



**NCA Accreditation Steering Committee
January 15, 2003
Meeting Notes**

- ❖ Barbara introduced Paul Stevens, who is replacing Chris Moore on the Steering Committee. Chris is leaving KU at the end of the academic year. Paul is an assistant professor of music.
- ❖ Barbara explained the steps the committee will apply to each criterion and presented the work schedule for the next year (attachment A).
- ❖ Sandra made a presentation to the committee regarding patterns of evidence to document achievement in the areas encompassed in the five criteria.
- ❖ Criteria One: Mission
 - Questions regarding KU's Mission Statement:
 - Is it appropriate?
 - Is there a pervasive understanding of it?
 - Does the structure of the university support it?
 - Responses to questions:
 - Appropriate
 - KU is a research institution that does teaching and service
 - May need to document undergraduate research
 - May need to document how the KUCR structure enhances research
 - Pervasive understanding
 - Mission of the institution is fairly well understood but knowledge of the 'mission statement' is not pervasive
 - Many students believe the "Top 25" goal is the mission
- ❖ Brainstorming on patterns of evidence for Mission
 - Research money
 - State money
 - Initiative 2001
 - Research university for Greater KC
 - Service learning
 - Recruitment/ Orientation materials
 - KUCR structure
 - Senior Survey
 - Unit mission statements
 - Promotion and Tenure process
 - Merit salary
 - Job descriptions
 - Student recruitment focus
 - Graduate Research Assistants
 - Awards – teaching, research, and service
 - Center for Teaching Excellence
 - Centers

- Investment patterns – tuition enhancement
 - Tuition enhancement process – student and staff involvement
 - Missed opportunity to tie this to mission
 - Stated priorities – fundraising
 - General education goals
 - General education data
 - Brochures – fundraising, recruitment
 - Websites
 - Newsletters
 - Public documents
 - Patterns of funding
 - Fuller recognition of individual missions of institutions by Regents
 - Performance indicators
 - Tuition ownership
 - International programs/ Study Abroad
 - Graduate School Task Force
 - Restructuring of Student Services
 - Task forces topics and the individuals that comprised the task forces
 - Equity studies
 - Service learning
 - Freshmen/ Sophomore Experience
 - Professional accreditations
 - Program Review
 - Curriculum – graduation requirements
 - Provide sophisticated workforce – job placement
 - Retention/ Graduation – student profiles
 - International requirement for faculty considered for distinguished professorships
- ❖ Deb said many of these items are already on the web site and more will be added. The status update of Initiative 2001 is one of the most important resources to examine. Committee members should look at this list and choose a couple areas to look at.
- Let Deb know so she can build a matrix
 - People without assignments will be assigned
- ❖ Committee members commented that we will be able to find good evidence that the mission is well supported. It was noted that we are looking for correlation with mission, not causation.
- ❖ Questions/ Observations:
- Allen: Is one of our goals to make the mission statement more widely known before the site visit?
 - Sandra: We have a lack of clarity between what is mission and what are goals.
 - Kathryn: We haven't done as good a job informing students/ parents, faculty, etc., at times when we could.
- ❖ **Homework:**
- **Read about Initiative 2001**
 - **From the brainstorming list, select several areas you are willing to review in advance of next meeting. Let Deb know by January 24 of your interest so she can assign topics as needed. Provide thumbnail of the topic at the next meeting.**
 - **Review PowerPoint presentation and provide comments ASAP**
 - **Review the Communication Plan and send comments to Deb by February 1**



Workflow Plan for Reviewing Criteria

Criteria

Criterion One: Mission and Integrity (MISSION)

Criterion Two: Preparing for the Future (FUTURE)

Criterion Three: Student Learning and Effective Teaching (LEARN/TEACH)

Criterion Four: Acquiring, Creating, and Applying Knowledge (KNOW/RES)

Criterion Five: Engagement and Service (ENGAGE/SERV)

Steps for Reviewing Each Criterion

1. Develop full familiarization of the concepts of the criterion
2. Gather relevant materials to address those concepts
3. Brainstorm expected patterns of evidence
4. Evaluate materials
5. Identify gaps and/or issues
Draft will be developed after step 5
6. Review draft and identify next steps to fill gaps and/or address issues
7. Determine strengths of the evidence

Schedule

January 15
MISSION– steps 1, 2, 3

February 12
MISSION – steps 4, 5
LEARN/TEACH – steps 1, 2, 3

March 12
MISSION – steps 6, 7
LEARN/TEACH – steps 4, 5

April 9
LEARN/TEACH – steps 6, 7
ENGAGE/SERV – steps 1, 2, 3

Late April (additional meeting)
Recalibrate process,
outcomes, and schedule

May 14
ENGAGE/SERV – steps 4, 5

Over summer via email
ENGAGE/SERV – steps 6, 7

Fall 2003

August
KNOW/RES – steps 1, 2, 3

September
KNOW/RES – steps 4, 5
FUTURE – steps 1, 2, 3

October
KNOW/RES – steps 6, 7
FUTURE – steps 4, 5

Late October
Recalibrate process,
outcomes, and schedule

November
FUTURE – steps 6, 7

December
Fill in the gaps

January 2004
Review draft of full report