AGENDA
2018 SACSCOC Reaffirmation Leadership Team Meeting
December 11, 2015
Lonestar Conference Room, AD 3.104

1. Call to Order   Serenity King

2. Approval of Minutes   Serenity King

3. Announcements   Serenity King
   A. New Team Members
   B. Compliance Certification Report, QEP draft, and lead evaluator due: **September 11, 2017**
   C. Dates for Off-Site Review Committee Report: **November 7-10, 2017**
   D. Focused Response and final QEP to Off-Site Review Report due: **January 23, 2018**
   E. Dates for On-Site Visit: **March 6-8, 2018**
   F. Dates / Location for Observer: **March 14-16, 2017** at Northwestern State University of Louisiana
   G. Print-outs for Binders

4. January 2016 Meeting – 2 meetings   Serenity King
   A. Other: Spring 2016

5. Follow Up on Reaffirmation Committees   Serenity King
   A. See Item 4 from November 6, 2015 meeting packet
   B. 2008 Reaffirmation Teams List
   C. Break out into 2 groups for January 2016 meetings

Group 1	Group 2
Laird	Hammers
Leeper-Piquero	Peinhardt
Murphy	Musselman
Venetis	King
Kaplan	Gentsch

6. Lessons Learned from Houston   Team Members
   A. Overview
   B. Team Members Report
      1. King   5. Leeper-Piquero
      2. Gentsch   6. Peinhardt
      3. Murphy   7. Laird
      4. Venetis   8. Hammers

7. Adjournment   Serenity King

ITEM 2

November 6, 2015 Meeting Minutes

UT Dallas Dox: http://dox.utdallas.edu/minutes1243/dchhgusfzd

2018 SACSCOC Leadership Team
Meeting Minutes

Friday, November 6, 2015 10:00AM
Bluebonnet Conference Room, AD 3.108A

I. Attendees:

B. Hobson Wildenthal, Inga Musselman, Serenity King (Chair), Kim Laird, Clint Peinhardt, Josh Hammers, Mary Jo Venetis, Simon Kane, Nicole Leeper Piquero, Jessica Murphy, Joanna Gentsch, Caroline Ries, Vy Trang

Absent: Sarah Maxwell

II. Introduction of all attendees

III. Team Charge: Setting up the committee structures to make sure compliance report is covered by all appropriate stakeholders. Task is not to write the report though some team members will be involved in writing the report.

All team members should read the *2012 Principles of Accreditation: Foundations for Quality Enhancement* pamplet, *Resource Manual for the Principles of Accreditation*, and *Handbook for Institutions Seeking Reaffirmation*.

The principles will be broken down into subtopics and discussed with the working groups.

ACTION ITEM: Members should read resource manual, read through handbook, may give pamphlet to members of working committee (additional copies of pamphlet will be handed out at Dec. 2015 SACS Annual Meeting in Houston, TX).

Discussion of timeline for reaffirmation: One document shows the timeline by month. Two reports due to SACS are the compliance certification report and QEP plan. They are due to SACS by September 11, 2017. Off-site review occurs in Fall 2017. On-site visit occurs in March 2018. Serenity mentions that the timeline may be altered based on the decision regarding the Third Monitoring Report. The decision will be announced at the Dec. 2015 SACS Annual Meeting in Houston, TX. The internal UTD timeline (draft) will be finalized by this committee.

A summary of the number of committees from 2006-2007 reaffirmation was given.

ACTION ITEM: Leadership team needs to think about how many committees to keep, if there are any committees that need to be added, what is the appropriate composition of each committee (who, size, scope, responsibilities).

Weblink to descriptions of committees from last reaffirmation. Become familiar with the descriptions. Descriptions can be changed by UTD. (http://sacscoc.utdallas.edu/2007-review/reaffirmation-teams)

Steering committee might include academic council members, senators, faculty, Dr. Redlinger's office, library representatives, chairs of all committees, etc.

SACS Dec. 2015 Annual Meeting: special sessions for Class of 2018 Orientation team (Serenity King, Nicole Leeper Piquero, Josh Hammers, Kim Laird, Clint Peinhardt). Need to ensure that all three orientation sessions are covered. On final day of the Annual Meeting, the decision on the Third Monitoring Report will be announced. There are two closing sessions for orientation – Kim Laird will attend Financial, others will attend general questions session.

ACTION ITEM: Serenity will send an email with list of sessions that need to be attended by members at annual meeting.

Discussion of principles that most universities are cited as noncompliant: UTD cited for 7 but 2 were self-reported in 2007. An example: in 2007, at least a majority of the graduate credits had to be taken at the awarding institution. UTD allowed for 50% to be transferred in so UTD had to report the number of times this allowed. UTD has revised its policy. SACS has revised principle 3.6.3 to require one-third of hours to be taken at awarding institution. At last reaffirmation, there were 87 principles that were addressed; now there are 96 principles. 29 principles have been revised from 2007-2008.

Jessica Murphy presents QEP. Last QEP resulted in Student Success Center. QEP is a 5-yr plan. Stresses/focuses on the environment that supports student learning and the broad-based involvement in the process and development of QEP. A webpage has been created for submissions of ideas. Plan will be developed by Fall 2016, proposal and design in Fall 2016, pilot QEP in 2017. Submissions will be documented; curated section on website (trending ideas). All submissions will be on Dropbox so data can be quantified. Previous challenge was actually the written submission of ideas – most ideas were given verbally. Jessica Murphy and Simon Kane will work on system where emails containing these ideas can be uploaded into the QEP submission webpage.

There is a SACS website with the 2007 compliance report, 2014 5th year interim report, QEP, and committee structure information. Currently building new SACS website for this compliance report that will contain a separate section for leadership team with meeting minutes, meeting materials, etc. for transparency. All committees will be encouraged to upload meeting minutes to website. Leadership meeting minutes will be uploaded to DOX.

ACTION ITEM: Regular leadership meetings: what days/times would each member prefer. Doodle poll will be sent out for options after the December meeting.

Brief summary of events that led to monitoring period.

Assessment tracking for each degree plan: tracks what each program is reporting as changes in courses or program and if the changes are being made in catalog. This only serves as a comparison analysis of assessment report/plan information with academic catalog.

University assessment committee: being proposed Senate agenda item. Assessment committee will be university-wide committee.

Implementation of documentation system for student complaints: Student Affairs is currently working on formal student complaint system – if there should be a central system.

A question was asked: what are the criteria for committee member selection?

Answer: selection of committee members was based on position during previous reaffirmation. Time commitment should be taken into consideration by candidates for committees.

Possible outcomes of Third Monitoring Report: 1) UTD placed on probation, 2) loss of accreditation, 3) UTD cleared.

ACTION ITEM: The Leadership Team will have a follow-up meeting on Dec. 11 (time to be determined) to debrief on the Annual Meeting and to discuss the impact of the Third Monitoring Report decision on UTD. The formation of the committees, discussion of UTD timeline, and whether or not more faculty need to be added to the leadership committee or if they will be represented in the other working committees will be discussed in Jan. 2016 meeting. Committees need to start meeting in early Spring 2016.

ITEM 3A

UT Dallas SACSCOC Leadership Team Members

B. Hobson Wildenthal, PhD
Inga Musselman, PhD
Serenity King, Chair
Ryan Dorman, Student Representative
Joanna Gentsch, PhD
Josh Hammers
Marilyn Kaplan, PhD
Kimberly Laird, EdD
Nicole Leeper Piquero, PhD
Jessica Murphy, PhD
Clint Peinhardt, PhD
Mary Jo Venetis, PhD
Administrative Support: Vy Trang
Technical Support: Simon Kane

ITEM 5B

2008 Reaffirmation Teams

Leadership Team

Executive Committee

Steering Committee

QEP Topic Committee/QEP Council

Committee for Federal Mandates

Committee for Faculty and Credentialing

Committee for Institutional Effectiveness

Committee for General Education

Academic Assessment Committee

Administrative Services Committee

Committee for Financial and Physical Resources

Committee for Graduate Education

Committee for Undergraduate Education

Committee for Library and Other Learning Resources

Committee for Mission, Governance, and Administration

Committee for Operational Assessment

Committee for Student Affairs and Student Services

ITEM 6A

Lessons Learned from Houston Overview

- Leadership Team Focus
- 2.5 Institutional Effectiveness
  - Institutional effectiveness – non-academic units
- 2.8 Faculty
  - Faculty qualifications have less flexibility when teaching higher level courses (e.g., PhD most rigid)
- HOP
  - Relevant policies/procedures are in writing, appropriately approved, published and accessible to relevant parties, and implemented and enforced
  - Policies and the policy development processes are critical
- Integrity perspective
- Energized and empowered as an educator
- To share and document what we do here
  - Document and defend your (the institution's) decisions
- Launch event(s)
- Should not stop the momentum / progress of improvements
- Meeting minutes are a great way to demonstrate ongoing [improvements, strategic planning, etc.]
- Revising some standards
- Reauthorization of Higher Education Act
- Think like a reviewer
- Demonstrating IT infrastructure resources
- Include fiscal experts in on the QEP planning
- Learning outcomes for internships
- International agreements
- Include assessment responsibilities in job descriptions for coordinator positions and above
- Use Qualtrics as a student complaint repository
- Rice sends out a single survey
- Peer review and quantitative data for assessment reports
- Student stakeholders

ITEM 6B

Lessons Learned from Houston Team Report

King

A. Leadership Team Focus
   1) Attitude
   2) Timeline for Compliance Certification Report (CCR) Completion
      - 2 months – planning/communication (need Kick-Off)
      - 3 months – readiness audit
      - 8 months – writing
      - 3 months – internal review
      - 2 months – external review
   3) Deadline Enforcement --> next level
B. 2.5 Institutional Effectiveness
   1) Link between IR/IE
   2) Strategic Plan Update
   3) Assessment of Non-Academic Units
C. 2.8 Faculty
   1) Allow faculty to justify
D. HOP
E. Assessment for minors without majors, certificates, and "advertised" concentrations
F. Fast-track continues to be a concern
G. Concurrent course evidence

Gentsch

As a first-time attendee, I got a lot out of the orientation talk by President, Belle Wheelan. Primarily, I was better able to understand the importance of these issues not from an accreditation perspective but rather from the passion for integrity perspective and more about the "why it matters." After her talk, I felt energized and empowered as an educator. I couldn't help but think that there might be more faculty "buy-in" of the process is others could hear this type presentation rather than just a "because we have to" type of approach.

The second epiphany that resulted from the conference came from the time I spent in the Resource Room. Like so many other things we often get bogged down with concerns about how to approach things. When I had the chance to review the variety of documents submitted by other institutions, it was a great way to think about how to share and document what we do here. In these reviews I was also able to gain an appreciation for the precision in the language that was most effective.

Murphy

QEP process ideas:
1. Host focus groups of faculty from each school and ask for ideas.
2. Issues call for proposals (4-5 pages, provide a rubric) once we have 3-5 topics. Award a gift card for selected mini proposal.
3. Host a launch event at which we unveil the topic.
4. Make sure upper administration has clear talking points once the topic is selected.
5. Have a door decorating contest before site visit.
6. Figure out what our core values are as an institution (mission, strategic plan, curriculum) & build from that core.
7. Code the meeting minutes from council to identify emergent themes.
8. Make sure QEP Council has representation from the strategic planning group.

Venetis

Need to establish and then maintain a culture of institutional effectiveness (IE) outside of reaffirmation/5th year interim reports cycles.
- Should not stop the momentum / progress of improvements.
- Not a good idea to use sampling for 3.3.1.x – it is why many institutions get "dinged."
- Find faculty champions to support ongoing IE / assessment.

SACSCOC is in the process of revising some standards within the *Principles of Accreditation* with a timeline to complete by December 2017.
- May impact those in the middle of the reaffirmation process; may need to provide addendums.
- Slated key *Principle* revisions:
  - o 3.13 / 3.13.1 Institutional Obligations for Public Disclosure (including complaints against SACSCOC and/or its accredited institutions; agreements involving dual and joint dual awards; language used in advertising, student recruitment and representation of accreditation status)
  - o 2.8 Faculty
  - o 2.7.3 General education
  - o 3.3.1 Institutional Effectiveness

The Reauthorization of Higher Education Act and its implications for SACSCOC and its institutions was mentioned in 4 sessions.

Institutions should implement a complaint resolution management / process in compliance of FR 4.5 (student complaints), similar to IE and assessment processes. Continue systematic data collection with accountability.

Leeper Piquero, N.

1. The "flexibility" built into the SACSCOC requirements.
2. Establishing faculty qualifications have less flexibility when teaching higher level courses (e.g., PhD most rigid)
3. Need to provide evidence; not just note that a policy exist but to actually show that the policy is working

Peinhardt

1. Accreditation is based on good educational principles (I want that substantiated) – the principles can be reworded into statements of good practice.
2. Pay special attention to the prologue of core principles, and make sure that relevant policies/procedures are in writing, appropriately approved, published and accessible to relevant parties, and implemented and enforced
3. Don't provide more information than necessary, and think like a reviewer when deciding what to provide.

Laird

Areas where I think we could benefit from an early and honest focus
1. In reviewing the Resource Manual & Handbook, and based on past experience, our policies and the policy development process are critical
2. Start drafting templates for example, financial – I will start drafting schedules and narrative templates to identify areas of concern, identification of needed supporting documentation, etc.
3. Institutional Effectiveness – process and documentation for non-academic units tricky— start early!
4. We have had several university wide committees in the past that are no longer operational. The tuition and fee committee and a budget review/development committee come to mind. Meeting minutes are a great way to demonstrate ongoing strategic planning, resource allocation decisions tied to strategic planning, etc.
5. Conduct a critical self-evaluation of physical resources and how we administer them

Financial/Physical Resources
1. Basic documentation needed to support core requirements, comprehensive standards, and federal requirements with regard to financial resources:
   a. An institution-specific audit for the most recent FYE (8/31/2017)
   b. A management letter issued by the external auditor
   c. A multi-year schedule of Unrestricted Net Assets Excluding Plant
   d. The most recent budget summary
   e. Documented proof of university budget planning/resource allocation and UTS BOR approval
   f. The most recent (not to exceed two years) state and federal financial aid audits

2. Three components for demonstrating sound financial base
   a. Is the university living within its means?
   b. Is the university living within its cash flows?
   c. Are these behaviors sustainable?
3. Quickest ticket to financial monitoring is to budget a deficit
4. While the financial audit may require inclusion of the unfunded pension liability on the University's financial statement, SACSCOC recognizes the commitment as unfunded and allows adjustment to calculate operating reserves
5. Demonstrating IT infrastructure resources for student distance learning (not just the LMS—the servers, network, etc.) is now a requirement for CS 3.11.3
   a. What platform is used?
   b. Who maintains the platform
   c. What support is needed from the university?
   d. Is the bandwidth sufficient to accommodate needs?
   e. What other physical facilities support distance learning and how is their effectiveness monitored?
6. Adequate financial/human resources are an important part of the QEP; include fiscal experts in on the QEP planning

Overall
1. Keep the narratives for the core requirements brief, factual, to the point, and include links to supporting documentation. Highlight sections of large documents (i.e. state single audit report, Texas education code) specifically related to the institution/standard.
2. Use the discussion in the narratives for the comprehensive standards to support the discussion for the core requirements
3. Serving as a peer evaluators during the next year would be very helpful to inform our preparation efforts

Hammers

While I gained many insights and ideas from the conference, these are not really things that transfer to an agenda item for discussion. The one topic that I would like to discuss at the meeting relates to student complaints (*Principle* 4.5).

Other UT Dallas conference attendees

Kaplan

- We should include our rubrics to list use of appropriate vocabulary in the discipline by the student in the assignment/exam
- We should upgrade our learning outcomes for internships
- The requirements for every policy:
   - It should be written

- o Published
- o Enforced
- o Enforced decisions should be documented
- o I think this will help especially with fast track and the number of students who appeal the policy
- On international agreements
  - o How we transcript the courses taken at the partner institution affects how the agreement is interpreted by SACs
  - o If we treat the courses like transfer credit
  - o OR we treat the courses as our own, use them in GPA calculations etc.
  - o So I think we are ok on this as we take the coursework as transfer
  - o The issue is then that we should treat the partners courses no differently than we would treat coursework coming from a domestic institution

Piquero, A.

Quite a few things actually, but in terms of things that stand out:

- SACSCOC is clear about laying out general principles and criteria bug not specifics. I like and don't like that aspect as two different schools could agree on an outcome but have different rationales but SACSOC can accept one and not another.

- As a follow up, I heard a lot was simply to document and defend your (the institution's) decisions. So that level of specificity is critical.

- Too much focus on undergraduate education to the exclusion of graduate education...given that graduate programs are assessed as well in accreditation it seems that at least equal importance should be afforded.

- I thought that there was a lot of repeating of sessions, which may be by design as people have conflicting sessions. But hearing the same material in three different sessions seems odd.

- I think more open ended forum that permitted the audience to ask questions would've been useful.

- Perhaps devote an extra day for beginners or first timer attendees, as there is quite a bit of learning curve to the uninitiated.

Carriaga

1. To increase assessment buy-in (or, at least participation), a few presenters recommended that we include assessment responsibilities in job descriptions for

5

coordinator positions and above. It was also recommended that assessment be tied to budget and/or funding (mostly for nonacademic units) so that as a part of their budget presentation, units are asked to explain their assessment practices.

2. Use Qualtrics as a student complaint repository. Each office is responsible for handling their own complaints, then they log those complaints into a centralized, confidential Qualtrics survey. A follow-up survey that is pre-populated with the details of the complaint can be used to address how the complaint was resolved.

3. Rather than sending several surveys to students each semester, Rice sends out a single survey that includes questions from multiple offices on campus. Essentially, it's several surveys assembled to look like one survey. The first part of the survey is required (students are placed on a registration hold until they complete—or at least flip through—the first portion). Then, students are given the option to continue answering questions for other offices (e.g., students enrolled in PLTL-supported classes would be given the option to take the CLASSE, athletes might be given the option to answer questions related to their sport, etc.). The feedback from students has been extremely positive—although the survey is longer, they're only asked to take one survey and all of the questions are relevant to them.

Shenoy

Some institutions for student learning outcomes assessment reports have a section that asks the report writers to look back at the previous year's feedback and comment about how changes have been made to address any concerns. This is a build in way for reflection and to track year to year change.

For peer reviewing on student learning outcomes assessment reports, it is helpful to the centralized office to have quantitative data while for the individual departments where feedback is written, qualitative data is key.

We have both upward and downward stakeholders but when we focus on the upward stakeholders (and writing reports) we sometimes lose sight of downward stakeholders (our students), which is interesting since they are the ones we are trying to serve. This can negatively impact ourselves and efforts long term.