

Please recall the Summary of all AACSB Accreditation Tasks, allocated by CBA Council, which was reviewed with each Council during AY03-04, and is linked from my CBA home page.

<http://cba.unomaha.edu/faculty/mohara/web/summaryAACSB.pdf> A new edition was released January 1, 2005 with zero changes in the Standards and a substantial rewrite of the discussion but only with cosmetic changes in content of the discussion. *From AACSB, the one material clarification since last year is that **remediation** is applied to the program rather than to the individual student. Locally, UNO CBA's reaffirmation year has been set: AY10-11.*

Each Council has an array of **short term tasks** (i.e., action items) and an array of long term tasks that are necessary for CBA to earn reaffirmation of its AACSB accreditation in AY10-11. Each output from each Council is input for at least one other Council. Accordingly, if any Council falls behind, then that can retard the efforts of the entire College. This document keys on the short term tasks that ought to be completed, ideally, in time for the **November 2005** meeting of the CBA faculty, but no later than the January 2006 meeting of the CBA faculty.

AACSB accreditation relies upon a process of continuous improvement. The short term tasks will establish frameworks for subsequent iterations of the same general task. But, those subsequent iterations are expected to evolve as CBA responds to the feedback it receives. ***It is important for CBA to complete one cycle of continuous improvement before the start of its self-review year of AY08-09.*** That is,

- [A] at the start of January 2006,
CBA has in place the full complement of its *annual* continuous improvement efforts (e.g., Mission Statement; assessment tools; Intellectual Contributions definitions) that will generate feedback for the start of AY06-07;
*NOTE: With respect to **assessment tools**, by January 2006 UNO CBA ought to have first drafts of the full set of BSBA, MBA, and EMBA assessment tools. However, the roll out those assessment tools may be done incrementally (e.g., one Learning Goal in first semester, then two Learning Goals in second semester, etc.). That way UNO CBA may use the early feedback to inform UNO CBA's continuous improvement of its assessment tools.*
- [B] at the start of Fall 2006,
CBA has assembled feedback from its first iteration and commences CBA's *annual* continuous improvement processes of review of and response to that feedback;
NOTE: However, the most stable facet ought to be the Mission Statement which ought to be revisited every three or five years since it is a long run document.
- [C] during AY08-09,
CBA authors its self-review, completing those documents before Fall 2009;
- [D] at the start of Fall 2009,
CBA conducts the fourth iteration of CBA's *annual* continuous improvement processes of review of and response to its feedback;
NOTE: AACSB is going to expect to see evolutionary changes in UNO CBA's activities that respond to the assessment tools and the annual reports to AACSB of UNO CBA's faculty qualifications and faculty's intellectual contributions.
- [E] during AY10-11,
CBA under goes its accreditation reaffirmation review.

It is *far more important* that CBA initiate its continuous improvement processes so CBA can respond to feedback than it is for CBA to make its first effort perfect.

Do not let the perfect be the enemy of the good. Fall 2005 will be an unusually busy time. But subsequent iterations only will require marginal improvements, not creation of fundamental processes.

Below, listed by Council, are the **most critical short term tasks**. Recall, the complete Summary hyperlinked above. The earlier in Fall 2005 these critical short term tasks are completed the easier the entire process will be.

1. Strategic Planning Council (SPC)

A *College's Mission Statement* is the linchpin of the entire AACSB process. SPC completed this at the end of Spring 2005 by obtaining faculty approval. Now, SPC shifts to continuous improvement in consultation with UNO CBA's *stakeholders*.

QUICK QUIZ: what does the Mission Statement identify as our College's choice for the relative importance of Intellectual Contributions (i.e., learning and pedagogical research ?<=>? contributions to practice ?<=>? discipline based scholarship)?

During Fall 2005, SPC must define what is and what is not an "*Intellectual Contribution*" (IC). IC can be either a Peer Reviewed Journal (*PRJ*) or Other Intellectual Contribution (*OIC*). Thus, in effect, to define "IC" really is to define which OIC will be counted by UNO CBA and which OIC CBA will not count. Importantly, the SPC defines whether the IC required for Academically Qualified (*AQ*) faculty are *identical* to the IC required for Professionally Qualified (*PQ*) faculty; and if *not identical*, then how the IC for AQ differ from the IC for PQ. This task will require consultation with PAC and FDC.

Identify UNO CBA's *Comparison Group* (i.e., Peers, Aspiration Group, and Competitors).

2. Undergraduate Program Council and Graduate Program Council (UPC & GPC)

List of UNO degrees (measured by official diploma) included within the AACSB accreditation review. AACSB requires AAVC to sign list and requires AACSB approval of list no later than 24 months prior to visit. Identify admission standards and Mission of each degree. The degree's Mission may be school's Mission.

Identify *learning goals* and location of learning goals within the curriculum, student *objectives* and student *traits*, as well as *standards* for assessment, assessment *tools*, and *feedback* review process. *Implement assessment tools*. Identify pedagogical and *delivery characteristics* as well as assessment of *comparable consequences*.

3. Faculty Development Council (FDC)

Implement processes for mentoring faculty members individually. The FDC assesses the faculty as a whole in serving the College's Mission and the students; the FDC must specifically assess Intellectual Contributions.

4. Personnel Advisory Council (PAC)

Clear and consistent reappointment, promotion, and tenure *processes*. Clear process for *evaluation* of Intellectual Contributions. That is, [a] what are the boundaries of each category of Intellectual Contribution (i.e., learning and pedagogical research *versus* contributions to practice *versus* discipline based scholarship); and [b] within a category, relative worth of a unit (i.e., Peer Reviewed Journals [*PRJ*] and Other Intellectual Contributions [*OIC*]) of Intellectual Contribution.

5. Technology and Educational Resources (TERC)

Identify resources needed to serve Mission, degree programs, students, faculty, and Intellectual Contributions, as well as identify and consult with stakeholders. Convey budgetary needs to Executive Council.

6. External Relations Council (ERC)

Identify and consult with all external stakeholders of College, Mission, and degree programs. Involve external stakeholders with expertise in *assessment* process of *learning goals* of degree programs.

7. Executive Council (EC)

Initiate web based submission of annual reports to populate the database of faculty output. Manage the *whole faculty as a portfolio*. Identify and provide *sufficient support* for all Supporting Faculty and Participating Faculty (e.g., using feedback from TERC and FDC). Annually prepare and review tables on: [a] financial support; [b] faculty sufficiency (by SCH, by contact hours, and by course); [c] Intellectual Contributions and Qualifications (by faculty member, by department, and by degree program). Academically Qualified (*AQ*), Professionally Qualified (*PQ*), and Other using a *rolling five year qualification*.