

HLC Leadership Team Meeting
April 6, 2017
8:00 a.m. – 9:30 a.m.
Minutes

1. Insights (and issues) from the HLC Annual Conference
 - a. The team members attending the conference brought many thoughts, perspectives, and ideas to the table. Some of the topics of discussion included:
 - i. Co-curricular (academic and non-academic) ongoing student professional development is interwoven into the operations of most all academic and student affairs units. It would be important to recognize and assess the efficacy of student learning for these activities and programs (for areas we aren't already doing so). Engage student participation in designing the assessment measures and practices as well.
 - ii. Related to Federal Compliance and Assumed Practices, we benefit by using a candid analysis of the evidence and transparent sharing of information as an opportunity to improve the student experience. We will want to insure that we are identifying all of the existing structures we have in place to evidence compliance with all regulatory agencies and showcase these documents and practices as reported on our website.
 - iii. Use of the evidence and de-constructing the language in the criterion for accreditation and aligning our responses across the criterion core-components is critical. Evidence should always be triangulated and showcase strengths in a truncated way. Additional evidence supporting the argument should be available when called upon by the peer review team. Create an environment of proactive transparency and implement solutions that are both effective and sustainable, have plans for solutions completed, and if at all possible plan implementation and results from the strategies. Fulfill the institution's obligation (see slide).
 - iv. Circumstantial evidence should be gleaned from financial statements, budgets, and annual financial reports that links strategic planning initiatives with actions. These insights should also include alignment with other plans such as the campus master plan, the KBOR foresight 2020 strategic plan, the information technologies plan, the student affairs strategies, the enrollment management plan, and academic success initiatives. The funding supports the initiatives and evidences the prioritization of resource allocation. Identifying evidence of strategic plans at the department levels and connecting resource allocations at this level of operation with some examples would be a good thing. Again, transparency and candor are expected when identifying successes and challenges in the existing fiscal climate specific to ESU.
 - v. The KBOR DegreeStats website serves as a transparency tool in a variety of contexts showing that we are outward facing with actual data from our students who have completed our degree programs. It will be important to identify those "consumer disclosure" strengths and weaknesses and present strategies for strengthening areas where the consumer protection/disclosure

framework is becoming part of the HLC legislation. The consumer protection legislation is up for 1st reading by HLC on Jun. 2017 or Nov. 2017 meeting, then 2nd reading scheduled for Nov. 2017 or Feb. 2018. From the time the legislation is adopted we have one year to implement policy, plans, and processes to accommodate the legislation. This legislation has implications for admissions/enrollment management/registration/financial aid/marketing and media relations. Requires training of staff in each of these areas to understand and operate in a fashion where we are in compliance with the consumer protection legislation. There were many topics covered that will become a part of assumed practices and with expectations to confirm within the assurance argument criterion. It will be important to keep a pulse on when this legislation will go into effect. ESU will be expected to have plans in place to comply. There are policy, procedures, and training implications that will need to be addressed in addition to what we are already doing. The timing of when we will be expected to comply may challenge where we will be at in the process when the site team visits in fall of 2018.

- vi. The presence of an Enrollment Management Plan and the alignment between the plan, student persistence and completion goals, funding and personnel resources, student success programming, and the transparency of these plans and reporting of success metrics with the campus community and stakeholders is important.
- vii. In regard to Criterion 2, the HLC has begun enhancing the expectations for confirming the argument that the institution operates with ethical integrity across all of its operations. Evidence should confirm the code of ethics in all operations of the institution with regard to all of the five criterion. Criterion 2 used to be the least complex of the criterion and HLC has made changes to ensure that ethics is a part of the policy, process, and practices including the alignment with institutional planning. The alignment between how these codes are implied and followed are evidenced through a multi-perspective approach where it is confirmed that there are policies, processes, and practices supporting the ethical operations of the institution. This topic was also covered in the peer review training and updates.
- viii. Criterion 5 confirms that the institution is not ignoring the realities of the environment and that the institution is being proactive with contingency plans. This is to include how the institution adapts its strategic planning with changes in those factors influencing successful plan initiatives (how does the financial picture affect continuation of strategic plan initiatives?)
- ix. The writing of the assurance argument should be a focused and concisely written document with evidence supporting statements of fact. Using text from past self-studies isn't appropriate. Look across previous documents submitted by HLC and the 2015 peer review team to look for suggestions and advice. Be sure to include our answers to all of the advice/directives in our assurance argument. Also, reflect back on the summary sections of the 2015 Self-study where we self-identified improvement opportunities and ensure that we have included responses to these challenges in our assurance argument.

- x. The first impulse is to start writing, we should identify and gather all evidence supporting the insurance argument and let the evidence guide the content of the assurance argument.
2. Questions or observations about Criteria Three and Four from the readings? We didn't get to this part of the meeting as time expired. This agenda item is moved to the May 4th meeting.
3. Next meeting: Thursday, May 4, 8:00am, President's Conference Room
 - A close look at Criteria Three and Four
 - A more detailed timeline for our work