



Minutes
NCA Steering Committee
October 12, 2005, 3:00 p.m.

Present: Co-chairs Judy Strong and Deb White, Tim Borchers, Rinita Dalan, Kathleen Enz Finken, Brittney Goodman, Ted Gracyk, Michelle Malott, Lisa Nawrot, Liz Rowse, Teri Walseth, Karla Wenger, Susanne Williams

Minutes: Moved by Goodman, seconded by Malott to approve the minutes of 9-14-05. The motion was approved unanimously. Moved by Walseth, seconded by Nawrot to approve the minutes of 9-28-05. The minutes were approved unanimously as corrected.

Professional Development Day: Borchers reviewed the schedule and highlights for the day. The NCA Accreditation session begins at 1:00 p.m. Enz Finken volunteered to moderate the Panel Presentation and Q&A session. Malott volunteered to introduce the Table Topic Discussion. Each Table Moderator will have a list of questions for the discussion and an instruction sheet. Table moderators should bring proper note taking materials. Criterion Teams should send discussion questions to Borchers otherwise generic questions will be used. Goodman and Nawrot volunteered to handle the wireless microphones during the Q&A session. Suggestions on ways to involve staff and students will be discussed at the October 26 meeting.

Public Relations Subgroup: Nawrot briefed the Steering Committee on the Public Relations Subgroup meetings and distributed a handout, *Reaccreditation 2007 Theme* that provides a rationale for the theme being recommended by the subgroup. A graphic is being created to go with the theme and should be ready in two weeks. The subgroup will present their ideas at the next steering committee meeting. Nawrot agreed to have the subgroup prepare an itemized publicity budget request. Publicity strategies including use of Continews and the NCA Visit and MSUM websites were discussed.

ROUNDS:

CT1: The Team is determining types of data needed for each component and is somewhat behind the other teams in this respect.

CT2: The Michigan State self-study and template for writing the chapter report for MSUM's self-study has been reviewed. The Team has discussed the main topics to focus on in the chapter report as well as how to address concerns without sounding too negative. Questions for table discussion on Professional Development Day have been determined.

CT3: The Team has been brainstorming on the large amount of data available and what might be best to use. Consideration is being given to surveying the campus community as well. It was suggested that one survey be created for use by all teams instead of each team doing a separate

survey. The chapter report will use sidebars to highlight the overarching themes based on findings.

CT4: Questions for use at table discussions on Professional Development Day have been formulated. The name of a student for the team has been submitted to White. The Team would like clarification on parameters for requesting data that is needed now. The Team has begun ranking topics for use in the chapter report.

CT5: The Team has reviewed the compiled data list and is ready to start digging in despite some sense of being overwhelmed by the amount of data available and/or needed. The Team has begun ranking topics for use in the chapter report and has divided into subgroups by the core components.

It was suggested that a glossary of “accreditation terminology” be created for use by the teams, as an example the difference between “evidence” and “supporting data.” It was also suggested that the themes highlighted in the report have “robust” data to support them.

It was suggest that a document be created that summarizes themes that we would like to have included in the self-study report. These “themes” would reflect the story that we would like to tell about MSUM. The themes will be drawn from existing mission documents and other data. Rowse and Williams volunteered to help White create the document. It was noted that the survey data collected at Professional Development Day only reflects faculty impressions and cannot be used to represent the entire campus.

Data Clearinghouse: White noted that a large of amount of data will be compiled for use in the Resource Room even if it is not specifically noted in the Self-Study. The Peer Evaluators can look at any evidence, not just what is provided for them. It will be to our benefit to have all possible data ready in some type of format for the Peer Evaluators. It was suggest that each Criterion Team host an open forum to help determine where data is located and to get feedback. Teams should begin to submit lists to White of data items needed, based on priority. It was requested that the teams try to limit themselves to requesting five items at a time. In the mean time, if there are data that is needed immediately, team co-chairs can begin to pull data together to share in the Resource Room. The goal is to have as much data as possible available in electronic format for easier distribution to the various Criterion Teams. Goodman agreed to ask Jean Kramer (librarian) to provide assistance in cataloging the data in the Resource Room. White agreed to update the data request list on a weekly basis and post it to the NCA Visit website. The updates will show which data is in the process of being gathered and which data is available for the teams to use. Les Bakke will attend the next meeting to review data he can prepare for use by the team. It was suggested that Iris Gill also attend. Both will be asked to come at 4:00 p.m. on October 26. It was suggested to have them meet individually with each Criterion Teams as well.

Report Template: Williams reviewed the revised *MSUM-NCA Self-Study Style Guide*. It was agreed to use first person to speak for MSUM and third person to speak for the Steering Committee. Williams will incorporate recommended changes and bring the Style Guide back to the Steering Committee for final approval. Discussion on additional chapters beyond the five

team chapters will be discussed at the next meeting. Email any additional suggestions to Williams and especially whether additional guidance is needed.

Chapter Template: Enz Finken reviewed the revisions made to the *Chapter Template* following the last meeting. Discussion ensued on synonyms to use for “strengths” and “weaknesses” in the chapter summary section. Further discussion and a decision will be determined at the next meeting. When the document is approved, Enz Finken will share it with Williams to include with the style guide.

Additional Team Members: White distributed a compiled list of *Suggestions for Additions to Criterion Teams* for review. She asked that any additional names be submitted ASAP so the list can be sent to President Barden. Strong agreed to work on getting a student named to the Steering Committee. The current list of Criterion Team members was reviewed and corrected. It was noted that the IFO needs to name their respective “designee” to the team(s). Team co-chairs were encouraged to remind their members that they were to hold 3:00-5:00 p.m. on Wednesdays for team meetings. Teams can also enlist assistance from members of the campus community as consultants.

Next meeting: October 26, 3:00-5:00 p.m., MA 268.

The meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.