

**Minutes
NCA Criterion 1
Committee Meeting
October 25, 2006, 3:00 p.m.**

Members Present: Sylvia Barnier, Casey Fawbush, Lisa Nawrot, Carol Sibley, Jayne Washburn, Karla Wenger, and Carolyn Zehren

The team met to discuss significant revisions that have been made to our chapter and expected to respond within two days which is an unreal timeline for changes. This manuscript has been through multiple revisions and these significant changes have not been suggested until now. Many people have had an opportunity to review this, we are wondering whose comments these were, was it one person's comments or a collaboration of a faculty group. It changes the tone and complexion of this portion of the self study.

These are significant changes with a totally different perspective. This is not just tweaking. It is no longer a self-study, it becomes a manuscript with one agenda. The process over the past 15 months evolved from multi-faceted perspective a self study which has totally changed.

This team understands that ultimately someone does have rewrite authority.

Reading from the Chapter 1/Criterion 1, **18 page document.**

Page 1 of 18

Word changes and striking ok in overview

Don't understand the claim about collaboration—defer to head writer. Last sentence has been added by someone other than this team, sentence not finished.

Insert 1A3 first paragraph

Striking of first sentence in second paragraph of MnSCU mission ok

Page 2 of 18

All suggested changes ok

Page 3 of 18

1A-3 Delete statement of evidence and move first paragraph to A1A as second paragraphs

Second paragraph moves to 1c1 addresses two concerns.

Move footnote 8 to first sentence after "Strategic Plan"

Evidence 1A4 becomes 1A3

Other changes okay links will be included

Page 4 of 18

Okay to remove NO's (does not support research) keep YES's

Page 5 of 18

Changes okay to add

Gender is present in Aim 7

Page 6 of 18

Change weak verb “reflected” to “have been prominent”

How it ties into the planning process: See Criterion Two

Move last paragraph of 1B2 “Within Multicultural Affairs, opportunities...” to first paragraph of 1B3 after evidence statement.

Page 7 of 18

1b3-where’s the evidence about MnSCU? Add MnSCU to three bullets

This section had MnSCU information included and someone told us to take it out, now they want it back.

Add Policies on to last

1B4 ”First mention of TOCAR needs more “See 5C”

1b4 TOCAR described in 5c. Steering committee agreed it should be in 5C.

The Steering Committee agreed not to discuss Corrick Center here, see later.

Add under SEED & HEART

Page 8 of 18

Core Component 1C changes okay

Evidence Statement 1C1 add from 1A3 second paragraph

Page 9 of 18

The Administrative Affairs Division Work Plan..... has been revised

Evidence Statement 1C3 add first paragraph from 1A3.

Page 10 of 18

Suggested changes ok.

Statement of Evidence 1c4B becomes 1c5, change mission to purpose statements.

Page 11 of 18

Core Component 1D when we reviewed other self studies they were not totally inclusive of all campus governance. We have addressed inclusive governance, mission invades the university. We stick to how we wrote this component. It was written this way intentionally, if you want to rewrite it you can. We will not. It is an overview of the governance process. It was kept brief for a reason.

Someone removed 2 evidence statements which puts a totally different focus on this section. What focus is trying to be accomplished here? What are these changes intended to do to this section? Why is there such a refocusing on so many parts...what is that adding to this section?

The rewritten evidence statements puts an academic perspective and is moving away from the overall organization. Talk to Warren Wiese and Carolyn Zehren about the contents. The suggested restructure of this section goes against the intentional tone, no justification for the shift of focus.

Core Component 1E

Don't agree with the changes. This section started as 10 pages now down to two and added stuff. Don't object to the changes in the first paragraph, just don't understand the first intensions. The examples of evidence students were followed from the NCA book.

At what point does it become a question of style?

Jayne Washburn, Recorder