



**Minutes  
NCA Criterion 1  
Committee Meeting  
September 7, 2005, 3:00 p.m.**

**Members Present:** Co-Chairs Lisa Nawrot and Karla Wenger, Sylvia Barnier, Jarilyn Gess, Sheryl Jones, Amy Phillips, Carol Sibley, Jayne Washburn, Warren Wiese, and Carolyn Zehren

**Members Absent:** Casey Fawbush, Cindy Phillips

Meeting started with introductions of members and review of the minutes from April 20 meeting. Motion to accept minutes by Amy Phillips and seconded by Carol Sibley. Jayne Washburn volunteered to serve as recorder.

Lisa Nawrot briefed the group regarding the Steering Committee's duties over the past 4-5 months. The Steering Committee consists of 13 members, 2 co-chairs Deb White and Judy Strong. There are five Criterion teams. The co-chairs of each Criterion team serve on the Steering Committee. They have met 6 times along with a Retreat at the Science Center. They established timelines, reviewed self study reports from other institutions and past reports for MSUM. A Resource Room was established in LI 214. A website was created at [www.mnstate.edu/NCAvisit](http://www.mnstate.edu/NCAvisit) with links to NCA, HLC, resource materials and sample self study reports, FAQs (what is accreditation and why is it important), Steering Committee minutes, and Criterion Team minutes.

Lisa encouraged each member of this committee to visit this website and review other self-study reports from the schools listed to get a perspective on the end result. Our group will be expected to prepare 30-50 pages. Susanne Williams will be responsible for writing the end report.

During the Fall of 2005 each team is in a "gathering" mode, not a "writing" mode. We are to determine if people on our campus know MSUM's mission. We will need to prepare a survey. We don't want to double dip because 75% or more of the data already exists somewhere. We will need to brainstorm and identify the data we need and where we are going to get it during the next few weeks.

During the Summer the Steering Committee came up with a new mission statement. They did not intend to change the university mission. They felt that the current statement was vague, not strong, not unique, so reworked, revised, and rewrote the mission statement. They identified core items in the mission statement and replaced the aims with goals and added a goal "A shared "liberal studies" experience for undergraduate students". This was done around three key words trying to be all things to all people: individuality, excellence and accessible. These words apply to both students and faculty. The only intention for the revision was to get something shorter and snappier.

Members of the team were surprised to find out that over the summer the Steering Committee had revised the Mission Statement. It doesn't seem that we can evaluate ourselves through a self-study with a Mission Statement that hasn't yet been approved by MnSCU.

The Criterion One team became concerned as to our responsibilities, since the Steering Committee already revised the mission statement, what is our purpose? There was much discussion on this revised statement. Comments were made about the fact that the statement does not appear to capture the intent of the university to prepare students for social responsibility or civic engagement nor does it directly reflect the university's commitment to service to the community. Concern was also raised about some of the original Aims not being reflected in the mission statement.

The (revised) Mission Statement will be revealed on the Faculty In-Service Day, Friday October 14. It was the consensus of the group that it is important that when the statement is revealed that it be clearly stated that the Steering Committee of 12 were responsible for the revision, not the Criterion One team.

The Criterion Team's responsibility is to determine:

- Do people know our mission (can they articulate it)?
- Do people understand our mission?
- Do people agree with our mission?
- Do we need to revise our mission?
- What do other people think?

One of the biggest challenges of our mission statement is a lack of identity and getting a better sense of who we are. The mission statement should be simple and clear and not need any explanation. The new statement does not capture what MSUM is all about. The words have been reordered, and therefore give a very different focus than the old mission statement. Many departments, divisions, student learning outcomes have missions based on our current statement. For example the Student Affairs Division bases its mission on aims 8, 10, 11 and 12 which have been lost in the newly created goals.

Lisa defended the Steering Committee's work in that one sentence captured it all. A comment was made that the second sentence of the old mission statement better encapsulates who we are than the revised sentence, and words like "foster excellence in teaching and learning" are words people remember and have memorized.

This Criterion team recommends to the Steering Committee that we stick with the original mission statement, and move forward in the re-accreditation process with the current mission statement, not the revised, although the revised statement could be used in discussions with the campus community about reworking the mission statement. The new mission statement would be more difficult to promote and explain than working from the old statement.

### Faculty In-service Day - October 14

Plans for the in-service day are a combination of half liberal studies discussion and half self-study with a focus on the self-study process. Sessions and topics are being prepared. A panel on accreditation will be present. A speaker from Northwestern Oklahoma State has been invited to discuss issues their school had in a recent accreditation visit.

This is an opportunity for our group to collect data on our mission. The web site for registering for the in-service day could include a few short answer questions. The problem in collecting data this way is only those who register for the in-service will answer the questions. How do we engage the entire campus community in answering surveys. This is an ongoing concern: How do we get everyone involved?

### Need Volunteers

We will be writing our report around the core components. We need student volunteers, hopefully in junior standing so they may stay involved until the visit, possibly non-traditional. Please suggest names of student representatives by our next meeting so we can recommend them to the Steering Committee.

We need volunteers for the Summer of 2006 to help read and revise the reports.

Kristi Monson, Doug Hamilton, Lisa Nawrot have been appointed to the Publicity subcommittee to develop ideas for PR and motto/theme slogan by October 14. Jody Bendel will be working on the graphics. They would like one more volunteer by next meeting.

Excellent list serves already available for gathering data, good responders, contact Margie Corcoran, Dean of Education Office also the Alumni list serve.

### **Assignments:**

- Review [www.mnstate.edu/NCAvisit](http://www.mnstate.edu/NCAvisit) website self studies and FAQs.
- Send an email to Lisa Nawrot of your top two choices for subcommittee 1a, 1b, 1c, 1d, 1e. They are not mutually exclusive.
- Lisa bring lap top to next meeting for recording minutes.
- Think of questions for survey
- Name suggestions for the student representative
- Next meeting, September 21, 3:00-5:00 pm, MA 268

Jayne Washburn, Recorder