MEETING MINUTES  
HLC STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING  
THURSDAY, APRIL 17, 2008  
ANNIE LAWS, EDWARDS ONE #6154


- Debrief of HLC Annual Meeting/Workshop.
  - Resource room was helpful; we should avoid dense “academic” presentation; graphics, charts, and pictures must be central; disappointment with Saturday workshop expressed by several members; Wright State University still stands as a good self-study model; check map of SSI on Institutional Research site
  - Some of the best assessment at UC is happening at the program level.
  - There is a document for consultant evaluators regarding what questions to ask about assessment during a site visit. This will be used for our preparation prior to the visit.
  - Financial expectations are becoming more sophisticated and are in transition. Moving toward every campus submitting/reporting standardized financial information.
  - UC meeting routinely with title IV consultants to review practices and procedure.
  - Major accrediting consolidation may be in the works.

- Preparations for Mary Breslin’s visit on Thursday, May 29th.
  - Themes for the day: (1) a commitment to continuous improvement and (2) an openness to Mary Breslin’s input.
  - Breakfast, 45 minute sessions for team chairs and team members, capstone/debrief meeting at the end of the day. Conference room at Van Wormer for meetings. Debrief in #220 Van Wormer. Five teams + publicity/logistics team = six teams.

- Campus awareness update.
  - Regular campus forums discussed. Communications venues presented.
  - Seeding and tailoring message. What do we want each message to do?
  - Community advisory boards to be determined.
  - Faculty communication needs to be increased. How to reach faculty? Go to the department heads.
  - Add college communications, college advisory boards and committees, college student tribunals.
  - Add column as to who on steering committee will be responsible for specific communications to specific audiences. University Communicators/Greg Vehr mentioned.
• Stage One: information dissemination. Stage Two: discussions, forums, feedback. Discussion on how to really get campus engaged. Seeking engagement and input.

• Writing team reports.
  • Any questions or challenges? Criterion Three has data collected. Some debate about how to present it.
  • Survey has been designed for program directors. Do we have competing, overlapping surveys?

• Expectations for criterion drafts, due Monday, June 9th.
  • Writing team criterion draft details presented.

• Next meeting plan: May 15th.
  • Short meeting planned.
  • Mary Breslin visit focus and preparation.