. Self-Study Guide
Amy Penne distributed a draft of a self-study guide that she adapted from a guide used by Danville Area Community College. The guide includes an introduction, the mission of the self-study, college goals for the self-study, a detailed timeline, a page to list the criterion work teams, a listing of the Information Management Team and Editing Team, the Steering Committee, and a working outline for the document by chapter. Amy would like feedback on the document in two weeks, either via email or in writing. It was noted that, for this spring, we have two major goals:
1) Create and adopt a template for our chapters – the template needs to be precise to encourage buy-in from potential team members, but still be flexible and allow for creativity.
2) Create criterion work teams – these teams should ideally meet once this spring semester. Teams should document who is going to do what and what questions were asked. Each criterion team should take the timeline and create benchmarks, which could eventually become the criterion’s table of contents. Our HLC contact will want to view these benchmarks.

Amy noted that ample time must be allowed to put our self-study document on the web and invite feedback from our constituents. The site visit will presumably occur in the fall of 2012, though the visit won’t be scheduled until early 2010.

The idea of inviting a “meta-evaluator” was discussed. This would be someone who would analyze snapshots of our progress along the way and provide feedback on the process, including our assessment processes.

We also want to consider campus-wide surveying. It was suggested to maybe wait until fall of 2010 on this to do this in one survey. Then we can include questions
from each of the criterion teams. Questions could be developed in the spring of 2010. We’ll also want to survey the students, too, and conduct some student focus groups. Existing committees will also be used, such as Academic Assessment, Support Assessment, Professional Development, and the College Planning Committee. Not that these committees will take the place of a criterion work team, but their input will be needed as the teams collect information.

3. **Creation of Criterion Work Teams**

Amy distributed a handout containing guidelines for membership for one of these teams.

- The five chairs were directed to create a list of roughly ten names of people who they would like on their respective teams or those who have pledged their help already. In two weeks, Amy and Dave will meet with the chairs to examine the lists, make suggestions, and avoid duplication.

- Teams should be selected to ensure balance and diversity on several levels. A vice-chair should be chosen to compliment the chair’s personality. For example, if the chair is an “idea person,” the vice-chair should maybe be more task oriented. The vice-chair will be a team member and someone the chair can trust and work closely with through this process. Team members should be from different wings of the college, be faculty, staff, and administrators, be retirees, and could be members from the community if they are on college advisory committees. We should also include students (especially in criterion #1).

- How many members should be on a criterion team? There are two models: 1) start small, make a few decisions as to how to proceed, and then expand if needed, or 2) start with a larger committee and then break into smaller groups to do the work. Or there could be a combination of these two. The criterion chairs can make this decision based on their work style.

- Members of the Information Management Team and the Editing Team are “off-limits” for criterion teams as they are making a contribution already. Members of the steering committee are eligible, though. If anyone desires a board of trustee member on their team, make that request through the president’s office.

- Criterion chairs were encouraged to consider representatives from Student Services (counselors, advisors, financial aid, admissions, etc) and from the Library.

- Use the outline on page 15 of the draft guide to help choose criterion teams. Do not approach anyone to be on your team at this time.

4. **HLC Contact**

Co-chair Amy Penne has had a conversation with our Higher Learning Commission contact Mary Breslin. She is very pleased to see our progress at this point and we are right on schedule! A site visit will be set-up next spring.

5. **“Homework!”**

- The Steering Committee as a whole should examine the draft of the self-study guide and submit changes to Amy Penne within two weeks.

- Criterion chairs should assemble some names of people they’d like to have on their teams and be ready to meet in two weeks to discuss the lists.