

Higher Learning Commission (HLC)
Executive Committee
Meeting Minutes
March 24, 2009



Executive Committee:

Eric Martin (co-chair)	x Ann Vendrely (co-chair)	x Beth Cada
x Diane Dates Casey	x Shannon Dermer	x Sandra Mayfield
x Margaret Neumann	x Fernando Rayas	x Becky Nugent

Guest: Bill Wilkinson

Staff Support:

x Jill Stanley

- Ann Vendrely convened the meeting at 10:00. Noted that due to Eric Martin taking his son to the doctor, Martin would not be in attendance.
- The minutes from the meeting of February 24th were reviewed – Diane Dates Casey noted that there is no hyphen in her name. Jill Stanley noted the omission of the request made to all the co-chairs to submit “evidence in hand” to Sandra Mayfield.
- Dates Casey moved that the minutes, once amended, be approved. Seconded by Nugent.
- Discussion ensued regarding evidence – is it a compilation of hard copies or would web addresses/links to sites suffice? Vendrely stated that both will be necessary
- Vendrely gave update on Writing Team – The Introductory Chapter, Chapter One and 3/4s of Chapter Two have been submitted to the President’s Cabinet. Chapter One has gone to Dermer’s committee, and constructive criticism has been relayed to the Writing Team. As soon as Chapter Two is done, it will be submitted to that committee for their review. We have started to write Chapter Four. Vendrely met with Nugent’s committee to gather evidence and start writing. Nugent asked what other evidence should they be looking for? Wilkinson commented that the entire process is very much “a chicken and the egg process.” Nugent hoped that enough material was given to the writing team. Neumann referred to a list of “links” that she had submitted to Wilkinson as evidence. Wilkinson noted that many did not go directly to the document cited, be sure the link takes you to the document cited as “evidence.”

- All of the material should be submitted to the vault – Diane Nadler in the Library is the point person, all documents will be scanned and saved in a pdf format.
- Discussion ensued regarding where all the documentation should reside – Dates Casey noted that there is no better place for documentation to reside then electronically “Records Retention is my job!” Data collection continues to be an ongoing process. Cada noted that the letter that their department is accredited is the documentation that is necessary, not the self-study. Wilkinson noted that links to a specific section of a self-study may be appropriate rather than the entire document. Tracking down the consultant reports for those programs that are not accredited. Lisa Hendrickson gave Wilkinson a table of when consultants visited and thumbnail conclusions, findings, recommendations, but no actual reference or link or indication of where the report actually resides. Vendrely commented that that was a good start and that everyone will have to dig deeper.
- The Marketing Communication Committee Update is deferred. Martin and Vendrely had planned to meet with Luke Helm prior to the Executive session, but due to Martin’s absence, that meeting was cancelled.
- One of the recommendations from the President’s cabinet was to have more people read the chapters as they are produced. The chapters are pretty rough right now, anyone is welcome to read them – if interested, Vendrely will email. Perhaps should be edited down to bullet points, findings, key points could be sent out to everyone and do “survey monkey” – we were going to speak to Helm about that process. Does that make sense to all? It would show HLC that we had an inclusive process, a PR purpose, if there was something very consistent coming back to the writing team in terms of feedback, it could still be incorporated. The President has described the draft as “a potter working with clay, it’s still spinning on the wheel and it’s still soft.” The feedback would allow us to incorporate any pieces. We will try to have a university wide meeting again; we want to reach out to all the communities – faculty, student, civil service, etc.
- Cada suggested the use of a pop-up invitation on the front of any web ct course to participate in this? May encroach on academic freedoms, but would that be viable? Should Eric Wignall be asked if that would work? Would serve as a reminder to students that the process is ongoing and be very prominent.
- Ramas recommended the use of Facebook. There are a large number of GSU students who are on Facebook as a group. Cada commented any way to engage people electronically would be good. Nugent asked how to make this process inviting to all populations. Vendrely noted that the President has suggested that there be incentives – even if it’s a certificate good for a free drink, or coupon for some value to be used in the bookstore, is a great incentive. Dates Casey cited the “To Kill a Mockingbird” campaign drew a great response.
- Vendrely noted that the budget for marketing is \$25,000. Not sure what that can be spent on, but it is a good thing.
- University wide meeting. Vendrely noted that probably wouldn’t be able to have anything ready to go during April. Stanley noted that May 12 was a date that had been agreed to at the last meeting. Mayfield felt that the University community needed something on a more regular basis, and felt a meeting was necessary in April. She also noted that there isn’t something in the GSU View on a regular basis. Dates Casey asked if the Strategic Plan was sent out electronically, and suggested that a contest be constructed around it. Posters were suggested, Dermer suggested using the “Burma

Shave” technique; put them along the driveways into the campus. Nugent contented that posters could be reused and would be a good value. Dates Casey recommended banners in the Hall of Governors, that they would be highly visible and could be put up and taken down and reused (making them more visible.) Mayfield suggested the marquis, TV monitors. Vendrely noted that the mission is now a slide on the TV monitors.

Ramas recommended t-shirts. Nugent said as long as they received a shirt for survey monkey and promised to wear them during the HLC visit. Dermer – if you are wearing your shirt on certain dates you’re eligible for a prize (cup of starbucks, etc.) Game show venues, “Who wants to be a millionaire” asking questions about the mission statement then you win. “Jeopardy” format, but keep it short.

- Vendrely asked for consensus if there was time to be organized for an April 9th meeting, would want to do it well. Highlight the mission statement, generate some type of give away, whether t-shirts or something smaller. Produce summary statements or highlights of what has happened already. What chapters have been written, what’s being drafted, what some of the findings are. Mayfield feels that we need to get the faculty connected as soon as possible. We lose four months – half in May and June and the other half in July and August. Dermer noted her experience as faculty in COE and the NCATE accreditation; two months before the actual visit, information was sent to the faculty – “these questions may be asked” – there are two schools of thought – and people’s attention span is only so long. A big push closer to the visit is better. Neumann concurred. Nugent felt that to demonstrate an inclusive process, we need to strategize ways to make it inviting to participate. Survey monkey, short and sweet, over in a half hour. The date of April 7th was agreed upon at 11:00 a.m. and that Stanley would secure a meeting room. If the Center for Performing Arts not available, Engbretson.
- The meeting was adjourned at 10:50 a.m.