

NCA Higher Learning Commission Accreditation Preparation Committee

Minutes

Thursday, May 22, 2003 (Fifth Meeting)

Present: Tom Manning, Sam Adams, Peggy Davidson, Craig Fiedler, Susan Finkel, Margaret Genisio, Jean Kwaterski, Jaya Jambunathan, Quintin Sullivan.

The meeting was called to order at 10:05 a.m.

Discussion on various models of activity that the Committee can use to organize for the NCA. The charge to the Committee is to have a preliminary report (draft) due to the Provost and Vice Chancellor by summer of 2004 – **three** years before the NCA Accreditation visit.

- The model used in 1997 accreditation was centered around the NCA criteria.
- Model 1: Sub group teams from the Committee are formed. Each member would take a leadership role and recruit a variety of people with access to documentation, experiences and information required under a criterion. The core team prepares the documentation and evidence.
 - Clear lines of responsibility for Committee members; Committee can recruit administrators when necessary.
 - Identify data sources and where to find them so Committee can use data and informational committees that are already in place.
 - Provide format for writing data and information.
 - Use a common recorder to be present at each subcommittee to ensure that all five criteria are congruent in language and ideas.
- Model 2: Campus-wide forums led by Committee as a whole. The Committee would act as a steering committee, setting up forums, recruiting subcommittees based on interest and expertise across campus.
 - Clearly builds in campus-wide involvement.
 - When issues are identified, Committee can use forums to discuss them campus-wide.
- Model 3: Organization of material with each member of the Committee acting as a liaison to university-wide formed committees to avoid duplication of information and coordinating the organization of material. This model is an amplification of Model 1 with the advantage of having a single writer. Co-Chair Margaret Genisio stated that as the Committee's administrator, she would be pleased to do the writing with the Committee's support. The Committee agreed since the writing of the report was considered the biggest problem in the 1997 Accreditation.

The Committee's consensus was for Model 1 paying special attention to addressing consistency across the whole re-accreditation process.

Discussion followed on including UW Oshkosh strategic planning into NCA Criteria since our strategic plan mirrors the Five NCA Criteria in many respects. Co-Chair Tom Manning stated that UW Oshkosh's current annual report is in an evolutionary state and will not mature rapidly enough to adequately address the Five NCA Criteria. However, the UW Oshkosh Five Strategic Directions will be a good basis for NCA Accreditation.

University administrators need to become more involved to help the Committee acquire the data needed. Chancellor Wells will take the initiative when he addresses the University at the beginning of the fall semester. The Office of Institutional Research will also be very involved in gathering data for the re-accreditation.

The Co-chairs will establish a campus NCA Website listing members, responsibilities, areas of strengths and weaknesses. Links to this site can include the Higher Learning Commission NCA Website and the UW Oshkosh Assessment Website.

Selection of Committee members to criteria (11 Committee members=2 members per criterion; Sam Adams will act as consultant):

- Criterion One: Mission & Integrity: Tom Manning, Nick Dvoracek
- Criterion Two: Preparing for Future: Tom Manning, John Koker
- Criterion Three: Student Learning & Effective Teaching: Susan Finkel, Quintin Sullivan (Margaret)
- Criterion Four: Acquisition, Discovery, & Application of Knowledge: Jaya Jambunathan, Craig Fiedler (Margaret)
- Criterion Five: Engagement & Service: Jean Kwaterski, Peggy Davidson, Dale Feinaur

The next meeting will be held in September 2003. Expectations for summer for each criterion group will be to identify a list of persons for your criterion (5-7 persons per subcommittee is optimal) and also identify existing University committees that will fit into your subcommittee.

Minutes of the April 18th meeting were approved by Committee.

Meeting was adjourned at 11:05 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Marleen Flack, Recorder