

## Workplan for NCA Task Forces

This document outlines the plan of work that we anticipate will be followed by each Task Force in the NCA self-study. This outline was developed by the NCA Self-Study Team (K. Pugliesi, K. Cruz-Uribe, P. Haeuser, T. Paradis), as well as the Steering Committee Co-chairs (K. Cruz-Uribe & MJ McMahon).

1) Get Task Force members together—review contents of Task Force Binder; discuss your particular criterion (referring to NCA/HLC handbook information provided in your notebook). Make sure you discuss:

- a) criteria statement
- b) core components
- c) examples of evidence
- d) strategies used by other institutions in addressing the criterion
- e) NAU mission thematic components

Outcome: TF members should have a thorough understanding of their criterion.

2) Training and Orientation to Self-study WebCT Environment and Evidence Inventory

3) Conduct self-study, especially focusing on the evidence that we have with respect to the criterion. NOTE: the examples of evidence given in the NCA/HLC handbook are simply that—examples only. We may use some of these types of evidence, but we may also add other examples that are most pertinent to NAU. The work of the Task Force is to think about types of evidence and decide what is most relevant for OUR self-study.

Also note that each Task Force should think beyond its membership—it should invite other members of the NAU community to participate—to help in collecting and discussing evidence for the criterion.

In addition, we do not anticipate that the Task Forces will be involved in developing surveys, conducting focus groups, etc. We already have lots of data at our disposal, and we have a group of people working on putting together much of these data in an accessible format (the “Evidence Inventory”). However, if a Task Force feels that we need some critical information that is not available, the Task Force should bring that recommendation forward to the Study Team. In such cases, we may choose to design and administer a survey or conduct some focus groups.

4) The study of the criterion should be honest—the members of each Task Force need to assess what we do well, and also identify areas for improvement or expansion of efforts.

5) Time frame: the task forces will be expected to complete their work by May 1, 2006. During May 2006, the steering committee will review the task force reports and synthesize them in order to produce a comprehensive outline for the self-study, to be completed by June 1, 2006.

6) Outcome:

Task Forces will produce *outlines* that feature evaluative statements and sub-points in relation to each criterion core component. Evidence used in formulating the evaluation should be identified for each statement and elaboration. The evaluation will be framed/organized in terms of: 1) how we fulfill the criterion, highlighting our strengths); 2) our future plans and next steps needed to strengthen or expand our efforts; and (perhaps) 3) thematic mission components. If Task Forces wish to provide narrative text in addition to the outline, they may do so, but that will not be expected.

A template will be used by Task Forces to present their findings. A consistent format for presentation will facilitate synthesis of the Task Force reports by the steering committee.

Skeletal template (Using Criterion One as an example):

*1. Criterion One: Mission and Integrity. The organization operates with integrity to ensure the fulfillment of its mission through structures and processes that involve the board, administration, faculty, staff, and students.*

Summative Evaluation Statement: a) How we meet the criterion, and our strengths; b) future directions.

- 1a. The organization's mission documents are clear and articulate publicly the organization's commitments.

Evaluative statements: Strengths/Fulfillment of Core Component

- Sub-points
- Evidence

Evaluative statements: Future Directions

- Sub-points
- Evidence

- 1b. In its mission documents, the organization recognizes the diversity of its learners, other constituencies, and the greater society it serves.

Evaluative statements: Strengths/Fulfillment of Core Component

- Sub-points
- Evidence

Evaluative statements: Future Directions

- Sub-points
- Evidence

1c. Understanding of and support for the mission pervade the organization.

Evaluative statements: Strengths/Fulfillment of Core Component

- Sub-points
- Evidence

Evaluative statements: Future Directions

- Sub-points
- Evidence

1d. The organization's governance and administrative structures promote effective leadership and support collaborative processes that enable the organization to fulfill its mission.

Evaluative statements: Strengths/Fulfillment of Core Component

- Sub-points
- Evidence

Evaluative statements: Future Directions

- Sub-points
- Evidence

1e. The organization upholds and protects its integrity.

Evaluative statements: Strengths/Fulfillment of Core Component

- Sub-points
- Evidence

Evaluative statements: Future Directions

- Sub-points
- Evidence

Note: We could also use mission components as thematic frameworks for each core component (as relevant).

## TIMELINE FOR WORKPLAN

### I. October (4 weeks)

Get Task Force members together—review contents of Task Force Binder; discuss your particular criterion (referring to NCA/HLC handbook information provided in your notebook). Make sure you discuss:

- f) criteria statement
- g) core components
- h) examples of evidence
- i) strategies used by other institutions in addressing the criterion
- j) NAU mission thematic components

Outcome: TF members should have a thorough understanding of their criterion.

Training and Orientation to Self-study WebCT Environment and Evidence Inventory

- Don Carter will be providing a training schedule for VISTA
- See **Data Inventory** section in Task Force Background Binder (will also be on WebCt/VISTA course)

### II. November – March (13 weeks)

Conduct self-study, especially focusing on the evidence that we have with respect to the criterion. NOTE: the examples of evidence given in the NCA/HLC handbook are simply that—examples only. We may use some of these types of evidence, but we may also add other examples that are most pertinent to NAU. The work of the Task Force is to think about types of evidence and decide what is most relevant for OUR self-study.

Also note that each Task Force should think beyond its membership—it should invite other members of the NAU community to participate—to help in collecting and discussing evidence for the criterion.

### III. April (4 weeks)

Outcome:

Task Forces will produce *outlines* that feature evaluative statements and sub-points in relation to each criterion core component. Evidence used in formulating the evaluation should be identified for each statement and elaboration. The evaluation will be framed/organized in terms of: 1) how we fulfill the criterion, highlighting our strengths); 2) our future plans and next steps needed to strengthen or expand our efforts; and (perhaps) 3) thematic mission components. If Task Forces wish to provide narrative text in addition to the outline, they may do so, but that will not be expected.