Welcome to our presentation, “Accessible and Engaging: Self Studies That Outlive the Study.” I’m Sherry Lindquist, a member of the English faculty and Self Study editor. Today you’ll be hearing from our President, Dr. Anne Temte, our Vice President, Dr. Kent Hanson, our Liberal Arts and Business Division chair, Dr. Brian Huschle, and me. Our special guest will be Dr. Benjamin Young, the chair of our Higher Learning Commission site evaluation team, and Vice Provost for Student Affairs at Ivy Tech Community College. Without further ado, here’s President Temte to give you some background on our college and a “presidential perspective” on the accreditation process.
Good morning

I am Anne Temte and honored to be the president of Northland Community and Technical College. During this presentation, you will understand why I feel this way about my college. We have not only responded to challenges, but have emerged as a leader in several fields, including the preparation and presentation of our self-study for PEAQ accreditation through the Higher Learning Commission.

Background and History
Northland Community and Technical College serves a large geographic area of northwestern Minnesota. We also serve northeastern North Dakota. Our main campuses are in East Grand Forks and Thief River Falls, MN. We are one of 25 community and technical colleges and seven state universities that comprise the Minnesota State Colleges and University System.

This is a very rural area is characterized traditionally by an agricultural-based economy. The past fifty years, however, have brought the emergence of several companies with global reach such as Arctic Cat, Polaris, LM Wind Power, and Digi-Key Corporation – a world-wide distributor of electronic components. While much of the rest of the country suffered the economic devastation of the recent recession, our area remained economically strong, with unemployment hovering around 4%.

We have not been without challenges, however. The Minnesota legislature is trying to
develop solutions to a $6.2 billion deficit. Northland is likely to lose between 6% and 12% of its state funding and there will be firm limits on tuition increases. For the past four years, we have been trimming our budgets, becoming more and more efficient, and questioning every aspect of our operations.

Northland was created in 2003, by a merger of the two campuses into one college. This merger was initiated by the Minnesota State Colleges and Universities as a move that would bring about economy of scale, reduce unnecessary duplication in services and programs, and unite a portion of northwestern Minnesota that has strong regional similarities.

The Thief River Falls campus was an independent college for many years and the sole higher education presence in its community; it had a comprehensive mission, offering a broad array of student life opportunities. The East Grand Forks campus, on the other hand, was one of multiple campuses of Northwest Technical College. Its mission was more limited and it was not funded in a manner that supported broad student life opportunities or community involvement.

The merger has allowed the comprehensive mission of Northland Community and Technical College to infuse both campuses and communities.

Since the merger, there have, of course, been pains of adjustment. While technical aspects of merger have progressed, the marriage of the campuses was not necessarily rooted in love and mutual admiration. Each campus has had to adapt to many changes in the ways it had previously done things; there have been fears on both campuses that strengths of the past might be lost or diminished.
I joined the college in 2006. Very quickly, it became apparent that the college had to deal with two enormous processes: Strategic Planning and preparing for reaccreditation in 2010. NCTC’s old strategic plan was complicated and presented itself more like a “TO DO” list than a document that moved the institution in a visionary direction. It was prepared by a small group of employees.

Many felt that there was a lot of hubbub surrounding the creation of the document but that, like with most strategic plans, it was prepared, printed, put on a shelf, and forgotten. We needed a meaningful strategic plan to guide decision-making in challenging times. We decided to try something different.

Northland’s Center for Outreach and Innovation – our customized training division – was employed to engage the entire college community and facilitate a process of Appreciative Inquiry. Over 350 faculty members, students, staff members, and community advisory committee members were involved. First, we were asked to DISCOVER – What is best about the college now and in the past? What should be retained and cherished into the future? Then, we were challenged to DREAM – What would you like the college to be in five years? What is your vision?

From this collective work, a strategic planning team distilled the strongest emerging themes. The team worked on the DESIGN of the new plan, committed to limiting it to only three or four really profound and memorable elements that could impact the college’s future. The draft plan was vetted with all of the constituents who had contributed to it. A
final point of involvement was a brief survey to gather input on the VERBS that would be the most robust and energetic ones to convey our commitment to action.
The strategic plan says, very simply:

- Inspire Student Success
- Cultivate Quality in Programs, Services, and Employees
- Revolutionize Growth Strategies to Sustain Vibrant Learning Communities

There are, of course, measurable outcomes attached to each of these statements.

The final phase of strategic planning was to move it from planning into action - deliberate steps that would impact the DESTINY of the college. The primary elements of this were:

- Requiring and encouraging all divisions and committees to take responsibility for elements of the plan and to create action plans
- Creating accountability for the plan on our college Web Site, through the posting of intended outcomes and progress toward those outcomes
- Building our Self-Study around the thematic structure provided by strategic plan

You will hear about that in the presentation of my colleagues.
Role of the President in preparation for Accreditation

Finally, I want to address the role of the president in the work of preparation for accreditation.

I was very fortunate to have the strength of leadership within the college that I have and that is represented by my co-presenters. Dr. Kent Hanson, VP of Academic and Student Affairs, Dr. Brian Huschle, Philosophy Instructor and Chair of our Accreditation Steering Committee, and Dr. Sherry Lindquist, English Instructor and Self Study Editor, were a formidable team that provided motivation, organization, and inspiration to the college.

Due to their brilliance, my role was easy. I offer three words for presidents who put together great teams:

• Empowerment – Be willing to delegate and trust your team
• Alignment – Check in periodically to insure that your view of things remains in line with where the steering committee is taking things, and what is emerging from the work of the steering committee
• Support – If your input is asked for, give it. If you’re asked to proof portions of the document, be willing to do so. Provide adequate resources, and remember to say “thank you.”
Our self-study and team progressed through the normal stages of group development: forming, storming, norming, performing, and adjourning. I will be discussing this process through the eyes of the chief academic officer, who has ultimate responsibility for the self-study and continuing accreditation.

The committee was formed by asking for faculty volunteers, but also key leadership was selected such as chairs of the assessment committee and the curriculum committee. An essential component to a successful self study is the selection of the chair and editor. We sought out volunteers for these positions, and we appointed two excellent faculty in Dr. Brian Huschle, as the chair, and Dr. Sherry Lindquist, as the editor. Please note we use the position title “editor,” not “writer.” I will discuss this further later.

The team went to Kansas City approximately two years prior to the self-study due date in order to prepare for this journey. This was pushing the timelines. In retrospect, I would have gone about six months earlier. The team delegated criteria writing assignments to various groups with a lead administrator or faculty chair in charge of writing/overseeing data analysis and evaluation of each of the five criteria. One piece of advice: it is necessary to form the team before you can get started, make sure you follow the suggested timelines by the Higher Learning Commission.
There was a fair amount of conflict in the storming stage of group development. One source of contention right out of the gates was the fact that the chair and editor emerged from the same campus as opposed to being evenly balanced between the two. As CAO, I certainly heard about this. But my faith in Brian and Sherry prevailed.

Another big source of conflict was the fact that the team initially thought the writer was going to just write everything and the rest of the team would serve as consultants as to what to write. I clarified on many occasions that Sherry’s job was to be the editor and the criterion teams would be doing the writing. It took a very long time for this to sink in. On other occasions, teams would provide data only and expect the editor to write evaluative statements based on this data. This was a big source of conflict even in my administrative team who did not want to do the writing. My approach was to lead by example, and I took the first criteria and was the first to complete a draft.

There was a great deal of conflict as to where to focus our analysis regarding individual campus focus and representativeness of the college as a whole. Another source of conflict was related to the honesty of self-evaluation. Some used this as a tool for “leadership bashing.” This really tested my conflict resolution skills.

When Sherry and Brian pitched the idea of a strategic plan-based self-study, I had to think about it for a bit. Sherry assured me that she would be able to crosswalk the criteria with our strategic plan, and so I was then convinced that this should be our approach. The next step was to sell it to the committee. Eventually, it was accepted, but with quite a bit of
Another source of conflict was related to making edits to the document. There were times when a member of the group would go to our editor and demand that she make edits to the document. Her stance and one that I supported was that individual members may not make edits to the document without group consensus. We did follow that approach, but there were times when I had to make an executive decision regarding some content that should be removed or enhanced.

My role in the mediation process was done mostly behind the scenes; however, there were times when I had to reinforce the direction that we were going. As an example, I had to announce numerous times that Sherry was an editor, not a writer. We were not going to have a self-study that somebody in a corner office wrote.
Things started coming together as we devoted inservice time for broad based input on the process. In fact, I should have mentioned this earlier, but every faculty was assigned to a criteria team where they could provide input into the evidence and evaluation regarding how the college demonstrates satisfaction in meeting the criteria.

Once the committee unanimously came to the point that we would be doing our self-study thematically based on our strategic plan, we seemed to pick up momentum and it was like all of the sudden we were coming together in support of one goal.

Also, once everybody realized that Sherry was not going to sit in her office and write the self-study for the college and the criteria teams were going to have to provide data and evaluation, things seemed to settle down and team members rolled up their sleeves and took responsibility for their criteria. I had to reinforce the fact that Sherry was an editor, not a writer, on several occasions. My main argument was that we wanted the self-study to represent the college, not one particular individual’s view of the college.

Also, I think a key strategy was getting the assessment chairs involved early on since a great deal of the self-study involves assessment of student learning. These folks understand assessment and helped clarify many issues for other faculty on the committee.
In the performing stage, there were key strategies to help us stay on task.

First and foremost was the relentless approach that our chair and editor took to keep us working toward strict deadlines. If a particular team was having difficulty with certain elements of their assignments, Brian and Sherry always made themselves available, but at the same time, stressed the urgency of timelines. The committee met regularly (at least monthly, more often if necessary). A smaller writing group emerged that met much more often to flesh out many of the details. This helped as large group editing never really works well.

There was a growing sense of pride in the committee—especially as we focused on our strategic plan. Eventually, the committee did come to consensus on edits especially those based on recommendations from the smaller writing group.
As far as adjourning, the committee has agreed to meet at least once per semester to keep continuity and alleviate the stress on the “forming stage” for the next cycle.
I am Brian Huschle, a philosophy instructor at Northland College, as well as chair for the Liberal Arts division on our EGF campus. I also served as Chair of Northland’s self-study team (which happens to be why I am here today). I was one of two faculty leads on our self-study team.

The team itself consisted of approximately 18 members, including Dr. Kent Hanson, two academic deans, student services deans, and staff members from human relations, the college business office, information technology, learning services, and faculty representing both campuses as well as different program areas. President Temte remained ex officio until about half-way through the process.

Sherry Lindquist (who you hear from next) and myself – the two faculty leads – were provided reassigned time for our work as Team Chair and Self-Study Editor. We could not have accomplished the work we did without the significant amount of time provided to us.
The selection of the team membership was a deliberate process. The academic deans on each campus tried to get a good sense for which faculty from each campus would be willing to work on the self study, as well as a sense for the skill sets that these faculty would bring to the self-study team. At the same time, a general announcement for volunteers was placed so that no one would feel left out. As it turned out, Sherry, myself, and one other faculty member from our campus were the only ones to express interest in the lead faculty roles. Because the process was opened up to the full college community, forming the base of the team with two faculty members from the same campus worked, politically speaking. (As for the actual work of the self study, it didn’t hurt that Sherry and I have offices next door to each other.) This concentration in faculty leadership put added pressure to ensure that there was a balanced representation from the entire college on the team.

In the end, part of what allowed this team to work well is that there were strong faculty leaders from both campuses: This allowed the college as a whole to trust the work being done.

Within the team itself, trust in the process was formed through long road trips and other unusual punishment. One of the key events for us was a 10 hour drive (each way) in two college vehicles to Kansas City for a PEAQ self study Design Workday, [February 29, 2008.] Six of us attended. In retrospect, it was absolutely vital that two of the six members attending were strong faculty leaders from our sister campus. (One of these two leaders stepped into the role of academic dean shortly after we begun the process. The other remained a strong voice throughout the process.) But Dr. Hanson was the only
administrator to attend. The shared experience of this workshop allowed for a basic level of trust and shared mission throughout the self study.
During the Self Study Design Workday our team set two important goals, and developed a key strategy.

The First Goal may go without saying: Reaccreditation for 10 years with minimal follow up reporting required.

The Second Goal we set was this: We wanted the document we produced to be a living document for the college – not a document that would be promptly shelved after the visit.

The strategy we developed was to have five groups (one for each criterion), and to have everyone in the college participate on a group through our college wide in-services. These sessions served a couple of purposes: (1) Gathering information about what our institution was doing well and poorly in relation to the five criteria. (2) Bringing awareness and a basic level of involvement to the entire college community.

The steering committee itself was also divided into five sub-teams, each team tasked with drafting a chapter of the report for their criterion.

While at the Self Study Design Workday, the idea of a thematic report (rather than one based on the five criteria) surfaced on my radar. But it seemed unrealistic: We were, in essence, a new institution doing our first self study. We wanted to keep it simple, and going with a criterion based report seemed the simplest way to go.
As it happened, our institution was going through a Strategic Planning process – determining strategic directions for the college. Sherry and I were both attending extra meetings in the strategic planning process as part of our work on the self study. This was a serendipitous thing. As a result Sherry poked her head in my office one morning and wondered out loud: Could we reorganize the report around the three new strategic directions?

Well, yes, we could. It was a good idea, and we had Dr. Hanson’s support. Selling it to the full 18 member steering committee turned out to be a little more of a challenge. The biggest expressed fear was whether we would know we had covered all five criteria. (I’ll let Sherry talk about the process of ensuring this.) Next, there was resistance to the change because people felt like the work they had been doing would be tossed out, and this was like starting over. In reality, the reverse was true. The three strategic directions served as a clearer means of organizing the material that was already written. Finally, there was resistance to the change based on a fear of how the on-site team would receive it. Would they be able to find what they wanted to know from a report organized around our strategic plan and not the five criteria?

Fortunately, we were able to delay these fears well enough to get buy-in from the full team.

There was one key selling point: A report organized around the themes of our college’s strategic plan would allow us to fulfill one of our primary goals: This report would become a living document for the institution since it would be a pivotal part of the strategic plan. At the same time, it would help insure that the strategic plan would also remain central to our institution (and not become some process we went through five years ago).
We received a key bit of advice at the Self Study Design Workday: Don’t keep skeletons in the closet.

Simple and obvious, but not as easy as it sounds. We repeatedly faced challenges, within the steering committee, of whether we should say *that*. 

The answer to these challenges is also obvious to me: Yes.

But I do want to share three cautionary notes here.

First, it is easy to fall into what I’ll term the “data data data trap:” The data is all reported. But evaluation of the data is thin (if present at all). We faced a significant challenge in getting members of the institution to do the hard work of *evaluating* the data.

Second, there is the flip side of the data data data trap: What I’ll term the “ax grinding trap.” Just as there are those eager to provide data with no true analysis and evaluation, there are those eager to provide lots of “evaluation” while providing no supporting evidence. This trap has the potential to create a large amount of internal conflict and erode institutional trust in the team’s work. We were lucky to safely navigate these waters, but did so by remaining open and relying on process.

Third, remember that a certain amount of disagreement within a self study team is a good, and even a necessary part of the process. As such, it needs to be allowed to be present.
The difficulty lies in keeping the disagreement healthy. To paraphrase J.S. Mill: It is only through collision with falsehood that the truth can come to the surface.

This brings me to a key point: In response to the data traps and conflict, as chair, my mantra was this: *The purpose of a self study report is to demonstrate that we have institutional self-awareness of our strengths and our weaknesses, and a plan on how we are going to improve*. Using the thematic approach, through tying our report to our institution’s strategic directions allowed us to demonstrate exactly these things.

I’m going to pause here to let that sink in a bit – it is really the crux of the matter. And now for a bad joke so you’ll never forget the point. Remember the skeletons: I am not saying you need to hang the skeletons over the welcome mat on the front entrance of the college, as if it were Halloween. But they should be on prominent display in the commons.

The report needs to be an honest self-assessment – and perhaps a theme based approach can help your institution accomplish this.
The true work of a self study, however organized, is getting a good level of quality evaluation based on sound data.

It is important to have a clear idea of the overall timetable, and firm deadlines. Believe the timetable that the Higher Learning Commission suggests!

As chair of the team, I had to be very aware of my time and availability in accepting and delegating responsibilities. I also had to have a strong sense of the strengths and weaknesses of my team members, and make conscious efforts to ensure they were being used to our benefit. I needed to know when to step back and allow a person or process to do what it needed to do (even if I already knew in advance that the end result would be watching it fall short). And I needed to know when to step in and cut a process or person off of a task so that we could keep either our focus or our timetable.

Finally, every team is going to need a “clean-up hitter.” I took this task on as chair. Fortunately, I had the foresight to plan this into my list of responsibilities and so left myself the time to do it – or at least I had the time to pass it off to Kent.

Whatever you do, don’t pass it off on the editor – they have enough to do. And with that, I turn it over to Sherry Lindquist, Editor Extraordinaire.
The Editor’s Role

- Understanding the roles
  - Editor vs Writer
  - Editor vs Researcher
- Editing for voice
  - Develop a style sheet
  - Circulate revisions before going “public”
  - Devise a process for tough choices
- Diplomacy and tough love
  - Coordinate requests for information
  - Prepare to explain/defend what makes the cut and what doesn’t
  - Clearly outline expectations for responses to requests

The choices you make about the editor’s role and how that role is communicated to members of the team and the college community can have a profound effect on how the work of the self study gets done.

As we outline in the introduction to our study, few of us on the committee had any previous experience with the accreditation process, so we made a few rookie mistakes. One of those mistakes was referring to the editor as "the writer" in some early communications. This led some members of the team to focus more on coming up with ideas for the "writer" to explore and write about rather than coming up with information for the "editor" to edit. This also led to some expectations that the "writer" would also be the chief researcher, while the criteria committees would focus more on giving feedback and pointing the researcher in the right direction. It should be noted at this point that we did not have an office of institutional research at the time of the study.

Clearing up this confusion caused us to lose some valuable time, but our committee structure made it easier to communicate accurate information about the editor’s role once it became clear there was some confusion.

Once the committees had a clearer understanding of their own roles in the process of gathering information and reflecting on it, the process ran much more smoothly.

As committee chairs gathered material for review and inclusion into the report, the editor began putting together a style sheet to guide the editing process. While it may seem
mundane, what you call things and how you refer to them makes a difference. One of the key concerns we heard from site team reviewers we spoke to early on was about the importance of consistent references throughout the document. If you have an Assessment Committee working on curriculum, you'll want to refer to it as the "Assessment Committee," rather than the "Curriculum Committee," even if the two terms are used interchangeably at your institution.

Another key aspect of editing is to circulate your revisions to the committee or individual who submitted them before putting those revisions in a version of the document that would be read by the whole team, to avoid misunderstandings and wasting time. The team should also devise a process for making tough choices—how much evidence is too much? How many of our skeletons are we taking out of the closet? Will we feature all of our programs or only representative examples?

All this calls for some serious diplomacy and some tough love. As you work on the report, you may begin to get requests for "sneak peeks" from program faculty, from student services, and even from members of the community. How you handle those requests and how you make "draft" versions available are decisions only you can make, but it's something that should be discussed early in the process.

Finally, as an editor, you will often be in the position of requesting information from people to fill gaps or add to information submitted by other criteria team members. We decided to have the editor funnel requests through criteria team chairs as often as possible, since those people were more likely to know who might have the necessary information. This also reinforced the importance of the work done by each criteria committee rather than having the editor making all the requests. The chair of the self-study team should also clarify the expectations for timely responses to requests—Brian was my "iron fist in a velvet glove," but fortunately, I didn't need to employ him often.
As you’ve heard already, we were committed to a digital self study. A key component of that commitment was that the study be digitally accessible. This was not just to stay ahead of the Section 508 curve, but also because it was the right thing to do. I could talk at great length about the reasons why digitally accessible design makes sense, but you’ll just have to take my word for it right now.

We used Microsoft Office Word® 2007 to create the report, so much of the accessibility checking was done manually. Thankfully, you can now use the accessibility checker feature in Word® 2010 and save a lot of time. As part of my recent sabbatical research, I created a Google™ site with links to resources and tutorials, if you are interested. I would welcome any of you as contributors!

Designing for digital accessibility is not hard—it just involves a change in the way you think about documents and information. If you only do three things, you can make your report almost fully compliant. Those three things are: headings to organize your document, descriptive captions for website links and images, and labels for data tables. One immediate benefit of using headings is that they are automatically converted to bookmarks when the document is saved in PDF format.

Some of the advantages of creating digitally accessible documents include easier navigation for all users with the navigation pane (in Word) or through bookmarks (in PDF), the opportunity to create an institutional style sheet to "brand" your report for use outside the institution, the always-beneficial blessing of being in federal compliance, and less stress for
you as creating the lists of charts and tables, a table of contents, and an index can be done with a few mouse clicks. Digitally accessible documents are also more likely to appear higher on a web search list, increasing your visibility to prospective students and parents.
One thing we knew we did not want to deal with during our self-study process was tracking down elusive pieces of paper from ten years ago in a box on top of a ten-foot shelf. Since we were entering this accreditation as a merged college for the first time, we had a lot of paper in many places. We also had many gaps in our data, information that we knew we could probably find somewhere in our system office, but first we had to figure out what we needed and who might know where it would be. Thus, our virtual resource room was born, originally hosted in our Desire2Learn course management system and now available at our website. All of our data would be in one place, digitally, which meant it could be accessed by many users from different places, 24/7.

Print resources have some limitations. Unless you are going to make multiple copies for multiple users, the users have to come to where the data is. If your resources are electronic, they can go wherever your users are—via web link, via e-mail, via flash drive, or even via cloud computing, if several people want to use the same information at the same time collaboratively.

We decided to organize our resources by chapter, which meant some resources appeared in multiple chapters, such as copies of our mission statement or some financial records. It made more sense to put a duplicate copy in another chapter rather than make a notation to "see chapter 4."

We also provided a descriptive index for our site team and other users. The index included the chapter, the title of the resource (which was the same title we used to reference it in the study—consistency, you know), and a short description of the resource.
One caveat with a virtual resource room would be to consider how much access you want to grant at different points in the process. In the early stages, we hosted our resource room in a learning management system that all employees used to complete required safety training and that instructors used to deliver course content. Thus, it was a familiar environment to navigate and available 24/7 through our network portal. When we were ready to submit our self study, we provided a generic user name and password for members of the evaluation team. We also sent team members a printed copy of our report, along with the resources on a flash drive. Once we received notice of our continuing accreditation, we put all the materials onto our institutional website, where they are available to anyone, any time.

Another caveat concerns digitizing paper documents. If you are creating a virtual resource room from print documents, you can scan them to create PDF versions, but you will also want to convert those scanned documents to OCR format, using Adobe Professional® or a similar program. Otherwise, the documents are just like photographs. Someone using a screen reader might not be able to understand the information. Another benefit of using OCR format is that you then create a searchable document.

Finally, whether you are working from an existing electronic document in PDF form or a scanned document that you have converted, you may want to check the bookmarks. Some documents may have bookmarks you don't need or would like to rename, while scanned documents will not have any bookmarks. Adding bookmarks is an easy step and makes navigation much easier.

You can view our resource room and self study documents at our website: Northland Accreditation Documents and Resources. If you are referring to a printed version of this presentation (and killed a tree—ha!), you will find the URL listing for this site at the end of the presentation.
As you heard earlier, we organized our report thematically rather than using a criteria-core component approach. As a result, it was crucial that we document evidence of how we met the requirements of the core component and commission statements within the study and make that documentation apparent to reviewers.

We did this by including charts at major heading levels (usually level 2-3, as level 1 was for the chapter title). The chart included a list of the core components and commission statements that would be discussed in those sections, along with definitions of the core components for quick review. We also included the Commission Statements in our reference materials for review.

We decided to provide the charts at the beginning of major sections rather than interrupt the flow of the narrative paragraph by paragraph when salient evidence appeared. This also helped to avoid information overload with too many charts in too many places.

One benefit of listing the core components and commission statements in charts was that we were able to use those lists for indexing purposes later, using the "mark entry" option in Microsoft Word®, available on the "References" ribbon.
We created an index primarily as a way to make certain we had covered all the bases. This way, we could see at a glance which core components or commission statements we still might need to work on. It was also a useful tool for those readers who preferred to go through the report criterion by criterion rather than by theme.

It should be noted that at present, the index option in Microsoft Word® is not hyperlinked or bookmarked, so users are not able to click on a page number in the index to go to the relevant location in the document. We hope that feature will be available in the next version. However, readers can still navigate through the document easily using the navigation pane in Word or the bookmarks in a PDF version.

So, as my part of the presentation comes to a close, you might be wondering how our choices affected our site team. I'll turn it over to Ben Young, the chair of the HLC team that visited Northland, for his perspective.
NCTC Review Team--1

• Composition & Experience
  o Member A
  o Member B
  o Member C
  o Chair

• Expectation of Self-Study Process & Report
  o Process goals
  o Submission to team & HLC
  o Integrity of document
  o Address HLC requirements
  o Format

Comments by Dr. Benjamin Young
NCTC Review Team--2

- Institutional Unique Characteristics
  - Two campuses/ merger history/One College Concept
  - Minnesota State Colleges & Universities System
  - Organized self-study report around college strategic plan goals

- Affirmative Measures
  - Virtual Resource Room
  - Update for Self-Study Report
  - Learning management system: Desire2Learn
  - Index to Core Components and HLC Statements on Accountability Projects, Prior Learning, Diversity, and General Education
  - Embedded links for easy access to data

Comments by Dr. Benjamin Young
Website References

• Digital Accessibility: https://sites.google.com/site/digitalaccessibility/home

• Northland Accreditation Documents and Resources: http://www.northlandcollege.edu/academics/accreditation/resources/

• Section 508 (federal digital accessibility site): http://www.section508.gov/
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