

NCA STEERING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Wednesday, July 6, 2005

3:30 P.M., CN301

Present: Rick Beck, Ellen Boswell, Gail Bruce-Sanford, Jennifer Caine, Linda Curran, Joan L. Foster, Kathy Heyl, Roberta Hills, Frieda Holley, Jeff Johnson, Vonda Knox, Larry Langton, Stephanie Moran, Abel Moreno, Ann Murphy, Ellen Susman,

Absent: Julie Strasheim, Hal Tamblyn

1. The minutes of the June 29th meeting were approved with no changes.
2. *Update on meeting with President Jordan:*

Frieda Holley, Linda Curran, and V.P Joan Foster had been asked to meet with Dr. Jordan to discuss the self-study process and the concerns of the Steering Committee. Frieda and Linda reported that:

 - a. Dr. Jordan suggested two minor changes to the short role and mission statement:
 - The sentence “Excellence in teaching and learning is MSCD’s primary objective” should contain a reference to students. Steering Committee members discussed possible wording changes. They noted the awkward wording of the sentence caused by making “excellence” the subject of the sentence.
 - According to Dr. Jordan, in the last sentence of the second paragraph: “The college fulfills its mission by working in partnership with the community at large and by fostering an atmosphere of scholarly inquiry, creative activity, and mutual respect within a diverse campus community,” the “community at large” does not seem to be involved in scholarly inquiry or creative activity. It should be involved.

After some discussion, Frieda said she would work with the suggestions and e-mail various versions out to the committee for further deliberation.
 - b. After the Committee recommends some changes to the role and mission statement, Dr. Jordan will work with the Trustees on their Operational Mission Statement. The revised role and mission statement will have to be approved by all campus constituencies.
 - c. Various ideas and strategies on planning were discussed, but no strategy has yet been decided.
 - d. The date of President Jordan’s visit to the committee has not been set.
3. *Policies and Procedures for hiring part-time faculty:*

Stephanie handed out another draft of the PT Faculty Contract Procedures.

 - It was noted that the third paragraph and the last paragraph were repetitive.
 - Committee members agreed that the college should be firm in not offering contracts to part-time faculty who did not have official transcripts sent to the college during their first term of teaching.
 - Stephanie will bring a revised version to the next meeting.
4. Committee members discussed the Criterion Two Table. Suggestions will be reflected in the revised table. Ellen Boswell noted that our graduates will be involved in a study done by the National Science Foundation.

5. Committee members discussed the Criterion Three Table. Suggestions will be reflected in the revised table. The difficulty of evaluating advising was discussed. Frieda mentioned that the School of Business uses a Tracking system to record the advice a student receives. Perhaps advising could be evaluated by looking at the advice received by a random selection of students. Ann Murphy and Abel Moreno agreed to provide a demonstration of the Tracking System at the next meeting. Rick Beck will set up the necessary equipment.
6. Committee members discussed the Criterion Five Table and the Draft Analysis. The comments will be reflected in the revised documents. There continues to be confusion over the definition of “constituents,” especially as used by the HLC.
7. Frieda mentioned that an MSCD HLC-NCA Website is being created. She will send the Web site link to members so they can critique the site.
8. Frieda handed out the list of Criterion Specialists and described their duties as follows:

Duties of the Criterion Specialists:

1. Re-read the long HLC description of the criterion.
2. Review the criterion analysis and the table to be sure all necessary parts are covered.
3. Does the analysis reflect what is needed? Would you like more information?
4. Does the table reflect what is in the analysis? Is something in one document that is not in the other?
5. Is everything mentioned in the analysis and the table somewhere in the plan?
6. Are there items in the plan connected to that criterion that are not in the table or analysis?
7. In short, are we consistent in the three documents?