Agenda – Short Form
November 29, 2005 Accreditation Steering Committee
3:30 PM, Johnson Hall Conference Room

1. Introductions
2. Background information
3. Progress since 3/29/05
4. To Do List
5. Time Line
6. Role of the Steering Committee
7. Requests

Agenda – Extensive Form

1. Introductions

2. Background information
   Overview of Accreditation Process
   Materials provided
   • Steering Committee membership (handout)
   • President’s letter (distributed electronically)
   • Abridged NWCCU Handbook (distributed electronically)
   • Self-study models organized around mission – illustrations (distributed electronically)
   • Issues/themes to date (handout)

3. Progress since 3/29/05 meeting. We have:
   • reached agreement with the NWCCU regarding an alternative form of the self-study.
   • tentatively identified the UO mission statement as the organizing principle of the report.
   • talked with several campus groups (UGC, Council of Deans, Graduate Council, Student Affairs, and the Administrative Council for Finance and Administration) about issues that might be emphasized in the narrative of the self-study – invited input.
   • begun investigating technical resources needed to produce the self-study document (print, CD-rom and web-accessible versions), which will be linked to web-based resources in place of physical documents and exhibits.
   • begun to organize the process for gathering the required documents and exhibits that must accompany the report.

4. To do list, in the “large”:
   • Complete initial campus rounds – certainly the FAC, Senate, and Senate Exec Com. Other possibilities depend on where things are percolating – e.g. Committee on Committees, Curriculum Committees (CAS and University), Ed Tech Committee.
   • Develop a “short list” of topics/issues to be addressed in the narrative.
   • Invite a more a more complete campus discussion of these topics in the context of our campus mission.
• Request input on from academic units through the academic deans, keeping in mind that the NWCCU requires “complete departmental or program self-studies” prepared specifically for the self-study.
• Draft a self-study that addresses campus issues as they pertain to meeting our mission.

5. Time line
   By year’s end – a tentative short list.
   By mid-Jan – Steering Committee approval of a short-list.
   Winter 2006 – solicit further input (e.g. Senate Forum, revisit key committees).
   – request “required documents and exhibits” from non-academic units.
   – request “required documents and exhibits” from academic units.
   – draft request for department/program input on narrative issues.
   – heads-up to deans and academic programs.
   Spring 2006 – request input on issues from academic units.
   – final calls for contributions from campus committees.
   Sept 2006 – distribute draft-study to campus for comment.
   Fall 2006 – revise and finalize self-study content.

6. Role of the Steering Committee:
   • Select and frame the issues that will be addressed in the self-study.
   • Assist in communicating with campus groups regarding the self-study – act as liaisons.
   • Mediate different points of view as we write draft the narrative of the self-study.

7. Requests:
   Let us know for which campus groups you could serve as a liaison and anticipate for us the necessary processes. Examples of groups with which we need liaisons:
   • Senate – arrange a Senate Forum – Jeanne?
   • Senate Executive Committee
   • Undergraduate Council
   • Graduate Council
   • FAC
   • CAS Curriculum Committee
   • University Curriculum Committee
   • Ed Tech Committee
   • Other

Give us your reactions to
   • “Self-study models organized around mission – illustrations”
     Which organization scheme do you prefer?
     Can you suggest improvements – or something altogether different?
   • “Issues/themes to date”
     What have we already done to address these issues, and who has done it?
     Which issues are most interesting to the campus as a whole?
     What committees or individuals are most involved/interested in these issues?