

HLC Steering Committee Meeting

Tuesday, February 3, 2016 3:00 – 4:30 PM Room AC 105A

Minutes

Attendees:

Leo Hirner	Tatia Shelton	Michel Hillman	Joe Roche
Kristy Edmondson	Fran Padow	Jon Burke	Todd Hall
Melissa Giese	Cynthia Proctor	Tim Engle	Tom Wheeler
Tristan Londre	Quentin O'Chieng	Ross Ann Downing	Katrine Swanson
Claire Otto	Christina Medina	Crystal Johnson	Mindy McCallum
David Gann	Carol Winters		

Welcome

Michel Hillman welcomed the group and thanked everyone for their time and effort. The group was introduced to Claire Otto a new member from District Communications. Barbara Johnson our HLC Liaison had sent an email letting Mike know our visit report would be reviewed by the IAC in March.

Final Report Findings

Mike reviewed the timeline with the group of when MCC received an initial report from HLC and that the Chancellor had submitted an Institutional Response. He feels the drop-in sessions had an impact on the response. The areas of concern revolve around shared governance issues and a general lack of trust. Trust takes time to correct. A question was asked as to whether we would receive a transcript of the concerns from the drop-in sessions. No transcripts of those discussions will be received.

Criterion 1 did an excellent job and met every condition.

Criterion 2C is the first area that requires a report in June 2017. It is important to show that this criterion aligns with our district regulation 2.100.10. One idea was to think about a college council with governance group representation. At the February Board Meeting there will be a discussion about shared governance. Because this criterion was an area of concern the summary for Criterion 2 was also met with concern.

Criterion 3 also met all of its requirements. Great work was done on Criterion 3 by Mickey McCloud, Kim Glackin and committee. One area that needs continued review is faculty credentials. A suggestion was made to request a roundtable discussion with an HLC representative at the conference to clarify the new credential policy changes.

Criterion 4 met all areas required. Another great job completed by Cynthia Proctor and Crystal Johnson.

HLC Steering Committee Meeting

Tuesday, February 3, 2016 3:00 – 4:30 PM Room AC 105A

Criterion 5 had areas of concern. Again this criterion may have been impacted by information received in the drop-in sessions. Our definition of co-curricular needs to be defined and MCC needs to have a common definition of shared governance. The HLC evaluators concerns seemed to be related to the lack of alignment between campus plans and the district Strategic Plan. Someone asked where the district was with the Hyperion software. No one in the room was familiar with the product. Another person asked if it is a budget related software that would attach expenditures with strategic priorities.

General Discussion

Shared Governance meetings are already scheduled to move forward. It will take time to build trust.

Campus strategic plans must be nested within an overall one MCC strategic plan.

One member was not sure the district understands that MCC has been removed from the Open Pathways process and changed to the Standard Pathways process. There would be further consequences if improvement in these areas was not achieved.

Shared governance, Strategic Plan and change in the role of the Board is imperative. These changes need to start at the top to be successful.

A general concern was felt by the group that the district does not understand the significance of the findings of the evaluator team. Minor steps toward improvement will not be enough for the reports due in June 2017. The urgency of this improvement needs to be communicated beyond the Chancellors initial message.

Another member wanted everyone to be clear that this means MCC will host a physical visit in four years.

HLC Steering Committee Meeting

Tuesday, February 3, 2016 3:00 – 4:30 PM Room AC 105A

How do we fix concerns in areas that we have no control over? A member said these exact conversations were happening at the officer table. A member asked other members if they were receiving this message from the leadership at their campuses. Campus members agreed there had been no acknowledgement of any concerns.

Change and re-assessment will be very significant in the next eighteen months. The evaluators need to see that the needle has moved in the right direction.

Again it was stressed that four year reviews are not to be taken lightly.

It was agreed that the urgency to do well in these next steps and this message needs to come from the top.

A suggestion was made for us to utilize the AAUP survey. We already had data from previous surveys. If this is re-taken in a year, it would be an excellent measure for Shared Governance. Another member suggested using a different assessment that they felt would produce more targeted responses. It was agreed that using the AAUP survey would be best because of the baseline data from 2010 and 2014. Multiple cycles of assessment is crucial. It was asked of all members who are active with their governance groups to communicate the urgency of these reports in 2017.

It was suggested to let existing committees take over the criterions. This would give the committees control. The Strategic Planning Committee would take over the role of the HLC Committee. All of these committees could do a monthly report out to an institution HLC Council.

One member felt if faculty was asked to take over a criterion there should be additional pay.

It was decided that conversations needed to continue to address all of these concerns. An additional February meeting was agreed upon by the committee. The meeting was adjourned at 4:41 p.m.