

MINUTES: University Self-Study Steering Committee

DATE: August 30, 2001
3:00-5:00 PM, Room 231 Student Center

PRESENT: C. Havice (presiding), D. Boyd, C. Currens, A. Goldman,
J. Hougland, D. Kalika, P. Kelley, T. Lillich, R. Mitchell,
M. Molinaro, L. Nora, J. Picoro, K. Tagavi, C. Vaughn

C. Havice called the meeting to order at 3:00 PM. She reminded everyone that there will be a meeting of the Steering Committee tomorrow, Friday, August 31 from 2:00-4:00 in room 231 of the Student Center. The meeting will be to review the report of the Faculty Committee. Another meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, September 4 to review the Principles and Philosophy and Administrative Processes reports.

Director's Report:

J. Picoro reminded the group that we would be sending in nominees for members of our SACS site visit team. D. Crump at SACS has asked for the nominations next week. If you have individuals in mind as possible site visitors, please send those to J. Picoro or C. Vaughn by September 6. We need the name, institution, mailing address, phone number and e-mail address if available.

D. Crump from SACS called this morning to discuss the possibility of a joint accreditation visit from SACS and the Council on Collegiate Nursing Education. The Council is the new accreditation body for our College of Nursing. They have scheduled an accreditation visit from April 15-17, 2001, which purposely overlaps with the time when the SACS visiting team will be on campus. SACS policy allows for joint visits and D. Crump pointed out several advantages of having a joint visit take place. J. Picoro has also talked with C. Williams, Dean of the College of Nursing. Since this is to take place, we will not have an individual from nursing on our SACS committee.

Library Subcommittee:

C. Havice reviewed the procedures for report review that the Steering Committee has followed to date. First the group will be given an opportunity for comments or general observations relating to the report as a whole. Then specific suggestions/recommendations from the report will be reviewed, discussed, edited and approved for inclusion in the final Self-Study Report. Decisions made in these meetings are basically final. Only editorial changes for formatting purposes are anticipated in addition to those changes decided upon here.

C. Havice welcomed K. Tagavi and A. Goldman from the Library Subcommittee. They are here to represent the subcommittee and to review the report with the Steering

Committee. She then opened the floor to general observations and comments regarding the report.

T. Lillich asked if the new library schedule had any basis on the needs of users of the Medical Center Library. He also asked if this emerged from the survey data. M. Molinaro said that the needs of Medical Center Library users were part of the need for the new library schedule. Everything that is over 10 years old from the Medical Center Library is housed in the Young Library. J. Piccoro asked if the needs of LCC students were a concern and if we had a large volume of LCC students using the library. M. Molinaro said that a large number of LCC students do use the library and that their needs were taken into consideration.

P. Kelley raised concern about publicizing availability of laptop computers. M. Molinaro said that they have many signs posted around the library and asked for recommendations of how to publicize this. P. Kelley said that the signage in the library is adequate once an individual reaches the library but that students need to have the information available by other means than having to come to the library to find out. M. Molinaro will look into this for other solutions.

With regard to the issues of shelving and noise, T. Lillich asked how much of this is really a problem and how much can be attributed to getting used to the new building. M. Molinaro said that people have not been complaining and that they would if there were actually a problem. There is really nothing that can be done about the shelving system. The existing system is the only way to be able to house the number of books that are now located in Young Library. The interior rooms of the library are quiet for those who have a problem with the noise level. It is generally the case that, if people have a problem with noise, they will ask others to be quiet.

K. Tagavi asked if some shelves were more frequently used than others. M. Molinaro said that they could determine this by the circulation records. But, the books housed in Young are those most used. Books not used have already been moved out. L. Nora observed that there seem to be a number of environmental issues on which the subcommittee would make suggestions. She asked if there is already a group in existence that is engaged in assessment of these types of potential problems. One way to handle these suggestions is to combine them as environmental issues and suggest that the group charged with this continue to actively assess environmental problems with the library.

P. Kelley asked why the report contains suggestions/recommendations for the law library but not for education, architecture or other branch libraries. Other members of the Steering Committee suggested that recommendations for branch libraries be combined in the report.

T. Lillich asked about the mention of a non-driver's license. M. Molinaro said that the non-driver's license is used as a form of identification. For example, an individual who is blind would not have a regular driver's license but may have a non-driver's license and can use that for ID.

C. Havice noted that recommendations are those things the University needs in order to comply with the SACS Criteria. What are listed in the Library report are actually suggestions. D. Kalika said that there are many places in the report where it does not specify whether the University is or is not in compliance with the SACS *Criteria*. A. Goldman said that, in many instances, the subcommittee found it difficult to determine whether we are in compliance. He said that the standards are vague and that members of his subcommittee did not feel qualified to make the determination. Several members of the Steering Committee stated that the purpose of the self-study is to investigate and to make the determination of whether the University is in compliance. This will be further addressed in the report of the Library Subcommittee. Evidence exists to determine whether the University meets SACS *Criteria*. K. Tagavi and A. Goldman said that their group was also dependent on the librarians for much of the information they needed to make determinations on compliance. M. Molinaro will work with the Library Subcommittee to add needed information and to modify the report where needed.

Specific suggestions and recommendations from the Library report were reviewed discussed and edited. Some will be combined, some eliminated. C. Currens noted specific changes and will incorporate these into the report.

Information and Instructional Technology Subcommittee:

C. Havice welcomed A. Doyle and asked for general observations/comments regarding the report. J. Houglund commented that, after reading some of the report, he found it surprising that the subcommittee said the University is in compliance. A. Doyle said that we are in minimal compliance. We meet the standards set forth by the Criteria but are not doing everything we should or could be. The suggestion was made that relevant parts of the report be rewritten to first state that the University is in compliance and to then address what additional things need to be done. The focus of the report is more on the “bad” aspects of technology at the University when we are, in fact, striving to incorporate technology and improve that used here.

C. Havice noted that there is a plan to replace FRS, HRS, and SIS. L. Nora noted that the report contains a lot of abbreviations that need to be spelled out so readers can follow the report. T. Lillich commended the subcommittee for the discussion of hardware and software on page 23.

Specific suggestions/recommendations were reviewed, discussed, and approved. Some were combined, some eliminated, some edited. C. Currens made note of specific changes and will incorporate these into the report.

Adjournment:

The meeting adjourned at 5:00PM.

C. Vaughn, Recorder