The University of Texas at Dallas
800 West Campbell Road, AD42., Richardson, TX 75080-3021
(972) 883-6749 FAX (972) 883-2276

## AGENDA <br> 2018 SACSCOC Reaffirmation Leadership Team Meeting <br> February 17, 2016 <br> Lone Star Conference Room, AD 3.104

1. Call to Order / Approval of Minutes

Serenity King
2. Announcements
A. Lunch and Learn

Serenity King

1. Friday, $2 / 5$ (11:30 am-12:30 pm): EPPS, AH, BBS, and IS (17 from schools)
2. Wednesday, 2/10 (11:30 am-12:30 pm): ECS, NSM, and BBS (20 from schools)
3. Next: Wednesday, 2/24 (11:30 am-12:30 pm): JSOM and ATEC in JSOM 1.117

Thursday, 3/3 (11:30 am-12:30 pm): open to everyone, in JSOM 11.210
B. Communication Plans
C. SACSCOC 2016 Annual Meeting Call for Proposals (Deadline: 3/17/2016)
3. Dr. Belle Wheelan Visit, March 1 (Dinner 2/29)
4. Final 2018 Reaffirmation Committee Nominations

Serenity King
A. Appointment Letters (Samples)
B. Due date of first draft
C. Sample Packet
5. Discuss SACSCOC Policies (listed in the January 26, 2016 agenda packet) Serenity King
A. SACSCOC policies are at http://www.sacscoc.org/policies.asp
B. Institutional Obligations for Public Disclosure
C. FR 4.1 Student Achievement Website and Analysis/Findings

D1. Substantive Change for SACSCOC Accredited Institutions
D2. Reaffirmation of Accreditation and Subsequent Reports
D3. Closing a Program, Site, Branch or Institution: Good Practices
E. Agreements Involving Joint and Dual Academic Awards: Policy and Procedures
F. Direct Assessment Competency-Based Educational Programs [Program Learning Outcomes]
G. Disclosure of Accrediting Documents and Actions of SACSCOC
6. Future: CS 2.5 Institutional Effectiveness

Serenity King
7. Adjournment

## ITEM 1

## January 26, 2016 Meeting Minutes

UT Dallas Dox: http://dox.utdallas.edu/minutes1246/dcglpphssj

# 2018 SACSCOC Leadership Team <br> Meeting Minutes 

Tuesday, January 26, 2016 1:30PM
BBS Dean's Conference Room, JO 4.306

## I. Attendees:

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

## II. Approval of Jan. 13, 2016 meeting minutes

Nicole Piquero motioned to approve, Clint Peinhardt seconded the motion. There were some revisions to the minutes to include the Group 2 committee recommendations. All in favor - minutes approved.

## III. Announcements

Lunch and Learn Q\&A Session Schedule
These Q\&A sessions are specific to accreditation/reaffirmation. The first session will be on February 5 with EPPS, A\&H, BBS, and IS. Serenity, Jessica, and Ryan will be the speakers. Leadership team members are invited to their school-specific session.

## Fall 2015 SACSCOC Report

The report is available online. In order to view the report, the reader must login with their UTD netid and password. All the assessment plans and reports will be accessible in the report.

## Dr. Neal Armstrong Visits

Dr. Neal Armstrong is reviewing the reports and plans (in detail) with Dr. Gloria Shenoy. He will visit campus at least twice in Spring 2016 to meet with the Schools and discuss some of the gaps that are in the assessment materials.

Dr. Belle Wheelan Visit
Dr. Belle Wheelan will be visiting campus in March 2016 to see how the campus has grown.

ACTION ITEM: Finalize reaffirmation committees with nomination acceptances and a kickoff event prior to or at the end of her visit. If members have any suggestions for the kickoff event, email Serenity King, Vy Trang, or Mary Jo Venetis.

ACTION ITEM: Next meeting will focus on reviewing SACSCOC policies.

## IV. Formation of Reaffirmation Committees Nominations

Financial and Physical Resources and Information Technology Committee Nominations

- Naomi Emmett - Office of Administration
- Dr. Denise Boots
- Rafael Martin
- Beth Keithly
- Beth Tolan

ACTION ITEM: Serenity will check how SACSCOC classifies Title IX.
Faculty Committee Nominations

- Dr. Murray Leaf - Chair and lead on writing of response
- Dr. Lev Gelb
- Dr. Nicole Leeper Piquero
- Dr. Ravi Prakash
- Dr. Noah Sasson or Dr. Candice Mills
- Dr. Varghese Jacob
- Dr. John Sibert
- Dr. Meghna Sabharwal
- Dr. David Channell
- Dr. Todd Fechter
- Dr. Erin Smith

Learning and Student Resources Committee Nominations

- Josh Hammers
- Amanda Smith
- Dr. Mary Jo Venetis
- Dr. John Jackson
- Kimshi Hickman
- Jennifer McDowell or representative
- Darren Crone or representative
- David Crain or representative
- University Library representative
- Cristen Casey or representative from International Center
- Dr. Vladimir Dragovic

Josh Hammers gave a brief summary of the organizational structure of Student Affairs.
Mission, Governance, and Administration Committee Nominations

- Dr. Mary Jo Venetis
- Serenity King
- Dr. David Cordell - chair
- Colleen Dutton or HR representative
- HOP Committee Chair
- Timothy Shaw
- Dr. Richard Scotch


## Institutional Effectiveness Committee Nominations

- Dr. Lawrence Redlinger or representative
- Serenity King
- Dr. Gloria Shenoy
- Dr. Catherine Parsoneault
- Dr. Kamran Kiasaleh or Mette Posamentier
- Dr. Kustal Dogan
- Dr. George Fair
- Michele Hanlon
- Dr. Theodore Price
- Dr. Kurt Beron
- Lauren DeCillis
- Rafael Martin
- Kim Winkler
- Environmental Health and Safety representative
- Pete Bond
- Cheryl Friesenhahn
- Toni Stephens or representative
- Dr. Marilyn Kaplan

Steering Committee Nominations

- Sue Sherbet

Program Committee Nominations

- Jennifer McDowell
- $\quad 2^{\text {nd }}$ Registrar's Office representative
- Dr. Paul Diehl
- Dr. Jennifer Holmes
- Dr. Eric Farrar or Dr. Monica Evans
- All members of Graduate Council
- All members of Committee on Undergraduate Education (CUE) including the offices that are represented at CUE meetings
- Dr. John Gooch - Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) representative
- Serenity King


## Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) Topic Selection Committee Nominations

(This committee will meet for a short period of time to select the QEP topic. The QEP Council will be involved in the implementation of the QEP topic.)

- Dr. Jessica Murphy
- Ryan Dorman
- Rajadhar Reddy
- Student Government representative
- Dr. Rebecca Files
- Dr. Walter Voit
- Kyle Edgington or representative
- Dr. Gene Fitch or representative
- Dr. Kim Laird (until Chief Budget Officer is hired)
- Katherine Morales
- Student Outreach and Academic Retention (SOAR) or Director of Advising
- Dr. Eric Farrar

ACTION ITEM: Nominations will be compiled and emailed by Serenity, Mary Jo or Vy to the Leadership team members for approval by Wednesday, January 27. Serenity will meet with Dr. Richard Scotch, Dr. Timothy Redman, and Dr. Murray Leaf and discuss the team nominations and additional nominations. Mary Jo will draft an email to be sent to the committee nominees that will detail what they are being asked to do on the committees and if they are willing to participate. Once nominations are secured, the kick-off event can be planned to coincide with Dr. Belle Wheelan's campus visit.

ACTION ITEM: Mary Jo and Serenity are working on a newsletter with information about the reaffirmation.

After the Lunch and Learn Q\&A Sessions, there may be a better sense on how the reaffirmation should be communicated to the university community.

## V. Meeting Adjourned

ITEM 2C

## SACSCOC 2016 Annual Meeting Call for Proposals

## Deadline: March 17, 2016



# Call for Proposals 

Deadline: March 17, 2016

Theme: "Higher Education at the Crossroads: Pathways to Equity and Excellence"

## "Higher Education at the Crossroads: Pathways to Equity and Excellence"



In the face of an active federal agenda related to higher education, which includes, a focus on campus safety, institutional budgetary constraints, student demands for fair and equal treatment, and a public call for transparency and affordability, colleges and universities have a list of priorities that continues to grow. When one achievement is accomplished, not far behind, there appears another challenge to overcome. The 2016 SACSCOC Annual Meeting will engage participants in sessions based on theory, research, and practice that provide options for ways to ensure their institutions continue to provide a quality education while standing in the spotlight of inspection and accountability.

This year's theme, Higher Education at the Crossroads: Pathways to Equity and Excellence, will highlight the sharing of ideas and strategies that have led to improved results and lessons learned in efforts to enhance the academic experience of students attending our member institutions in light of competing priorities. The 2016 SACSCOC Annual Meeting will offer sessions on topics that enable participants to leave with the ability to implement activities that enhance teaching and learning, as well as the supporting administrative operations. To deliver on the intent of this theme, you are invited to submit proposals that represent the tracks featured below.

## - Track 1: Balancing Internal and External Accountability

While trying to strengthen ways to make institutional improvements, the increasing demands of federal legislation and state policies cannot be ignored. It becomes more difficult to ensure that the campus' needs are being met, while managing how to deal with federal, state, and other agency requirements. For some, modifying institutional processes to adhere to new state policies is sometimes at odds with being able to demonstrate compliance with the Principles of Accreditation. How does your institution successfully manage administrative and academic operations while coping with the tide of increasing demands from outside agencies that govern programs offered on your campus? How is your institution able to attract quality faculty and recruit top students in light of a decreasing budget? How does your institution improve the morale of students, faculty, and staff while facing pending administrative changes? How is your institution balancing internal and external matters with competing priorities?

## - Track 2: Diversity and Equity

As the climate on the campuses continues to change, it is imperative that institutions do not lose sight of their
mission to provide a quality education. Recent headlines speak to the challenges faced by some institutions to reexamine the level of attention and sensitivity given to their students' needs. What policies and practices have been adopted to address fair and equal treatment on your campus? How successful have the policies and practices been with ensuring that faculty, staff, and students are treated fairly in all situations? How has your institution addressed challenges to create an inclusive environment? How has your institution succeeded at recruiting and retaining a diverse faculty, staff, and student body? What lessons may help other institutions in their efforts to promote diversity and equity on their campuses?


## - Track 3: Good Practices for Accreditation Compliance

Proposals in this track will highlight strategies that have supported the successful development of compliance documents submitted to address standards and requirements in the Principles of Accreditation for reaffirmation, accreditation, the Fifth-Year Interim Review, monitoring, and other reporting. In addition, proposals will feature effective methods designed to assist participants with preparing for accreditation activities, including but not limited to: hosting committee visits; planning, developing, and implementing a Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP); developing a QEP Impact Report; and submitting a substantive change prospectus. Proposals from institutions that have been removed from a sanction are encouraged. Other questions that proposals in this track may address include: How has your institution integrated discipline-specific accreditation activities with SACSCOC accreditation? In what ways has your institution integrated accreditation requirements or activities into your institution's operations to reap the benefits of more efficiency in documenting and reporting?

## - Track 4: Effective Assessment Practices

Institutional effectiveness is a key focus area in the Principles of Accreditation. An institution must demonstrate that it engages in continuing efforts to enhance the quality of student learning, and its programs and services. How has your institution developed a culture of assessment and a commitment to continuous improvement? How has your institution enhanced its assessment practices? How have your academic programs adopted assessment practices to enhance student learning? How do the administrative offices on your campus engage in assessment activities to demonstrate continuous improvement? How have you integrated program assessment into your strategic planning efforts? What evidence do you have to demonstrate success in fulfilling your institution's mission?

## - Track 5: Student Success and Completion

 Institutions have adopted many different innovations to improve student learning and increase retention and graduation rates: new student services initiatives,
infusion of technology in key curricular areas, faculty development programs, enhanced funding strategies, and more. What lessons have been learned from your institution's implementation of student success initiatives? How has your institution addressed the Completion Agenda? How does your institution define, measure, and demonstrate student success? What changes were made to your curriculum that led to increased retention and graduation?

## - Track 6: Hot Topics

A number of current issues in higher education pervade the cover stories of journals, periodicals, and websites. The value of accreditation has been questioned and scrutinized. The discussion surrounding the College Scorecard continues to be debated. Competency-based education is gaining interest. Campus safety is a growing concern among our institutions. Proposals in this track should stimulate discussion and engage participants in sharing methods to address these and other pressing issues in higher education.

## Sessions will be offered for:

- Presidents, chancellors, trustees, and state college/ university system personnel
- Provosts, vice presidents, and deans
- Accreditation liaisons and Leadership Team members
- Academic program coordinators, faculty, and institutional research/institutional effectiveness staff members
- Staff members in student services, finance, library, and instructional technology
- Other personnel who would like to stay informed of developments in accreditation and higher education


## Guidelines for <br> Proposal Submission

To submit a proposal, please go to www.sacscoc.org/ aamain.asp and click on Proposal Submission Form. Proposals must be submitted on or before March 17, 2016.

## Format of Session

The 2016 SACSCOC Annual Meeting Program will feature more than 200 different sessions offered by approved proposal submissions, including workshops, concurrent sessions, group discussions, and poster sessions. Consider the appropriate format of your session that will best ensure participants are able to achieve the learning outcomes. Below is a description of each session format:

- Workshops will consist of full-day (6 hours) and halfday (3 hours) sessions and include active learning led by experienced professionals. A schedule of activities to be conducted during the allotted time must be included in the proposal. In addition, the content must include both didactic and applied instruction that is relevant to accreditation and/or the theme. Workshop presenters should be knowledgeable in their fields and capable of presenting the content in creative ways and applying it to real problems in academia.
- Concurrent sessions will offer practical applications to address challenging areas in higher education and/ or accreditation (what worked and what did not work). It is imperative that the content extend beyond "this is how we did it" to the discussion being generalizable to other institutions. Concurrent sessions will be 60 minutes and should include at least 5-10 minutes for questions from the audience. A few topics may warrant 90 minutes, provided they are fully justified and include an active learning component.
- Group discussions are designed to include an open discussion between a knowledgeable facilitator and a small group on a topic relevant to accreditation, emerging trends in higher education, or hot topics in academe. Formal presentations will not be considered.
- Poster sessions will combine text and graphics to create a visually appealing presentation. The topic can address subject matter in any of the tracks and may

consist of results from a research project that includes implications for a wider audience.


## Target Audience and Content Level

Each proposal should identify the target audience that will benefit most from participating in the session (e.g., QEP Leadership Teams, Accreditation Liaisons, academic administrators, faculty, assessment officers). Each proposal should also indicate the anticipated content level of your topic (beginner, intermediate, or advanced) as defined below:

- Beginner level content is designed to cover basic topics in accreditation or higher education. Familiarity with the Principles of Accreditation may be helpful; however, in most cases, prior knowledge is not assumed.
- Intermediate level content is designed to cover theory and practice in topics in accreditation or higher education for participants with some related work experience.
- Advanced level content is designed to cover highly developed or complex topics, knowledge, or skills for participants with several years of related work experience. Usually advanced sessions provide an opportunity for participants to apply the content to a real problem or to analyze some of the concepts presented.

Below are the accreditation tracks that reflect the membership institutions:

- Track A institutions offer undergraduate degrees only.
- Track B institutions offer undergraduate and graduate degrees or graduate degrees only.


## 2016 SACSCOC Program Planning Committee

Dr. L. Dean Adams<br>Lindsey Wilson College (KY)

## Ms. Tara Askew

Columbus Technical College (GA)

## Dr. Divya Bhati

College of Charleston (SC)

## Ms. Karen Brunner, co-chair

Roane State Community College (TN)

## Mr. Jason Chaffin

Cape Fear Community College (NC)

## Dr. Sally Cook

Texas Lutheran University (TX)

## Dr. Gemma Frock

Aiken Technical College (SC)

## Ms. Kimberly Gant

Caldwell Community College and Technical Institute (NC)

## Dr. Julie G. Howdeshell

The University of Southern Mississippi (MS)

## Dr. Brenda Kennedy

Faulkner State Community College (AL)

## Dr. Juliana Lancaster

Georgia Gwinnett College (GA)

## Dr. Brad Petitfils, co-chair

Loyola University New Orleans (LA)

## Dr. Daniel W. Petty

Florida College (FL)

## Dr. Anthony Pina

Sullivan University System (KY)

## Ms. Kristi Shackelford <br> James Madison University (VA)

## Dr. Jaya K. Soni

Huston-Tillotson University (TX)

## Continued from

"Guidelines for Proposal Submission"

## Outline of Proposals

All proposals should be well-developed with thorough responses to the questions below. Incomplete documentation will not be reviewed.

- Proposal title. Does the title describe the content accurately, clearly, and succinctly?
- Clarity of proposal abstract. Is the abstract concise and coherent with sufficient detail to generate interest in the topic? Does the abstract describe the intended audience and proposal content level accurately?
- Relevance of the topic and its appropriateness to the theme. Does the proposal address issues of immediate relevance to higher education and the conference theme/tracks?
- Participant learning outcomes. Are the participant learning outcomes realistic, clearly stated, and reflect what participants will learn in the session?
- Significance of the content. Does the proposal make a compelling case for the session supported by relevant references? Is the content based on widely accepted practices in the field? Does the proposal demonstrate how the topic can be replicated in other settings?
- Qualifications of presenter(s). Does the proposal give evidence that the presenter(s) are well-qualified and will make an important contribution at the conference?
- Active learning. Does the proposal suggest meaningful activities for participants that appropriately support the participant learning outcomes?


## Deadline

Proposals will be reviewed by the 2016 Program Planning Committee in conjunction with SACSCOC staff. The deadline for submission of proposals is March 17. Written notification of acceptance will be provided no later than May 2.

## ITEM 4

Final 2018 Reaffirmation Committee Nominations

## 2018 Reaffirmation Committee Nominations

The 2018 SACSCOC Reaffirmation Leadership Team has re-structured the reaffirmation committees by creating eight committees, a reduction of 5 committees from 2007. The Leadership Team's proposed nominations were culled from the UT Dallas community of faculty, staff, and students. The 2018 Reaffirmation Committees represent a minimal membership at this point. The membership can be expanded to include additional members as needed.

## Committee Structure

1. Mission, Governance and Administration Committee: $\mathbf{1 0}$ members

Chair: Dr. David Cordell; Vice Chair: Serenity Rose King

## 2. Financial and Physical Resources and Information Technology Committee: $\mathbf{1 5}$ members

 Chair: Dr. Kim Laird; Vice Chair: Beth Tolan
## 3. Faculty Committee: 15 members

Chair: Dr. Murray Leaf; Vice Chair: Dr. Nicole Leeper Piquero
4. Learning and Student Resources Committee: 17 members

Chair: Josh Hammers; Vice Chair: Debbie Montgomery
5. Programs, Curriculum Instruction Committee: 31 members

Chair: Dr. Poras Balsara; Vice Chair: Dr. Marilyn Kaplan
6. Institutional Effectiveness Committee: $\mathbf{2 5}$ members

Chair: Serenity Rose King; Vice Chair: Lawrence Redlinger
7. Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) Topic Selection Committee: 13 members

Director: Dr. Jessica C. Murphy
8. Steering Committee: 19 members

Chair: Serenity Rose King; Vice Chair: Dr. Murray Leaf

Membership Summary

| Membership Representation |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Classification | Number | Percentage |
| Faculty | 57 | $50 \%$ |
| Staff | 49 | $43 \%$ |
| Students | 8 | $7 \%$ |
| Total | 114 | $100 \%$ |


| Faculty Status Representation |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Status | Number | Percentage |
| Tenured | 44 | $\mathbf{7 7 \%}$ |
| Tenure Track | 3 | $5 \%$ |
| Non-Tenured | 10 | $18 \%$ |
| Total | $\mathbf{5 7}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 \%}$ |

Charge: This committee reviews not only UT Dallas' compliance with the SACSCOC Principles, but also the UT System Board of Regents' compliance. Both the UT System and the Board of Regents play an integral role in UT Dallas' operation, and to the extent they provide the framework for UT Dallas' performance, their performance is also a factor. Additionally, this committee reviews UT Dallas' mission statement, how that mission statement translates into action, and the role of the faculty and the administrative staff in leading the institution.
2018 Committee Chair: Dr. David Cordell; Vice Chair: Serenity Rose King
10 members
Administrative Support: Vy Trang

| Principles | Related Policies | 2018 Nominations |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CR 2.1 Degree-granting authority <br> CR 2.2 Governing board <br> CR 2.3 Chief Executive Officer <br> CR 2.4 Institutional mission <br> CR 2.6 Continuous operation <br> CS 3.1.1 Mission <br> CS 3.2.1 CEO <br> evaluation/selection <br> CS 3.2.2 Governing board <br> control <br> CS 3.2.2.1 Institution's mission <br> CS 3.2.2.2 Fiscal stability of the institution <br> CS 3.2.2.3 Institutional policy <br> CS 3.2.3 Board conflict of interest <br> CS 3.2.4 External influence <br> CS 3.2.5 Board dismissal <br> CS 3.2.6 Board/administration distinction <br> CS 3.2.7 Organizational structure <br> CS 3.2.8 Qualified <br> administrative/academic <br> officers** <br> CS 3.2.9 Personnel appointment** <br> CS 3.2.10 Administrative staff evaluations <br> CS 3.2.11 Control of intercollegiate athletics <br> CS 3.2.12 Fund-raising activities | "Reaffirmation of <br> Accreditation and Subsequent Reports" <br> "Core Requirement 2.3: <br> Documenting an Alternative Approach" <br> "Distance and <br> Correspondence Education" <br> "Advertising, Student <br> Recruitment, and <br> Representation of Accredited Status" <br> "Agreements Involving Joint and Dual Academic Awards" <br> "Substantive Change for SACSCOC Accredited Institutions" <br> "Quality and Integrity of Undergraduate Degrees" <br> "Mergers, Consolidations, Change of Ownership, Acquisitions, and Change of Governance, Control, Form, or Legal Status" <br> "Unreported Substantive Change" |  |


| CS 3.2.13 Institutional-related | "Separate Accreditation for |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| entities | Units of a Member Institution" |  |
| CS 3.2.14 Intellectual property | "Integrity and Accuracy in |  |
| rights | Institutional Representation" |  |
| CS 3.4.3 Admissions policies** | "Accrediting Decisions of |  |
| CS 3.4.5 Academic policies** | Other Agencies" |  |
| CS 3.4.7 Consortial | "Complaint Procedures |  |
| relationships/contractual | Against SACSCOC or its |  |
| agreements** | Accredited Institutions" |  |
| CS 3.7.5 Faculty role in | Other Documents |  |
| governance** | "The Impact of Budget |  |
| CS 3.12.1 Substantive change | Reductions on Higher |  |
| CS 3.13.1 Policy compliance | Education" |  |
| CS 3.14.1 Publication of | "Developing Policy and |  |
| accreditation status | Procedures Documents" |  |
| FR 4.3 Publication of policies | "Closing a Program, Site, |  |
| FR 4.6 Recruitment materials | Branch or Institution" |  |

* Consolidated the 2007 Federal Mandates and Mission, Governance and Administration Committees
** Overlap of principles exists for CS 3.28, 3.2.9 and 3.7.5 (Mission and Faculty Committees) and CS 3.4.3, 3.4.5, and 3.4.7 (Mission and Programs Committees)

Note: Green highlights indicate academic senators.

## Financial and Physical Resources and Information Technology Committee

Charge: This committee ensures that the University meets the guidelines for fiscal soundness and stability, financial aid administration and regulation, sponsored research programs, and physical facilities. As a part of the committee's work, this group also focuses on environmental health and safety issues as well as campus security. This committee also reviews the entire information technology infrastructure, including the computer labs, the wireless network, email systems, and even the UT Dallas web portal to identify the degree to which UT Dallas' information technology infrastructure services not only meet the needs of students but also provides adequate safeguards against internet-driven viruses and scams.

2018 Committee Chair: Dr. Kim Laird; Vice Chair: Beth Tolan
15 members

| Principles | Related Policies | 2018 Nominations |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CR 2.11.1 Financial resources and stability <br> CR 2.11.2 Physical resources <br> CS 3.10.1 Financial stability <br> CS 3.10.2 Financial aid audits <br> CS 3.10.3 Control of finances <br> CS 3.10.4 Control of sponsored research/external funds <br> CS 3.11.1 Control of physical resources <br> CS 3.11.2 Institutional environment <br> CS 3.11.3 Physical facilities <br> FR 4.7 Title IV program responsibilities | "Distance and Correspondence Education" <br> "Integrity and Accuracy in Institutional Representation" <br> Other Documents <br> "The Impact of Budget Reductions on Higher Education" | Dr. Kim Office of <br> Laird <br> Budget and <br> Finance <br> Beth Tolan Office of <br> Financial Aid <br> Dr. Denise Campus <br> Boots <br>  Facilities <br> Committee <br> Chair; <br>  Economic, <br> Political and <br> Policy Sciences <br>  Natural <br> Sciences and <br> Izen Jathematics  |


|  |  | R. David Crain or designee <br> Dr. Darren Crone <br> Naomi Emmett <br> Kelly <br> Kinnard <br> Terry <br> Pankratz <br> Toni <br> Stephens <br> Chad <br> Thomas <br> Larry <br> Zacharias or designee | Office of Information Technology <br> Learning Technologies <br> Office of <br> Administration, <br> Financial <br> Services; Staff <br> Council <br> President <br> Facilities <br> Management <br> Office of <br> Budget and <br> Finance <br> Internal Audit <br> University <br> Safety and <br> Security Council <br> Chair; Student <br> Media <br> Police <br> Department |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

Note: Green highlights indicate academic senators.

## Faculty Committee

Charge: This committee reviews a variety of issues related to the faculty at UT Dallas. The University must demonstrate that it has an adequate faculty as well as a faculty that has members qualified to teach in the areas they are assigned. As a part of this review process, this committee will review the academic record (transcripts, vitae, research, and publications) of every faculty member who offers instruction to the students at UT Dallas. Additionally, the transcripts of every faculty member who received a graduate degree at an institution outside the United States will be reviewed by an outside agency to ensure the credentials are equivalent to similar credentials earned at accredited universities in the U.S.

2018 Committee Chair: Dr. Murray Leaf; Vice Chair: Dr. Nicole Leeper Piquero 15 members

| Principles | Related Policies | 2018 Nominations |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CR 2.8 Faculty <br> CS 3.2.8 Qualified administrative/academic officers** <br> CS 3.2.9 Personnel appointment** CS 3.4.10 Responsibility for curriculum** <br> CS 3.4.11 Academic program coordination** <br> CS 3.5.4 Terminal degrees of faculty <br> CS 3.7.1 Faculty competence <br> CS 3.7.2 Faculty evaluation <br> CS 3.7.3 Faculty development <br> CS 3.7.4 Academic freedom <br> CS 3.7.5 Faculty role in governance** | "Distance and <br> Correspondence Education" <br> "Quality and Integrity of Undergraduate Degrees" <br> Other Documents <br> "Faculty Credential Guidelines" <br> "Developing Policy and Procedures Documents" | $\left.\left.\begin{array}{ll}\text { Dr. Murray Leaf } & \begin{array}{l}\text { Vice Speaker of } \\ \text { the Senate; }\end{array} \\ & \begin{array}{l}\text { Economic, } \\ \text { Political and } \\ \text { Policy Sciences }\end{array} \\ \text { Dr. Nicole Leeper } \\ \text { Piquero } & \begin{array}{l}\text { Provost's Office, } \\ \text { Economic, }\end{array} \\ & \begin{array}{l}\text { Political and } \\ \text { Policy Sciences }\end{array} \\ \text { Dr. Timothy } & \begin{array}{l}\text { Speaker of the } \\ \text { Redman }\end{array} \\ & \begin{array}{l}\text { Senate; past } \\ \text { chair of } \\ \text { Committee on }\end{array} \\ \text { Qualifications of } \\ \text { Academic }\end{array}\right\} \begin{array}{l}\text { Personnel; Arts } \\ \text { and Humanities }\end{array}\right\}$ |


**Overlap of principles exists for CS 3.2.8, 3.2.9 and 3.7.5 (Mission and Faculty Committees) and CS 3.4.10 and 3.4.11 (Faculty and Program Committees)

Note: Green highlights indicate academic senators.

## Learning and Student Resources Committee *

Charge: This committee determines the adequacy of UT Dallas' support systems for student achievement. Simply, this committee must examine the Eugene McDermott Library, its holdings, its budget, its staff, and its program mission and goals to determine whether or not the Library meets the needs of the UT Dallas student population and faculty. Additionally, it focuses on student rights and responsibilities, the integrity and confidentiality of student records, and the effectiveness and quality of student affairs programming.
2018 Committee Chair: Josh Hammers; Vice Chair: Debbie Montgomery 17 members

| Principles | Related Policies | 2018 Nominations |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CR 2.9 Learning resources and services <br> CR 2.10 Student support services <br> CS 3.4.9 Academic support services <br> CS 3.4.12 Technology use <br> CS 3.8 Library and Other Learning Resources <br> CS 3.8.1 Learning/information resources <br> CS 3.8.2 Instruction of library use <br> CS 3.8.3 Qualified staff <br> CS 3.9 Student Affairs and <br> Services <br> CS 3.9.1 Student rights <br> CS 3.9.2 Student records <br> CS 3.9.3 Qualified staff <br> FR 4.5 Student complaints | "Distance and Correspondence Education" <br> "Complaint Procedures Against SACSCOC or its Accredited Institutions" <br> Other Documents <br> "Developing Policy and Procedures Documents" |  |


*Consolidated the 2007 Library and Other Learning Resources and Student Affairs and Student Services Committees

Note: Green highlights indicate academic senators.

## Programs, Curriculum Instruction Committee *

Charge: This committee's focus is to ascertain the University's compliance with the SACSCOC goals associated with general, undergraduate, and graduate education. This compliance requires an examination of the education components as a part of the undergraduate and graduate programs, but also focuses on the role of on- and off-campus programming as a contributor to student success. This committee also focuses on the evaluation of transfer coursework and the academic policies that contribute to "good educational practice."
2018 Committee Chair: Dr. Poras Balsara; Vice Chair: Dr. Marilyn Kaplan
31 members

| Principles | Related Policies | 2018 No | minations |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CR 2.7.1 Program length <br> CR 2.7.2 Program content <br> CR 2.7.3 General education <br> CR 2.7.4 Course work for degrees <br> CS 3.4.1 Academic program approval <br> CS 3.4.2 Continuing education/service programs <br> CS 3.4.3 Admissions policies** <br> CS 3.4.4 Acceptance of academic credits <br> CS 3.4.5 Academic policies** <br> CS 3.4.6 Practices for awarding credit <br> CS 3.4.7 Consortial relationships/contractual agreements** <br> CS 3.4.8 Noncredit to credit <br> CS 3.4.9 Academic support services <br> CS 3.4.10 Responsibility for curriculum** <br> CS 3.4.11 Academic program coordination** <br> CS 3.5.2 Institutional credits for a degree <br> CS 3.5.3 Undergraduate program requirements <br> CS 3.6.1 Post-baccalaureate program rigor <br> CS 3.6.2 Graduate curriculum | "Distance and Correspondence Education" <br> "Credit Hours" <br> "Substantive Change for SACSCOC Accredited Institutions" <br> "Agreements Involving Joint and Dual Academic Awards" <br> "Quality and Integrity of Undergraduate Degrees" <br> "Core Requirement 2.7.4: Documenting an Alternative Approach" <br> "Integrity and Accuracy in Institutional Representation" <br> "Advertising, Student <br> Recruitment, and Representation of Accredited Status" <br> Other Documents <br> "Commission Statement on Sampling" <br> "Developing Policy and Procedures Documents" <br> "Faculty Credential Guidelines" | Dr. Poras Balsara <br> Dr. Marilyn Kaplan <br> Dr. Andrew Blanchard <br> Dr. Frank Dufour <br> Dr. Euel Elliott <br> Dr. George Fair <br> Dr. Eric Farrar <br> Dr. Joanna Gentsch | Engineering and Computer Science <br> Committee on the Core <br> Curriculum <br> Chair; <br> Management <br> Dean of Undergraduate Education; Engineering and Computer Science <br> Arts, Technology, and Emerging Communication <br> Economic, Political and Policy Sciences Interdisciplinary Studies <br> Arts, Technology, and Emerging Communication <br> Graduate Studies; Behavioral and Brain Sciences |



|  |  | Dr. Tonja Wissinger <br> Courtney <br> Brecheen <br> Dr. Darren <br> Crone <br> Kimshi Hickman <br> Dr. John Jackson <br> Serenity Rose King <br> Jennifer McDowell <br> Elizabeth <br> Samuel <br> Wray Weldon <br> Brett Cease <br> Brian Moore | Interdisciplinary Studies <br> Undergraduate Education <br> Learning <br> Technologies <br> Student Success <br> Center <br> Undergraduate <br> Education <br> Assistant <br> Provost, <br> SACSCOC <br> Liaison <br> Registrar's <br> Office <br> Registrar's <br> Office <br> Office of <br> Admission and Enrollment <br> Committee on <br> Educational <br> Policy Graduate <br> Student <br> Representative; <br> Economic, <br> Political and <br> Policy Sciences <br> Committee on <br> Educational <br> Policy <br> Undergraduate <br> Student <br> Representative; <br> Economic, <br> Political and <br> Policy Sciences |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

*Consolidated the 2007 General Education, Graduate Education, and Undergraduate Education Committees
**Overlap of principles exists for CS 3.4.10 and 3.4.11 (Faculty and Program Committees) and CS 3.4.3, 3.4.5, and 3.4.7 (Mission and Programs Committees)

NOTE: this is the largest committee and will have subcommittees for Undergraduate and Graduate.

Note: Green highlights indicate academic senators.

## Institutional Effectiveness Committee *

Charge: This committee must determine the degree to which UT Dallas is actually effective in its work and to which UT Dallas displays institutional integrity. It determines the degree to which all programs and courses mesh with good educational practice and the mission and goals of the University. This committee also focuses on departments and programs not directly associated with the offering of degree credit. For example, this committee reviews the effectiveness of operations within such areas as Learning Resources, Purchasing, the International Center, the Women's Center, the Career Center, the Bursar's Office, Intercollegiate and Intramural Athletics, and Payroll and Tax Compliance.

2018 Committee Chair: Serenity Rose King; Vice Chair: Lawrence Redlinger 25 members
Administrative Support: Vy Trang

| Principles | Related Policies | 2018 Nominations |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CR 2.5 Institutional Effectiveness <br> CS 3.3.1 Institutional Effectiveness <br> CS 3.3.1.1 Educational programs, to include student learning outcomes <br> CS 3.3.1.2 Administrative support services <br> CS 3.3.1.3 Academic and student support services <br> CS 3.3.1.4 Research within its mission, if appropriate <br> CS 3.3.1.5 Community/public service within its mission, if appropriate <br> CS 3.5.1 General education competencies | "Distance and Correspondence Education" <br> Other Documents <br> "Commission Statement on Sampling" | Serenity <br> Rose King Assistant <br> Provost, <br> SACSCOC <br> Liaison <br> Dr. Lawrence  |



*Consolidated the 2007 Institutional Effectiveness, Academic Assessment, and Operational Assessment Committees
** To include input from the Development Board

Note: Green highlights indicate academic senators.

## Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) Topic Selection Committee *

Charge: This committee organizes meetings and follow-up meetings with faculty, students, staff, alumni, and members of the corporate community to communicate the QEP process and solicit input for potential topics. The data collected from these meetings are supported by email and website submissions. This committee will recommend the final QEP topic for implementation.
2018 Committee Director: Dr. Jessica C. Murphy
13 members

| Principles | Related Policies | 2018 Nominations |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CR 2.12 QEP <br> CS 3.3.2 QEP <br> Also related to other standards/requirements <br> CR 2.5 Institutional Effectiveness | Other Documents <br> "Handbook of Institutions Seeking Reaffirmation of Accreditation" | Dr. Jessica C. QEP Director; <br> Murphy Arts and <br>  Humanities |  |
|  |  | Lisa Bell | Arts, Technology, and Emerging Communication |
|  |  | Dr. Euel Elliott | Economic, Political and Policy Sciences |
|  |  | Dr. Rebecca Files | Management |
|  |  | Dr. Walter Voit | Engineering and Computer Science |
|  |  | Dr. Gene Fitch | Student Affairs |
|  |  | John Johnson | Student <br> Outreach and <br> Academic <br> Retention (SOAR) <br> Advisor |
|  |  | Dr. Kim Laird until Chief Budget Officer hired | Office of Budget and Finance |
|  |  | **Melinda <br> Mendoza- <br> Ellis | Alumni Relations and Giving, Office of Development and Alumni Relations |



* We are separating the QEP Topic Selection Committee from the QEP Council this time.
** To include input from external stakeholders

Note: Green highlights indicate academic senators.

## Steering Committee

Charge: The Steering Committee works in concert with the Leadership Team to lead the various 2018 Reaffirmation committees in their efforts to prepare the compliance certification report. Comprised of the chairs and vice chairs of the committees, in addition to key stakeholders across campus, the Steering Committee reviews the work of all committees and offers recommendations to the Leadership Team regarding needed changes and improvements in UT Dallas policy and practice.
2018 Committee Chair: Serenity Rose King; Vice Chair: Dr. Murray Leaf 20 members
Administrative Support: Vy Trang

| Principles | Related Policies | 2018 Nominations |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |



Note: Green highlights indicate academic senators.

ITEM 4A

## Appointment Letters (Samples)

| Appointment Letters |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Type | Number |
| Single Committee | 78 |
| Multiple |  |
| Committees | 15 |
| Chair / Vice Chair | 6 |
| Total | 99 |

ITEM 4C

Sample Packet

## 2018 SACSCOC Reaffirmation Committee Packet

The 2018 SACSCOC Reaffirmation Committee represents a minimal membership at this point. The membership can be expanded to include additional members as needed.

## Committee Structure

## Mission, Governance and Administration Committee: $\mathbf{1 0}$ members

Chair: Dr. David Cordell; Vice Chair: Serenity Rose King
The committee's success depends on your full commitment as a member. The initial appointment will continue through March 2018. We will receive the official decision from SACSCOC in December 2018. For additional information on the timeline, check out http://sacscoc.utdallas.edu/2018-review/timeline

## Committee Responsibilities

- Chair and Vice Chair Responsibilities:
- The chair and vice chair are expected to attend the Steering Committee meetings in order to share the information with their committee members.
- The chair and vice chair should notify Serenity Rose King (serenity.king@utdallas.edu) if additional members need to join the committee prior to the invitation. The Leadership Team will send formal appointment letters.
- Hold regular meetings.
- Submit proposed recommendations to the Steering Committee.
- Participate at each meeting by sharing ideas, suggestions, and other tasks.
- Begin data collection (if appropriate) for your unit.
- Submit approved minutes to Vy Trang (vythuy.trang@utdallas.edu). The minutes will be posted on the SACSCOC website for your committee.
- Submit progress reports to the chair and vice chair, and they will report to the Steering Committee.
- As a committee, submit a narrative report for each assigned principle. When appropriate, the 2007 Compliance Certification Report (CCR) can be used as a reference point. (http://sacscoc.utdallas.edu/ccrnav/)
- The first draft is due November 1, 2016. Additional guidance forthcoming.

Charge: This committee reviews not only UT Dallas' compliance with the SACSCOC Principles, but also the UT System Board of Regents' compliance. Both the UT System and the Board of Regents play an integral role in UT Dallas' operation, and to the extent they provide the framework for UT Dallas' performance, their performance is also a factor. Additionally, this committee reviews UT Dallas' mission statement, how that mission statement translates into action, and the role of the faculty and the administrative staff in leading the institution.
Committee Chair: Dr. David Cordell; Vice Chair: Serenity Rose King
10 members
Administrative Support: Vy Trang

| Principles | Related Policies | Members |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CR 2.1 Degree-granting authority <br> CR 2.2 Governing board <br> CR 2.3 Chief Executive Officer <br> CR 2.4 Institutional mission <br> CR 2.6 Continuous operation <br> CS 3.1.1 Mission <br> CS 3.2.1 CEO <br> evaluation/selection <br> CS 3.2.2 Governing board control <br> CS 3.2.2.1 Institution's mission <br> CS 3.2.2.2 Fiscal stability of the institution <br> CS 3.2.2.3 Institutional policy <br> CS 3.2.3 Board conflict of interest <br> CS 3.2.4 External influence <br> CS 3.2.5 Board dismissal <br> CS 3.2.6 Board/administration distinction <br> CS 3.2.7 Organizational structure <br> CS 3.2.8 Qualified administrative/academic officers** <br> CS 3.2.9 Personnel appointment** <br> CS 3.2.10 Administrative staff evaluations <br> CS 3.2.11 Control of intercollegiate athletics <br> CS 3.2.12 Fund-raising activities | "Reaffirmation of <br> Accreditation and Subsequent Reports" <br> "Core Requirement 2.3: <br> Documenting an Alternative Approach" <br> "Distance and <br> Correspondence Education" <br> "Advertising, Student <br> Recruitment, and <br> Representation of Accredited <br> Status" <br> "Agreements Involving Joint and Dual Academic Awards" <br> "Substantive Change for SACSCOC Accredited Institutions" <br> "Quality and Integrity of Undergraduate Degrees" <br> "Mergers, Consolidations, Change of Ownership, Acquisitions, and Change of Governance, Control, Form, or Legal Status" <br> "Unreported Substantive Change" |  |


| CS 3.2.13 Institutional-related | "Separate Accreditation for |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| entities | Units of a Member Institution" |  |
| CS 3.2.14 Intellectual property | "Integrity and Accuracy in |  |
| rights | Institutional Representation" |  |
| CS 3.4.3 Admissions policies** | "Accrediting Decisions of |  |
| CS 3.4.5 Academic policies** | Other Agencies" |  |
| CS 3.4.7 Consortial | "Complaint Procedures |  |
| relationships/contractual | Against SACSCOC or its |  |
| agreements** | Accredited Institutions" |  |
| CS 3.7.5 Faculty role in | "The Impact of Budget |  |
| governance** | Reductions on Higher |  |
| CS 3.12.1 Substantive change | Education" |  |
| CS 3.13.1 Policy compliance | "Developing Policy and |  |
| CS 3.14.1 Publication of | Procedures Documents" |  |
| accreditation status | "Closing a Program, Site, |  |
| FR 4.3 Publication of policies | Branch or Institution" |  |
| FR 4.6 Recruitment materials | "nants |  |

* Consolidated the 2007 Federal Mandates and Mission, Governance and Administration Committees
** Overlap of principles exists for CS 3.28, 3.2.9 and 3.7.5 (Mission and Faculty Committees) and CS 3.4.3, 3.4.5, and 3.4.7 (Mission and Programs Committees)

Note: Green highlights indicate academic senators.

