

**Criterion Two Committee**  
***Meeting #2 – October 15, 2004***

Present – Marnocha, Clements, Freer, Wilder, Mertens, Pokot, Pulliam, Heyning, Summers, Spellman, Swanson

Given the four core components of Criterion Two, committee members submitted suggestions for important campus units to be reviewed. Randy Marnocha compiled the suggestions into a single outline (attached) and distributed the document at the meeting.

Suggestions were made for modification/additions/deletions to the document. Committee members were asked to email Randy with additional edits by 10/20/04. It was recognized that this document would serve as a guideline for our research but that it would be dynamic in nature and subject to change.

The committee discussed how it wanted to approach the next phase of our assignment: data collection. We gave thought to dividing the committee into four subgroups with each being assigned to one of the Core Components. It was quickly recognized that such a structure would lead to a duplication of effort between the subgroups due to the overlapping nature of the Core Components.

The committee decided to break down into sub-groups, based upon our relative expertise and knowledge base, and to divide the units to be reviewed among the subgroups accordingly. The subgroups were chosen as follows...

(AcSup) **Academic Support Services**

Roger Pulliam

(AcAf) **Academic Affairs**

Chris Clements

Bob Mertens

John Kozlowicz

Katy Heyning

(StAf) **Student Affairs**

Steve Summers

Pat Freer

Dave Wilder

(AdAf) **Administrative Affairs**

Randy Marnocha

Greg Swanson

Jeanne Freeman

(UnAd) **University Advancement**

Mike Spellman

(TIR) **T&IR**

Elena Pokot

Following the submission deadline of 10/20/04 for edits to the outline, Randy will assign a subgroup to each unit on the outline. The assignment for each subgroup is to begin their research by identifying and collecting data to address each of the respective Core Components. Subgroups are not expected to physically bring in piles of support documentation but should be compiling a brief summary for each unit including citations to specific data sources that support our findings. Randy will speak with John Stone to determine his expectations regarding the format of our data collection.

The committee will meet again in mid to late November to review our progress to date. Since the criteria being used in this accreditation process are very new, determining the best format for our narrative is difficult at this juncture. Since each subgroup will be functioning on its own until this next meeting, we assume that our preliminary findings will allow us to identify an approach that appears to be more appropriate and efficient than the others.

Randy will attempt to begin using D2L to provide a record of our progress.