



**Minutes
NCA Criterion 5
Committee Meeting
September 21, 2005, 3:00 p.m.**

The minutes from the previous meeting were approved.

Volunteers for the Publicity Subcommittee were solicited, and Sara Leigh volunteered. Brittney will pass along Sara's name to Lisa Nawrot from that committee.

Potential names of student members were discussed. Veronica will speak with Savannah Nelson and Kathy Scott will speak with Ian Cole. It is hoped that we will have two student members and at least one.

Brittney passed out the "potential draft mission statement" which the Steering Committee has worked on and passed along to the Mission Criteria Team. Members were asked to forward comments to that subcommittee (Lisa Nawrot – nawrot@mnstate.edu) or to Brittney or Teri for forwarding.

The rest of the meeting was a discussion of the "Criteria 5" sections of the reports distributed at the last meeting, using the Discussion Guide sent via e-mail on 9/16/05.

Notes from discussion:

"How does MSUM measure the quality of its services to its constituencies?"

- Qualitatively more than quantitatively. (Do we need more quantitative data?)
- More informally than formally.
- Institutional Effectiveness surveys for more non-academic departments particularly.
- We may gather data and input, but how do we use it?

"What do we mean by 'constituencies'" and "Is there a difference between 'constituencies' and 'communities'"

- A community is usually collocated (Community of Moorhead; MSUM campus community)
- A community member can be a member of various constituencies (Alumni)
- They are different but not mutually exclusive.

"Do you find any identified constituencies in any of the reports that we have left out of our discussions?" **[Added to our constituents grid]**

- Postsecondary options students

- Transfer students (contact: Jim Anderson, Admissions)
- Faculty
- Tribal Colleges
- Employers of our graduates (contact: Cliff Schuette; Sonja Rue; Dept. Chairs)
- Distance/online learners (contacts: Rhonda Ficek & Jan Flack)

“Are there ways MSUM is held back because of its lack of ‘capacity to support those commitments’ to our constituencies?”

- Funding!
- We need to prioritize our almost ‘unlimited opportunities.’
- Do we do a good job of telling our constituencies what we have to offer?
- We may need a central “University Marketer” or “External Communication/Publicity” office on campus.
- More “branding” needed.
- We liked Eastern Illinois University’s way of telling about their funding difficulties and how they have some issues with supporting their commitments. Some similarities to MSUM.
- We want to be somewhat careful not to start partnerships too often that we cannot sustain.

“How do the reports respond to serving ‘the diversity of the constituencies it serves?’”

- Several members of the group liked the way Loyola (Chicago) talked about this.

“Strengths of MSUM for 5A”

- We have dedicated, hard-working people who are service-oriented.
- We have several long-standing service partnerships/programs that work. Longevity is a strength.
- We are willing to take risks by piloting service programs and initiatives.

“Challenges for MSUM for 5A”

- How much do we actually listen to our external constituencies?
- What do we do with that feedback when we get it?
- Do we need a “one call does it all” office on campus?
- Better/more signage to let people know where they are going on campus.
- Bureaucratic red-tape problems on MSUM’s side can keep us from serving our constituents needs
- We need to create a process or tool (like a survey?) to give to constituencies to help them articulate their needs more effectively to us. How do we help them become aware of their own needs?

Next meeting: back to the Discussion Guide – 5B – 5D.