Higher Learning Commission Monitoring Report Steering Committee
Tuesday, October 21, 2008
11:00 A.M., Administration Building Board Room

Present: Tim Daugherty, Co-Chair; Deborah Payne, Co-Chair; Terry Crain, Shayne Crawshaw, Kim Dixon, Keith Kendrick, Perry Knop, Keith Krapf, Phil Minnis, Gayle Pesavento, John Profilet, Eric Pulley, Julia Schroeder

Absent: Valerie Barko, Sheryl Bleyer, Perry Knop

Tim told the group about the workshop the board of trustees attended conducted by Gary Davis. He shared Gary Davis's vita. Gary Davis is affiliated with the organization the Higher Learning Commission would recommend the board of trustees receive training. He said Mr. Davis was very straight forward with the members of the board of trustees and administrators. The workshop was very good and did what the Higher Learning Commissions asked us to do. Gary Davis's report about the workshop is attached. Tim said we want what we report to the Higher Learning Commission to be honest.

Since the last meeting on September 15, 2008, members of this committee shared the draft questionnaire with their respective departments and colleagues for feedback.

Items of discussion:

- Tim will share with the Operational Staff information regarding the upcoming survey (why we are doing it, etc.) on November 13 at this group's staff development day
- What direction should the questionnaire go? This was the concern, this was the action taken – how do you rate the action taken.
- Was the administration and board of trustees acting with integrity with the policies – micro-managing was an issue.
- How are the actions being taken being received?
- On the questionnaire, do not state what we've done. They should know ahead of time. That is the duty of the committee. If this is done, would it appear that we are prompting their answers?
- If you state what we've done, you are not going to get honest feedback. Some people have <u>strongly requested</u> that the surveys <u>**not**</u> be done electronically.
- Feedback received: Questions 1 and 2 should be a numerical answer because of the way it must be answered.
- Change the sentence before question 1. It should read "Please judge the following..." instead of "Please answer the following….". Also in the same sentence, change the word "questions" to "statements."
- Provide a checklist of things they think have helped increase communication? This devalues the survey. Leave blank lines where the individual can fill out what he/she wants.
- The question was asked about having two surveys: one for North Central and the other for our information.
- What is the most effective way to inform/remind people what actions have been taken. Some employees have asked what actions have been taken.
- The survey is only required to ask two questions. Some thought there was a danger in just asking two questions.

- Classification of current position of respondent is needed on the survey.
- Should information be sent out about what actions have been taken since the last survey, then later, send out the survey?

  Is a marketing campaign needed for the survey? Perhaps put information in *General News* and *Volunteer*?

  Do not market too much too close to the survey. Do not overkill.
- Add comment sections for each question.
- Do people trust us to do things to make the workplace better or do they think that this is just for compliance?
- Keep the survey simple.
- Based on the "comments" on the survey, then we can follow up with another survey if necessary.
- Incorporate additional questions presented today.
- Question #6: Change "faculty and staff" to employees.

The questionnaire will be re-formatted and e-mailed to committee members. Send responses back to Tim instead of having another committee meeting. Then, the president and vice-presidents will review.