



The Higher Learning Commission

A Commission of the
North Central Association
of Colleges and Schools

NCA

30 North LaSalle Street, Suite 2400 | Chicago, IL 60602 | 312-263-0456
800-621-7440 | Fax: 312-263-7462 | www.ncahlc.org

Serving the common good by assuring and advancing the quality of higher learning

June 26, 2008

TO: Chancellor Douglas Kristensen
University of Nebraska at Kearney

FROM: Robert R. Appleson, Associate Director, Accreditation

SUBJECT: Final Team Report

Enclosed is the institution's copy of the final Team Report of a visit to University of Nebraska at Kearney. The Commission encourages you to make additional copies of the Team Report to circulate to your constituencies. In addition, I have attached draft copies of the Statement of Affiliation Status (SAS) and the Organizational Profile (OP). These two documents, the SAS and the OP, will be posted on the Commission website after the Board of Trustees validates the accreditation decision of the Institutional Actions Council or the Review Committee. They are enclosed now for your information and for your review. You will receive an official action letter, an SAS and an OP following validation of the action by the Board of Trustees.

You are asked to acknowledge receipt of the Team Report and the SAS and OP worksheets; and to file on behalf of your institution, a formal written response to the evaluation team's report and recommendation. Your response becomes a part of the official record of the evaluation visit. Your response also serves as an integral part of the evaluation process, and it will be included in the materials sent to the next team that visits your institution. Please send your institutional response to me **two weeks** after you receive this report, send copies to members of the visiting team, and set aside some additional copies for the Commission's review process. (See *Handbook of Accreditation, Third Edition*, Chapter 2.2-2)

In your response, you are also asked to let me know which review option you prefer: the Readers Panel or the Review Committee. A description of these processes appears in the *Handbook*, Chapter 2.2-2 and 2.2-3. Please review these options and advise me as soon as possible, whether you agree essentially with the team's report and recommendation and therefore choose the Readers Panel, or whether you wish to have the team's report and your materials examined by a Review Committee. The next Review Committee meeting is September 22, 2008, in Chicago.

Enclosed please find three evaluation forms. In an effort to strengthen its professional development program for Peer Reviewers, the Commission is initiating this structured method outside of the institution's formal written response to seek from the institution an evaluation of the team. We recommend that you distribute these to knowledgeable people representative of several constituencies at your institution. You can make additional copies if you wish. Your participation is voluntary but greatly appreciated.

If you have any questions concerning the evaluation team's report, the SAS, the OP or the review options, please let me know.

Enclosures

cc: Dr. Neil Hattlestad, Team Chairperson