



Minutes
NCA Steering Committee
October 26, 2005, 3:00 p.m.

Present: Co-chair Deb White, Tim Borchers, Rinita Dalan, Brittney Goodman, Ted Gracyk, Michelle Malott, Lisa Nawrot, Liz Rowse, Teri Walseth, Karla Wenger

Guests: Les Bakke, Iris Gill, Doug Hamilton

Minutes: Moved by Gracyk, seconded by Nawrot to approve the minutes of 10-12-05. The motion was approved unanimously.

Faculty Development Day Review: Discussion ensued on comments Steering Committee members received regarding the afternoon session devoted to NCA Reaccreditation. White reminded Criterion Team co-chairs to submit the comments their teams gathered during the Table Top Session. Nawrot distributed and reviewed the compilation of the online registration survey data. The survey will also be given to staff and students and included in the final results.

Additional Events: Discussion turned to additional events for staff and students. The timeframe would most likely be 1.5 hours in length. Borchers and Goodman volunteered to plan the sessions. Criterion Teams are to review and submit table top questions by the next meeting. It was noted that the Public Relations Subgroup should be including in the events. Additional ideas to garner student involvement were discussed, including ways to gather feedback from students. Rowse agreed to contact Kathy Scott regarding inclusion of NCA Reaccreditation in the Fall 2006 Orientation schedule. It was noted that Reaccreditation should be an integral part of the All University Meeting in Fall 2006 as well.

NCA Liaison Visit: The best time to invite John Taylor, NCA Liaison, to campus for a visit was discussed. It was agreed that late February – mid-March, 2006 would be best. While it would not be necessary to have chapter drafts ready, teams should be prepared with concerns/questions. Strong will be asked to contact him to determine possible dates.

ROUNDS:

CT1: Working on core components and chapter outlines. CT1 will use the same survey questions for staff and students. They may also be used again in next year as a post-test.

CT2: The timeline for writing chapter 2 was distributed. The team is anxious to begin and writing will start this week.

CT3: The team is just about ready to begin writing. CT2 has a vast amount of data to sort and it should help give shape to the chapter. Reinvigorating the Vitae Project is under discussion. Concern was expressed by members regarding willingness of faculty to participate in the Vitae

Project. It was agreed that vitae information collected should only be for the past five years. The team has been discussing various data needs and sources. Survey questions are being developed. Discussion ensued on the teams doing a coordinated survey and the logistics necessary. It was determined that each team should create and submit survey questions to the Steering Committee via the team co-chairs.

CT4: The team divided into subgroups to work on criteria. The subgroups will present at next week's team meeting. The next step is to determine what data to use to start writing.

CT5: The team has divided into subgroups by constituents vs. core components. They are working in subgroups and will report on Nov. 16. They are also creating questions for each constituent group on the core components and compiling a list of the most important data.

Relationships Between Chapters: How the chapters interrelate and possible ways to handle the overlap was discussed. It was noted that one chapter might start an idea with it developed in later chapters so communication between teams is necessary.

Data: Bakke and Gill each distributed a list of various types of data they can produce. Bakke also distributed sample tables of information pulled from ISRS. Gill noted that a large amount of data is available on the Institutional Research website (<http://www.mnstate.edu/institut/>) and the MSUM Fact Book, which will be updated with Fall 2005 data when it is frozen January 30, 2006. Discussion on the various types of data needed followed. Bakke and Gill agreed to meet to review the data list compiled by White. It was noted that Gill can also provide data related to personnel from Human Resources.

Discussion followed on whether a subgroup should be formed to work on data collection and formatting the data for use with the Self-Study Report and whether the data should be available to the Evaluators in hard copy, electronic, or both formats. White agreed to meet with Strong and Marla Smith to determine the best way to handle data collection and distribution to teams. A meeting with Jean Kramer, Catalog Librarian, will also be scheduled to discuss organization of the Resource Room.

Publicity Subgroup: Hamilton distributed a handout and explained the logo along with the various options for breakout logos. The logo, only for reaccreditation use, would appear on all information related to the reaccreditation visit, including weekly and/or monthly updates in Continews and emails, posters, table tents, t-shirts, buttons, etc. Discussion on the design followed and a suggestion regarding the B/W version will be taken back to the graphic designer. It was agreed that Criterion Teams would gather sample feedback from various constituents. Feedback is due to Nawrot by 5:00 p.m., Thursday, Nov. 3, 2005.

Additional Chapters: White distributed a list of additional chapters needed for the Self-Study Report. Criterion Teams are to review the list and send additions to White by Tuesday, November 8. How to incorporate this additional information into the report along with responsibility for gathering information and writing the various parts needs to be determined.

Next meeting: Wednesday, November 9, 3:00 p.m., MA 268.

The meeting adjourned at 5:02 p.m.