

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

Present: Kathy Cruz-Uribe, Karen Pugliesi, Wayne Sjoberg, Stephanie Jacobson, Karen Appleby, Pat Haeuser, Sarah Bickel, John Campbell, Don Carter, Brandon Cruickshank, Deb Harris, Ariel Hawkins, Roberta Kelly (via phone), Susanna Maxwell, Mary Reid, Diane Verkest, Matt Spilsbury, Becky Butcher

Excused: Tom Paradis, David Camacho, Bruce Fox, Fred Hurst, MJ McMahon, Betsy Putman, Angela Willetto.

1. Comments on the first draft from Steering Committee and Task Force Members

- Before the first draft was discussed, Karen Pugliesi opened the meeting, asking everyone to introduce themselves and announcing that Carla Andrews-O'Hara would be joining the group.
- Kathy Cruz-Uribe reported that she was leaving NAU and beginning a new position in Monterey, CA in January. She went on to state that the oversight of the Steering Committee will be a team effort, with Karen Pugliesi coordinating the team.
- Regarding comments on the first draft, Kathy reported the following: Overall, the comments were good and helpful as they directly pointed out specific errors and where we need more clarification and evidence. She also noted that the comments suggested the first draft of the report was painting "too rosy" of a picture of the university and that the scope of the reported needed to be expanded in order to tell NAU's story.
- Karen reported feedback from the President, who is also a CE for the HLC, noting the first draft was too long and needed to be shortened.

Next Steps

- Karen and Kathy reported that the self-study team will be taking all the comments received by the various task forces and steering committee members as well as hard copies of edits/comments submitted by the task forces, using them at a working retreat on Tuesday, November 21st to beginning the page-by-page editing process.

2. Changes for the Self-Study Report

- The group discussed the handout concerning changes to be made to the self-study report—environment, organization, capital development/facilities, programs, enrollment, and budget/investments.
- Karen Pugliesi shared with the group the importance of a "freeze" date for data to be collected for the report. She commented that she'll be working with Pat

Haeuser from PAIR as well as Carla Andrews-O'Hara on a freeze date as well as web site changes for data

3. Next two phases of the process

- Review of the draft
- Community Outreach/Education

- The group reviewed the two handouts regarding the review of the draft and community outreach/education. The first phase, Review of the Draft, takes place from January through March and contains questions for those reviewing the draft to answer. The second phase, Community Outreach/Education, taking place from January through October was discussed and ideas and suggestions were added such as: have tidbits of self-study embedded in mouse pads; have different brochures for different audiences; promotional chocolate; include self-study information at the up-coming College Bowl.
- It was suggested that at our next meeting in December, the group should come prepared to say which one of the many events listed you would be willing to attend **and** which one of the many events listed you would be willing to lead.

4. Student Engagement Update

- Matt Spilsbury and Ariel Hawkins presented an update for student engagement from the handout that was distributed. Matt reported that their summary presents not only the how, but the what—meaning, addressing how students should be engaged and what they should be told about accreditation. He emphasized the importance of accreditation for legitimizing degrees and credits to study at other accredited institutions. Other suggestions for what to present to the students were: accreditation also contributes to a university's continual improvement to advance quality education; the distinctiveness of the university and its committed faculty to students, small class size, and rankings at the national level. It was suggested that the "distinctiveness" of the university be presented as the "what" for students. How the students receive the information about accreditation include the new online course, attending ASNAU, Greek Life, and other student organizations and clubs.
- Also noted was the importance of transfer students who are able to compare one higher education institution to another and possibly have a focus group with transfer students to hear their stories.
- Accreditation also brings good faculty, who then connect to students who end up benefiting from positive, learning experiences both inside and outside the classroom.
- Accreditation is important for degreed undergraduates seeking graduate school admission.
- Carla reported the Lipman Hearne report had student findings about campus culture that could also be used for engagement purposes.

- The group discussed what theme to use and the importance of a consistent theme across campus.

5. Other

- Deb Harris also shared an up-coming information opportunity—making luminaries—with resident life students.
- Karen announced that the site team may visit our Yuma campus and other campuses statewide. She also noted that students from statewide campuses may come to the mountain campus for the site visit as well. It was suggested that Distance Learning address this in subsequent newsletters.