

NCA Steering Committee Meeting

Agenda and Minutes for April 16, 2009

Attending: Brian Huschle, Sherry Lindquist, Andy Mueller, Jack Haymond, Steve Crittenden, Kent Hanson, Beth McMahon, Hank Roerich, Mary Fontes, Al Shervold, Jim Retka, Karla Anderson.

1. Draft 2 Discussion:

- Narrative Form: Are there still concerns with the approach?
 - o In general: Narrative approach is working well.
 - o Not everything sent necessarily needs to make the final cut.
 - o What is the process for deciding what is in the final cut?
- Comments on draft and approach
 - o P 5: “Constituents”: Defined on 102—
 - o P 47: “Administrative efficiency” –
 - “Differential tuitions” – problem is the “reexamination.” Wrong word.
 - o P46: Program review/advisory committees: These are ways we measure adequacy...
 - Resources are adequate: Is this accurate?
 - The limited resources do force prioritization of what is important. How do we want to word this? Example: Proctoring.
 - Wording: Institution constantly evaluates resources.
 - MNSCU document that analyzes us on 9 areas – bring this into the NCA report.
 - o P 29: Proctoring: Evolving process... When and how do we identify these processes?
 - Need to do more evaluative of why they are “in process.” (Is the reason financial constraints (like with proctoring), or other things? The report needs to develop these evaluations.
 - But evaluation indicates when things are in flux/change.
 - What about the things in the report that we may not still be doing:
 - P 93: Novell-Levitz: Now we use CCSSEE
 - o Show the changes—show the evolution of the institution.
 - o What we have done, how did we react, what did we learn, how have we changed.
 - Keep these types of items: Let it be part of the evaluation process and part of how we show a dynamic and changing institution.
 - o For Data and changes within the institution: The cut-off date is June 30, 2009 (FY09).
 - o Larger questions: Are we happy with where we are (as an institution)? Are we happy with where we are going? What is our evaluation of the institution?

THE TO DO LIST FOR CRITERION TEAM MEMBERS

- **Look at the three chapters, with an eye to your criterion:**
 - **Each Team: Make a to do list from each team for the three chapters (Chapters 3, 4, 5): Have this by April 30 into Sherry and Brian.**
 - **Plan: By mid- June: Having data and evaluation further along working off of the to do lists. Have a full or half-day meeting to look at draft. Goal here is too make sure all of our questions are satisfied. Information is accurate and understandable to the committee.**
- Summer and Fall: A need for more than just monthly meetings.
 - Perhaps some longer meetings to go through and work on the wording.
 -
- 2. Where we are going (notes for minutes, not from discussion in the meeting):**
- Summer:
 - Continue to collect data
 - Continue to develop evaluation of data
 - Updating with FY09 data
 - Working on virtual resource room (collection and pdf)
 - Hunting missing data
 - Draft letters for third-party comment
 - Begin working with marketing on design of final version
 - Get feedback from peer evaluators in MN on draft
- Fall
 - Publish third-party comment notifications
 - Locate remaining data
 - Collect and edit remaining evaluations for any sections
 - Polish draft
 - Resource room preparation for electronic resource room and location, and laptops, printers.
 - Responding to suggestions from MNSCU peer evaluators from summer.
- Spring
 - Hospitality planning (Mary Jo and Cindy???) (January)
 - Hotel, flights, meals, transportation, refreshments, resource room set up, laptops, any social activities (meals with committee members).
 - Completed draft and other materials sent to each member of Evaluation Team (January)
 - Self-study shared with third party commentators/institutional constituencies (Feb)
 - Be available for team during visit: April 26-28 (Monday-Wednesday)

3. Spring Term Meeting Schedule:

- May Meeting: Monday, May 4: 1:00-2:25. EGF 106; TRF545.
-

4. Adjourned: 10:58