moorhead

Minutes NCA Criterion 5 Committee Meeting October 19, 2005, 3:00 p.m.

In attendance: Betty Gunderson, Ian Cole, Sara Leigh, Ginny Bair, Tim Harms, Terry Kroke, Teri Walseth

1. Discussion of feedback received during Friday's Round Table discussions. Results of discussions have been forwarded to Deb White.

Interesting point brought up as one table: We say we are a liberal arts college, but are we really? Some believe we do professional preparation.

2. What "story" do we want to tell? Discuss various reports and the method they used to tell their stories.

Mesa- stressed community

Paradise Valley – future focus, anticipating and responding. Referred to budget constraints and working to the best of their capacity. Described pilot activities.

New Mexico – Connected. Constituents from local all the way to national. Heavily stressed remediation of previous weaknesses. Does MSUM have any previously cited weaknesses? Dickinson – driven by locale – Western North Dakota. Lots of lists.

UNC – used NCA's overarching themes in margins.

People liked pictures with captions in the margins.

Eastern Illinois – Primarily student focused. Their "main" constituency.

Are students MSUM's main constituency? Many believe yes, but do not feel that everyone on campus feels this way. Discussed how many faculty feel they know are mission, but few believe we "live" it. Not a liberal arts school.Survey should've differentiated between long and short versions of mission. Knowing content of short one isn't the same as knowing the longer version. Are we dedicated to service? Key component of IFO criteria for promotion is service. Not mentioned in other contracts, but referred to as "service" faculty.

3. How do we divide into logical workgroups? Brainstormed various frameworks and expanded and revised them until we ended up with the following:

Constituent groups: Students, Alumni, Community (need to define), Employers

I. Responsiveness to Constituents (Do we learn from them and act upon their feedback?)

Data from focus groups, advisory councils, exit surveys, unsolicited feedback

II. Resources/Financial/Commitment

Data from budget, planning documents, staffing/HR, biennial reports, mission. Our priorities are shown by where our resources are directed.

III. Assessment of Value – was our response valued?

Data from retention, returners (post-bach), financial support given to us, job, grad school and intern placement, enrollment, attendance, outreach requests, institutional effectiveness evals, data on why students come here.