



**Minutes
NCA Criterion 1
Committee Meeting
September 21, 2005, 3:00 p.m.**

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

Members Absent: Carol Sibley

Minutes from the September 7 meeting were reviewed. Motion by Jerilyn Gess to accept minutes, seconded by Amy Phillips, approved.

Student Volunteers for Criterion One Team: Lynette Stepan and Meghan DaPisa submitted by Carol Sibley. Lisa will forward these names to the Steering Committee, and final appointment will be made by President Barden.

Publicity Committee needs volunteers to develop a tag line, motto, theme, by the October 14 In-service day. This graphic, slogan, theme will go on all paper work that comes out of Steering Committee and Criterion meetings, so the campus becomes aware of the accreditation study. This committee is responsible for regular publications, i.e. insert in Continews. Rationale for a theme developed throughout earlier meetings of Steering Committee, to raise awareness of the self-study process. Lisa Nawrot is Chair of Publicity Committee and looking for volunteers. Amy Phillips suggested going to the Graphic Comm majors, Jody Bendel will volunteer.

Revised Mission Discussion: Members of Criterion One team were present at the Steering Committee meeting Wed, Sept 14, seeking more clarification on the revised mission statement. The reason given for changing the short abridged statement was because it sounded like all the other mission statements. They were looking for an emphasis unique to MSUM. A 1996 focus group was used to re-write abridged mission statement so the Steering Committee had data in writing this. They meant to be helpful, meant to be reflective of other reports of MSUM focus groups. They were trying to help out our team, giving us something short and snappy to bring future awareness of the accreditation visit. NCA has changed their criterion for accreditation, one important piece is to be future focused.

In discussion about the revised statement, the group suggested that if the university wants to revise its mission statement, it must be a university process and not just an add-on to the accreditation process. A comment was made that there is not a need to change the mission statement for the self-study. We should stick with what we have. We will table this discussion until the Steering committee minutes have been posted and read.

It was concluded that for the short term Criterion One will use the current long and short mission statements for its work. As a result of the self-study process, it might be appropriate for Criterion One to recommend revisions of the current mission statements.

Lisa reported that the other teams did not unveil the new revised statement to their teams. They have moved forward. This [deleted]version is one document among many, the overall mission of the university has not changed. There will be no unveiling of the revised mission statement at the October 14 professional day. Mission was only meant to be a small part of the re-accreditation process and liberal studies discussion.

Criterion Reports: Lisa reported the plan for structure of each Criterion reports. The same writing structure will be used. There will be 5 Chapters, one for each criterion. Introduction first, followed by discussion of each core component (1a 1b 1c 1d 1e), then summary of each level (e.g. 1a description, summary, 1b description, summary, etc). The challenge portion will come at the end of the criterion. One challenge speaking to all of our items. Many examples of evidence will be used.

Professional Day Update: There will be online registration. Ronda Ficek will set up registration site. This team can collect some of its data at the point of registration. We could add a short section for questions and answers. (see below)

8:45 Presidents Welcome

9:00 Liberal Studies portion of program task force updates Q&A

10:30 break

10:45 Rev. Jonathan Rosenthal General Education guidelines

12:00 lunch break

Re-accreditation process after lunch. Guest Speakers. Five criterion teams

Speakers Jonathan Rosenthal & Cheryl Evans will share stories on the benefits of the self study.

Break-out sessions, round table discussion. Six tables per criterion. 6-8 people at each table.

This will be another opportunity to ask questions. We need team members from each criterion to help at each table, one moderator and one notetaker. (Cindy Phillips and Warren Wiese are gone that date.)

Here are the questions Criterion One team would like posted on the on-line registration form:

- 1) The organization's mission documents are clear and articulate publicly the organization's commitments.
 Yes No
- 2) In its mission documents, the organization recognizes the diversity of its learners, other constituencies, and the greater society it serves.
 Yes No
- 3) Understanding of and support for the mission pervade the organization.
 Yes No
- 4) The organization's governance and administrative structures promote effective leadership and support collaborative process that enable the organization to fulfill its mission.
 Yes No
- 5) The organization upholds and protects its integrity.
 Yes No

- 6) Are you familiar with the university Mission statement?
_____ Yes _____ No
- 7) Would you know where to find the university Mission statement?
_____ Yes _____ No
- 8) What would you say is unique about MSUM?

During the round table discussion, moderators should bring copies of the long mission statement and short statement and have discussions. Here are some suggested questions to ask:

- Do faculty reflect on the university mission statement or any part of it in your classes?
Do you make reference to the university Mission Statement in any of your classes?
Do you know the university mission statement?
Do you remember any buzz words?
What would you say is unique about MSUM?
What 3 words would you use to describe MSUM?
What do you know about the mission?
What can you tell us about where we can find documentation?
How do you use the university's mission in your day to day activities?
How does it apply in your day to day activities?

Student's are vital source of information, but haven't determined how we are going to get to students. Possibly prepare a survey for students and randomly survey classes.

Assignments: Each member chose two schools to review the accreditation reports before our next meeting. Karla Wenger prepared a Core Component grid for examples of evidence. Please add to the list as you read the other reports. We are not going to use every piece of evidence, just get it out there from your sample reports. Karla will email grid to all members and we can add to it.

Criterion One subgroups:

- 1a)** Lisa & Sylvia
- 1b)** Sheryl, Cynthia & Amy
- 1c)** Jerilyn & Amy
- 1d)** Warren & Carolyn
- 1e)** Carol, Casey & Karla

In Summary: The team recommended that the self study be based on the current mission statements, due to concerns with the revised mission statement, although the long range job of this team may be to gather information about changing the University's current mission statements (which include the AIMS). Lisa will take this recommendation to the next Steering Team meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 4:40 pm.

Next meeting, October 5, 2:30, MA 268

Jayne Washburn, Recorder