

NEASC Steering Committee Meeting  
October 9, 2009

**Present:** Jack Kartez, John Voyer, Beth Higgins, Cathie Fallona, Bob Caswell, Jean Whitney, Dick Campbell, David Carey, Adam Tuchinsky, Tom Knight, Andy Anderson, David Nutty, Bill Wells, Joan Boggis, Luisa Deprez

Agenda

I. Updates

Luisa opened the meeting asking for comments, changes, deletions on the September meeting minutes:

A bit of time was spent re-reviewing the time line for work as put forth in the September minutes reminding members that September through December will be the bulk of committee/sub-committee meetings with a first draft due December 30<sup>th</sup> from each standard committee. To reiterate: The Steering Committee will meet monthly over the course of this academic year. The schedule for meeting agendas will look something like this:

October: preliminary review of Standards 1 and 2 descriptions and discussion of committee Composition

November: preliminary review of/update on Standards 3, 4, 5, and 11

December: preliminary review of/update on Standards 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10

Note: The intent of these meetings will be to get a sense of issues/concerns that might be emerging or have arisen, and will appear in, the draft report. For both the November and December meetings, the sub-committee co-chairs will be invited to attend.

January/February: Steering Committee will conduct a detailed review of the first draft of the Self-Study. President Botman and Provost Forhan will be invited to the January meeting (President Botman has accepted invitation).

February-March: Drafts returned to Standard Committees for revisions based on Steering Committee deliberation.

March-April: Self-study posted on NEASC Website for USM community review and comment. Meetings at each of the three campuses will be done to allow for comment and feedback.

April-May: Campus feedback/comments handed on to Standard Committees for consideration/integration into draft.

June-July: Pre-final draft completed and reviewed by Steering Committee

August: Pre-final draft to NEASC Commission for review and comment

As indicated above, all sub-committee chairs have accepted the invitation to attend the November and/or December meetings for a discussion of specific standards. Additionally, President Botman has confirmed her attendance at the January meeting for a beginning review of the self-study draft.

Luisa also indicated that she is still responding to requests for data/information. Requests have been thoughtful and thorough; some will not be able to be met because the information/data is just not available. In other cases, data/information is not available in the format requested by committees/sub-committees. Luisa will continue to do her best to respond. It may be that in the appraisal and/or projection sections, committees will have to indicate that missing data/information deterred their ability to thoroughly delve into the standards at hand. These sections may indicate data that is needed for future reviews.

The upcoming NEASC workshop will be attended by Jack Kartez, Beth Higgins, Monique Larocque, Tom Knight, and Luisa Deprez. We will report back at the November meeting. The group also has a meeting with Pat O'Brien.

The NEASC website. Luisa had a meeting with Kim Dominicus and Robin McGlaufflin to discuss postings to the website. Kim will have access to the website and will post material sent her by Luisa. Robin will review the URI and UVM websites for format, etc. She and Luisa also discussed putting up a comment - "blog" - page after the draft of the self-study is released and posted so that faculty and staff can send in comments if they are not able to attend the campus meetings scheduled for Spring.

## II. Discussion of Standards 1 and 2

Prior to a discussion of each of these standards Luisa asked everyone to read "What the Section on each Standard should include" - this was handed out and is on the NEASC BB site under Documents. This standard-by standard piece provides suggestions for preparing and reviewing the drafts of each standard. We will use this in our review of all the standards. Committee chairs were encouraged to use it in the development of their draft and to encourage all committee members to review it prior to writing.

### Standard 1

A hearty discussion was had around the Standard I Description. Key words in the mission statement that provide guidance are **public**, **comprehensive**, and **regional**. There was consensus that the Mission Statement is relatively generic but the specificity of these keywords provide direction and focus while allowing the institution to be both responsive and entrepreneurial. There was some reflection on the Mission Statement Committee charged by former Provost Lapping to revise the Mission Statement and the corresponding tweaking and shortening undertaken by the Faculty Senate - resulting in the current statement. It was agreed that appraisal and projection of this standard needed to wait until all the other standards were written as each needs to reflect on the mission statement (see References to Mission Statement in NEASC Guidelines).

### Standard 2

Jack Kartez, co-chair of Standard 2 led the discussion of Standard 2. He indicated information that was still needed to be incorporated into the description. There was also discussion about parts that needed clarification/correction so as to ensure accuracy in reading and perception. Jack requested assistance in re-writing certain parts to ensure this and got some volunteers. There was also a good deal of discussion about the process of planning and evaluation at USM; questions about the integration of the Strategic Planning process and resultant plan with the current reorganization as well as with the UMS planning effort; there was also a good deal of discussion about the use of evaluation as a key planning/feedback tool. There appears to be some movement on this front - to better use evaluation as a key ingredient in the planning process. The suggestion was made that Jack meet with John Wright who has recently been designated the Strategic Plan implementer. Jack will, in the coming weeks, meet with John and reach out to others including Bill Wells, Dick Campbell, Bob Caswell, and Susan Campbell. Like Standard 1, the group believed that parts of the appraisal and projection would more likely come to light after other standards were written.

Minutes by: Luisa S. Deprez