

**MEETING MINUTES
HLC STEERING COMMITTEE
MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY
May 8, 2014**

Present

William Cheek	Etta Madden
Lynn Cline	Matt Morris
Rachelle Darabi	Sarah Nyquist
Thomas Dicke	Elizabeth Rozell
Steve Foucart	Don Simpson
Tamera Jahnke	Colette Witkowski

The March 4, 2014 and March 18, 2014 minutes were approved with no changes.

Tammy announced that the HLC accreditation team visit is scheduled for October 5-6, 2015.

The committee discussed town hall meeting notes from April 4, 2014. (attached)

Committee members who attended the 2014 HLC Annual Conference in Chicago shared updates and information. Committee members talked with other universities at the Share Fair and attended many sessions. Key outcomes:

- Start Federal Compliance collection now.
- Evidence needs to include more data. We don't need 10 years of data but we need data to support claims.
- Learned more about how criteria fit with graduate education.
- Learned about student survey that HLC will conduct.
- Learned many "best practices" from other institutions.

The subcommittees were charged with reviewing their reports and providing data with analysis to provide additional evidence. Please send links to data (or where we can find data) along with where it fits in your subcommittee's report by June 15, 2014 to Sherry Jones. We will not be changing the current reports but we will include this as we write the first draft of the assurance argument.

Tammy will look into how the student survey is administered before the next meeting. She will also determine the dates and process to solicit for public comment prior to our visit.

Schedule for Fall 2014 (2:00 – 3:00 PM in Carrington 203)

**August 26
September 16
October 21
November 18**

Town Hall Meeting

April 4, 2014

Compiled notes submitted after the meeting.

1. Question about transparency with respect to Criterion 2. Not really focused on any questions of the initial draft or evidence, but perhaps raises the question of how can the University (all of us) constantly make sure that we are clear in how we conduct business of the University.
2. Graduate programs and sufficiency of quality faculty. How do we review programs? How do we distribute dollars? Use of budget committees.
3. QIP project and the process of assessment. Who is ultimately responsible for ensuring quality (*teaching and consistent improvement in teaching*)?
4. Cultural Competence. Questioned commitment when we are “dismantling” language requirements and Bachelor of Arts.
5. Incorporate the work of the Provost’s Academic Advising Council into 3D3, 3E and perhaps 4B.
6. Registrar’s Office staff indicated that the students do find the fee structure complicated and difficult to understand.
7. Note the recruitment processes for underserved groups for fields in which such groups were underrepresented, and process of inviting such students to campus to observe such programs to get a feel for the possibilities. Might serve as some evidence of ways in which U is approaching diversity issues.
8. How does ratio of Full-time ---part-time---- and adjunct/per course faculty affect accreditation?
9. Include all evidence of diversity efforts.
10. How will QIP evidence results be articulated, evaluated as successful or not?
11. Appears to be less emphasis on Research, Performance, and or Creative productions in drafts so far? Perhaps embedded in Criterion 3 and Criterion 4 – the way in which we go about educating?
12. Are students involved in HLC process?