

Steering Committee Minutes
October 6, 2006
BAC Room 206/1-3 p.m.

Present: Kathy Cruz-Uribe, Karen Pugliesi, Pat Haeuser, MJ McMahon, Sarah Bickel, David Camacho, John Campbell, Don Carter, Brandon Cruickshank, Bruce Fox, Deborah Harris, Fred Hurst, Susanna Maxwell, Mary Reid, Angela Willetto, Matt Spilsbury, Becky Butcher, Gypsy Denzine, Cynthia Childrey

Excused: Tom Paradis, Joe Collentine, Ariel Hawkins, Stephanie Jacobson, Roberta Kelly, Betsy Putman, Wayne Sjoberg, Diane Verkest, Karen Appleby

1. Welcome and Announcements

- Kathy Cruz-Uribe opened the meeting by welcoming everyone back and thanking them all for their efforts in completing the work plan. She went on to say that the work plan helped the self-study team write the outline during the summer and create the subsequent first draft of the self-study report.
- Kathy announced that everyone had received a packet for the meeting and noted items contained in it: agenda, results from the formative assessment, guideline document (with URL for first draft of self-study report), comment sheet to submit responses, timeline for self-study process, updated leadership list, updated task force list, and 2006-2007 meeting schedule. She went on to introduce Matt Spilsbury and Ariel Hawkins, two undergraduate students who will be part of the Steering Committee. It was also noted that from Yuma, Roberta Kelly has replaced Anna Marie Aldaz, who recently retired.
- Karen Pugliesi announced the site visit date for the comprehensive review—October 22-24, 2007. She has already shared this date with campus leadership and has also requested that the evaluation team members be from a similar Carnegie Classification as NAU—non-urban, residential, undergraduate, four-year institution. She'll have more information to share about the evaluation team members in the Spring of 2007.

2. Results from Formative Assessment of NCA self-study process

- Becky reported the findings from the formative assessment of the self-study process (see attached) noting positive areas (communication, campus representation, accreditation website, staff support, HLC liaison visit, individual participation and group participation, self-study team and steering committee guidance) and areas of improvement (online course). Becky noted that a new campus-wide course was being developed with a database that includes the evidence used in the self-study report as well as documenting institutional capacities. Kathy Cruz-Uribe did share that letters had been sent to supervisors of all self-study participants indicating appreciation for their work thus far in the self-study process.

3. Discussion of the First Draft of the Self-Study Report

- Kathy went over the guideline document (see attached) noting that editing was not necessary in the reviewing process, but emphasized the need for or deletion of evidence for criteria. She specifically addressed the areas in the first draft in red that indicate gaps that are “under construction” whereby input for data and/or evidence is needed. Kathy went on to note that task force members are only responsible for the chapter that’s relevant to their task force, but if they feel compelled to review more of the report to feel free to do so but please submit a separate comment sheet for each chapter reviewed. She also reminded everyone that the URL for the first draft of the self-study report was on the guideline document. Becky is to follow-up with ITS personnel to have online access to the first draft for all self-study team, steering committee, and task force members and to post the guideline and comment documents on the accreditation website.
- The comment sheet was presented (see attached), noting that reviewers are to submit data and/or evidence from a broader perspective and to indicate *what* and *where* evidence was needed. It was also mentioned to indicate if evidence was not relevant to the specific area being reviewed to refer where in the report it could be used.
- Karen and Kathy noted the section on the comment sheet that addressed the HLC’s cross-cutting themes as well as potential themes for NAU. Discussion was given as to how to note these in the comment sheet as well as providing a narrative if applicable.
- Karen Pugliesi asked for members to also review the Introduction (Chapter 1) that isn’t related to the criteria, but presents a historical view or story of the university. She went on to say that those who review this chapter need to submit a separate comment sheet with their responses.
- Kathy went over the timeline document for the self-study process (see attached), indicating the importance of keeping to the deadline for submitting comments to the first draft – October 25th – emailed to Becky. Additionally, Kathy shared that the document is too long and it doesn’t need more information, but possibly different information.
- It was asked the cut-off date for “freezing” the document and Karen replied that it would probably be sometime in the Spring of 2007 but a definite date would be communicated later.

4. Campus Engagement Discussion

- Kathy and Karen asked for ideas for engaging the campus community for the self-study process. Clarification was needed for the level of engagement and Karen noted that we’ll first ask for input on the document, then the evidence, and then prepare for the site visit. The following were ideas presented: Presentation of information at state advisory councils; Separate strategies involving deans and chairs on up and engaging the broader campus community using marketing and media; Student engagement with emphasis on why accreditation matters to them; Information presented at Faculty Senate and to parents and students during orientation; Have a “NCA DAY”; Information presented on NAU’s homepage, Inside NAU, Lumberjack; Have task forces write a blip for Inside NAU on their

experiences in the self-study process; Physically go out to the campus community and distribute a brochure; Distribute a brochure to the local community – School Board, Rotary Club, United Way etc; Include in the brochure NAU's mission, values, and goals.

- Karen reiterated that the introduction (chapter 1) of the first draft tells NAU's story and the importance of linking the mission, values, and goals to the self-study process. She concluded that the goal for the next steering committee meeting (Friday, November 3rd) is to give feedback on the synthesis of comments to the first draft.
- Becky is to follow-up and email the updated task force list to all task force co-chairs.