



The University of Texas at Dallas

800 West Campbell Road, AD42, Richardson, TX 75080-3021

(972) 883-6749 FAX (972) 883-2276

AGENDA

2018 SACSCOC Institutional Effectiveness Committee Meeting

April 20, 2016

JSOM, Room 2.804

1. Call to Order and Introductions Serenity King
 - A. Additional member recommendations

2. Deliverables Serenity King
 - A. Deadlines / Timelines: Draft due November 1, 2016

3. Committee Resources Serenity King
 - A. SACSCOC and other resources located on UT Dallas SACSCOC website
<http://sacscoc.utdallas.edu/>
 - B. *Resource Manual for the Principles of Accreditation: Foundations for Quality Enhancement*
<http://dox.utdallas.edu/publication1210>
 - C. IE Committee's Assigned *Principles* with web links
 - D. *Resource Manual* Excerpts for IE Committee's Assigned Principles
 - E. 2007 Compliance Certification Report (CCR) Navigator
<http://sacscoc.utdallas.edu/ccrnav/>
 - F. 2008 Focused Response Report (requires log-in)
<http://sacscoc.utdallas.edu/frnav/>
 - G. SACSCOC Report Fall 2015 (requires log-in)
 - H. SACSCOC Top 10 Principles: 2013 and 2014 Preliminary Data Charts
2013 Chart: <http://dox.utdallas.edu/chart1236>
2014 Chart: <http://dox.utdallas.edu/chart1235>
 - I. UT Dallas Strategic Plan
<http://www.utdallas.edu/strategicplan/>
 - J. *The Principles of Accreditation: Foundations for Quality Enhancement*
<http://dox.utdallas.edu/publication1209>

4. Future Meetings Serenity King

5. Questions/Concerns Serenity King

6. Adjournment Serenity King

ITEM 1

2018 Institutional Effectiveness Committee

Chair: Serenity Rose King

Co-Chair: Dr. Lawrence J. Redlinger

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.

Committee Members:

Kutsal Dogan	Assistant Dean for Graduate Programs and Clinical Professor, Naveen Jindal School of Management
Monica Evans	Associate Professor, School of Arts, Technology, and Emerging Communication
George W. Fair	Vice President for Diversity and Community Engagement
Michele Hanlon	Assistant Dean for Undergraduate Studies and Clinical Associate Professor, School of Arts and Humanities
Jennifer S. Holmes	Professor, School of Economic, Political and Policy Sciences
Marilyn Kaplan	Committee on the Core Curriculum Chair; Associate Dean for Undergraduate Programs and Study Abroad and Clinical Professor, Naveen Jindal School of Management
Kamran Kiasaleh	Associate Dean of Assessment and Professor, Erik Jonsson School of Engineering and Computer Science
Theodore Price	Associate Professor, School of Behavioral and Brain Sciences
Jerry Alexander	Assistant Dean for Student Development, Erik Jonsson School of Engineering and Computer Science
Pete Bond	Assistant Vice President for Procurement, Office of Budget and Finance

Michael Carriaga	Accreditation and Assessment Coordinator, Provost's Office
Lauren DeCillis	Director of the Galerstein Women's Center
Kyle Edgington	Associate Vice President for Development, Office of Development and Alumni Relations
Cheryl Friesenhahn	Director of Financial Services, Bursar, Office of Budget and Finance
Josh Hammers	Director of Assessment, Student Affairs
Kimberly Laird ¹	Associate Vice President and Controller, Office of Budget and Finance
Rafael Martin	Associate Vice President for Research, Office of Research
Catherine Parsonneault	Assistant Dean of Assessment, School of Arts and Humanities
Gloria Shenoy	Director of Assessment, Provost's Office
Toni Stephens	Executive Director, Internal Audit
Mary Jo Venetis	Director, Provost's Office
Kim Winkler	Associate Dean of Student Engagement Initiatives, Student Affairs
Sayeeda Jamilah	Graduate Student Representative, School of Economic, Political and Policy Sciences; Research Assistant, Provost's Office
Vy Trang	Administrative Associate, Provost's Office

¹ Will serve until Chief Budget Officer hired.

ITEM 3C

IE Committee's Assigned *Principles* with web links

Online, interactive version found here: <http://sacscoc.utdallas.edu/ccrnav/>

¹ **2.5 - Institutional Effectiveness:** The institution engages in ongoing, integrated, and institution-wide research-based planning and evaluation processes that (1) incorporate a systematic review of institutional mission, goals, and outcomes; (2) result in continuing improvement in institutional quality; and (3) demonstrate the institution is effectively accomplishing its mission.

<http://go.utdallas.edu/ccr2007/u205>

3.3.1 - Institutional Effectiveness: The institution identifies expected outcomes, assesses the extent to which it achieves these outcomes, and provides evidence of improvement based on analysis of the results in each of the following areas:

Note: no narrative associated with this standard.

3.3.1.1 educational programs, to include student learning outcomes

<http://go.utdallas.edu/ccr2007/u320>

3.3.1.2 administrative support services

<http://go.utdallas.edu/ccr2007/u321>

² **3.3.1.3** academic and student support services

<http://go.utdallas.edu/ccr2007/u322>

² **3.3.1.4** research within its mission, if appropriate

<http://go.utdallas.edu/ccr2007/u323>

² **3.3.1.5** community/public service within its mission, if appropriate

<http://go.utdallas.edu/ccr2007/u324>

¹ Standard also assigned to Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) Topic Selection Committee for overall QEP's effectiveness.

² Standard revised since 2008 edition. See "SACSCOC Revised Principles" section below.

3.5.1 - General Education Competencies: The institution identifies college-level general education competencies and the extent to which students have attained them.

<http://go.utdallas.edu/ccr2007/u337>

Related SACSCOC Policies and Documents

<http://www.sacscoc.org/policies.asp>

Policy

Distance and Correspondence Education

Document

Commission Statement on Sampling

SACSCOC Revised *Principles* since 2008 edition

- **3.3.1.3** – changed wording from “educational support services” to “academic and student support services”
- **3.3.1.4** – replaced “...educational mission...” with “mission”
- **3.3.1.5** – replaced “...educational mission...” with “mission”

***A Principle* requiring special attention from IE Committee**

³ **4.1 - Student Achievement:** The institution evaluates success with respect to student achievement consistent with its mission. Criteria may include: enrollment data; retention, graduation, course completion, and job placement rates; state licensing examinations; student portfolios; or other means of demonstrating achievement of goals.

Note: this standard was also revised since the 2008 edition.

- **4.1** – changed wording from, “The institution evaluates success with respect to student achievement including, as appropriate, consideration of course completion, state licensing examinations, and job placement rates.”

³ Standard also assigned to Programs, Curriculum Instruction Committee.

ITEM 3D

*Resource Manual Excerpts for IE Committee's
Assigned Principles*

Principles

2.5 The institution engages in ongoing, integrated, and institution-wide research-based planning and evaluation processes that (1) incorporate a systematic review of institutional mission, goals, and outcomes; (2) result in continuing improvement in institutional quality; and (3) demonstrate the institution is effectively accomplishing its mission. (*Institutional effectiveness*)

Rationale and Notes

Institutional effectiveness is the systematic, explicit, and documented process of measuring institutional performance against mission in all aspects of an institution. It permeates all facets of the institution. The purpose of this Core Requirement is to assure that the institution has an appropriate approach to institution-wide effectiveness that supports its mission and serves as a framework for linking mission to planning. A commitment to continuous improvement is at the heart of an on-going planning and evaluation process. It is a continuous, cyclical process that is participative, strategic, flexible, relevant, and responsive. An approach to institutional effectiveness includes all programs, services, and constituencies; is strongly linked to the decision-making process at all levels; and provides a sound basis for budget decisions, resource allocations, and plans for institutional improvement.

The various activities of the institution's planning and evaluation system may be scheduled at periodic intervals that make sense for the institution and its mission. The results of diverse assessment efforts can be integrated to provide a sound basis for plans aimed at institution-wide improvement.

Even though the concept of institutional effectiveness may not be explicitly referenced in all of the comprehensive standards, the accreditation process assumes that all programs and services wherever offered within the context of the institution's mission and activity are reviewed as part of the institutional effectiveness process.

Note: Core Requirement 2.5 is distinguishable from CS 3.3.1 in that CR 2.5 focuses on institutional effectiveness at an institution-wide level. In CS 3.3.1, the effectiveness of the functioning units is addressed.

Relevant Questions for Consideration

- How are the institution's systematic, ongoing, integrated, research-based (data-based) reviews conducted?
- How does the institution describe its planning and evaluation process?
- What evidence exists that the institution-wide planning and evaluation processes incorporate a systematic review of institutional mission, goals and outcomes?
- What evidence exists that the institution-wide planning and evaluation processes result in continuing improvements in institutional quality?
- What evidence exists that the institution-wide planning and evaluation processes demonstrate that the institution is effectively accomplishing its mission?
- How does the institution demonstrate a sustained, documented history of planning evaluation cycles, including the use of results for improvement to accomplish the institution's mission?
- Is there appropriate institutional research and budgetary support for assessment programs throughout the institution?
- What is the evidence that data from various sources concerning the effectiveness of programs and services are being used to make decisions for improvement?
- How is the institutional effectiveness process related to the budget?
- Are appropriate internal and external constituents and stakeholders involved in the planning and assessment process?

Documentation

Required Documentation, if applicable

- Description of the institutional effectiveness process

- Documentation that shows that the process includes a systematic review that results in continuing improvement and demonstrates the extent to which an institution accomplishes its goals

Examples of other Types of Documentation

- Evidence of linkage of institutional effectiveness to institutional mission
- Documentation that the institution has a systematic, ongoing, integrated, research-based process
- Institutional plans and budgets that demonstrate the linkage of assessment findings to planning at all levels
- Strategic institution-wide plans (or similar) that drive the mission
- Minutes from appropriate units, committees, task forces charged with coordination of institutional effectiveness and evidence of broad-based involvement of faculty, staff, students and other stakeholders in the institutional effectiveness process
- Documentation that relates to institutional effectiveness, such as budget preparation instructions, minutes of budget presentation meetings, annual reports, annual assessment updates, institutional effectiveness reports
- Recent examples of how institution-wide planning/effectiveness has affected the institution

Reference to Commission Documents, if applicable

Commission Statement on Sampling (See definition of “Sampling” in the Glossary.)

Cross References to other related Standards/Requirements, if applicable

Comprehensive Standard 3.3.1

Comprehensive Standard 3.5.1

Federal Requirement 4.1

3.3.1 The institution identifies expected outcomes, assesses the extent to which it achieves these outcomes, and provides evidence of improvement based on analysis of the results in each of the following areas: (*Institutional effectiveness*)

3.3.1.1. educational programs, to include student learning outcomes

3.3.1.2. administrative support services

3.3.1.3. academic and student support services

3.3.1.4. research within its mission, if appropriate

3.3.1.5. community/public service within its mission, if appropriate

Rationale and Notes

This standard addresses the process of assessment that supports the institution’s educational programs, its administrative support services, its academic and student support services, and, as appropriate, its research and community/public service; this process serves as the cornerstone of institutional effectiveness. Institutional effectiveness focuses on the design and improvement of educational experiences to enhance student learning.

Guiding statements designed to assist institutions in documenting compliance:

1. Institutions should interpret “outcome” in a manner consistent with an academic program or a given service unit’s mission and role in the institution. It is the institution’s responsibility to explain how each unit’s outcomes are related to its mission and role in the institution.
2. While it is clear from the standard that assessment is at the program level for academic programs, institutions should determine the organizational levels at which assessment is useful and efficient for administrative and for academic and student support units. It is incumbent on the institution to explain how this determination follows from its mission and organizational structure.

3. Institutions are not required or expected to use the same assessment procedures in each of the four areas; in particular, administrative support services, academic and student support services, research within the mission, and community/public service within the mission need not be assessed in the same way as educational programs. However, institutions are expected to use multiple assessments in each area. Consequently, grades alone for the assessment of educational programs or student learning outcomes are insufficient.
4. Institutions that engage in research or public service should carefully frame the scope of their discussion of CS 3.3.1.4 and CS 3.3.1.5 by identifying their research and their service missions, explaining the ways in which the institution has chosen to evaluate the effectiveness of each. This may include a connection with its educational programs and discussing its assessment of the impact of research and service on the institution and its programs, as appropriate.
5. There is a clear expectation that an institution be able to demonstrate institutional effectiveness for all its diplomas, certificates, and undergraduate and graduate educational degree programs.
6. The expectation is that the institution will engage in on-going planning and assessment to ensure that for each academic program, the institution develops and assesses student learning outcomes. Program and learning outcomes specify the knowledge, skills, values, and attitudes students are expected to attain in courses or in a program. Methods for assessing the extent to which students achieve these outcomes are appropriate to the nature of the discipline, and consistent over time to enable the institution to evaluate cohorts of students who complete courses or a program. Shared widely within and across programs, the results of this assessment can affirm the institution's success at achieving its mission and can be used to inform decisions about curricular and programmatic revisions. At appropriate intervals, program and learning outcomes and assessment methods are evaluated and revised.
7. An institution may provide a *sampling* of its programs as long as it is representative of its mission and includes a valid cross-section of programs from every school or division and at each degree level. Sampling should also include programs offered at off-campus instructional sites and course work offered through distance or correspondence education. It is the institution's responsibility to make a compelling case as to why the sampling and assessment findings are an appropriate representation of the institution's programs. This sampling, however, does not preclude the institution from having data/analysis available on the effectiveness of all programs in case evaluators request to review it. It is the evaluators' prerogative to conduct a more in-depth review of an institution's data/findings/analysis on the effectiveness of its educational programs.
8. Institutional effectiveness can be achieved in a variety of ways and the mentality that "one size fits all" is inappropriate and diminishes the individual missions of institutions. The institution should develop and/or use methods and instruments that are uniquely suited to the goal statements and that are supported by faculty.
9. At the time of its review, the institution is responsible for producing mature data. Mature data can be defined as sufficient information used as a basis for sound decision making.
10. At the time of its review, the institution is responsible for providing *evidence* of improvement, based on the analysis of the assessment results, as opposed to a *plan* for improvement.

Notes: For consistency in rhetoric, the Commission uses "assessment" in place of evaluation, and "outcomes" instead of objectives/goals.

The institution should define "units" based on its organizational structure.

While institutions may organize functions differently, it is expected that all services, whether administrative or academic student support services, engage in the institutional effectiveness processes

3.3.1.1 Educational programs, to include student learning

Note: In this standard, the Commission expects the review of the effectiveness of educational programs and of student learning.

Relevant Questions for Consideration

- How are expected outcomes clearly defined in measurable terms for each educational program?
- What is the evidence of assessment activities for each program?
- How are periodic reviews in which programmatic outcomes assessed, reviewed, and used for improvements?
- How does the institution's use of assessment results improve educational programs?
- If the institution used sampling, why were the sampling and findings an appropriate representation of the institution's programs?
- What assessment instruments were used and why were they selected? Were multiple assessment methods used? If so, describe.
- Have the programs assessed the extent to which they have been successful in achieving their learning outcomes?
- If called for, have program improvements been made as a result of assessment findings?
- How does the institution's use of assessment results improve educational programs?

Documentation

Required Documentation, if applicable

- Documentation of expected outcomes for educational programs and for student learning outcomes
- Documentation of the evaluation of those outcomes
- Evidence that the student support services and programs effectively meet the needs of students of all types
- Documentation of the use of the findings from assessment to improve the institution
- If sampling is used, (1) how the sampling is representative of the institution's mission, (2) documentation of a valid cross-section of programs, and a (3) case as to why sampling and assessment findings are an appropriate representation of the institution's programs.

Reference to Commission Documents, if applicable

"Distance and Correspondence Education"

Cross References to other related Standards/Requirements, if applicable

Core Requirement 2.5

Comprehensive Standard 3.5.1

Federal Requirement 4.1

3.3.1.2 Administrative support services

Note: Administrative support service units normally include finance, administrative facilities, administrative services, development/advancement, the president's office, etc.

Relevant Questions for Consideration

- How are expected outcomes clearly defined in measurable terms for each unit?
- What is the evidence of assessment activities for each unit?
- How are periodic reviews used for improvements?
- How does the institution's use of assessment results improve administrative support services?
- What assessment instruments were used and why were they selected? Were multiple assessment methods used? If so, describe.
- If the institution used sampling, why were the sampling and findings an appropriate representation of the institution's administrative units?

Documentation

Required Documentation, if applicable

- Definition of institution's administrative support service unit
- Documentation of expected outcomes for administrative support services
- Documentation of the evaluation of those outcomes
- Documentation of the use of the findings from assessment to improve the institution
- If sampling is used, (1) how the sampling is representative of the institution's mission, (2) documentation of a valid cross-section of units, and a (3) case as to why sampling and assessment findings are an appropriate representation of the institution's units

Reference to Commission Documents, if applicable

"Distance and Correspondence Education"

Cross References to other related Standards/Requirements, if applicable

Core Requirement 2.5

3.3.1.3 Academic and student support services

Note: Academic and student support services normally include such activities as living/ learning resources, tutoring, financial aid, residence life, student activities, dean of students' office, etc.

Relevant Questions for Consideration

- How are expected outcomes clearly defined in measurable terms for each unit?
- What is the evidence of assessment activities for each unit?
- How are periodic reviews used for improvements?
- How does the institution's use of assessment results improve academic and student support services?
- What assessment instruments were used and why were they selected? Were multiple assessment methods used? If so, describe.
- If the institution used sampling, why were the sampling and findings an appropriate representation of the institution's administrative units?

Documentation

Required Documentation, if applicable

- Definition of institution's academic and student support services units
- Documentation expected outcomes for academic and student support services
- Documentation of the evaluation of those outcomes
- Documentation of the use of the findings from assessment to improve the institution
- If sampling is used, (1) how the sampling is representative of the institution's mission, (2) documentation of a valid cross-section of units, and a (3) case as to why sampling and assessment findings are an appropriate representation of the institution's units

Examples of other Types of Documentation

- Evidence that the student support services and programs effectively meet the need of students of all types and promote student learning and development

Reference to Commission Documents, if applicable

"Distance and Correspondence Education"

Cross References to other related Standards/Requirements, if applicable

Core Requirement 2.5

Core Requirement 2.9

Core Requirement 2.10

3.3.1.4 Research within its mission, if appropriate

Note: Research within an institution's mission normally includes (1) research units, research centers, institutes, etc.; (2) sponsored research programs, usually with defined areas of research (e.g., energy, environment, innovative technologies, etc.); and (3) degree programs and courses where research is an expected outcome.

Relevant Questions for Consideration

- How does the institution define research within its mission?
- Has the institution articulated its research outcomes in relation to its mission?
- How are expected outcomes clearly defined in measurable terms?
- What is the evidence of assessment activities for research?
- How are periodic reviews used for improvement of effectiveness?
- How does the institution's use of assessment results improve research?
- What assessment instruments were used and why were they selected? Were multiple assessment methods used? If so, describe.
- If the institution used sampling, why were the sampling and findings an appropriate representation of the institution's research mission?
- How does the faculty's research and scholarship contribute to and benefit the institution's research mission?
- How does research contribute to the intellectual mission of the institution?

Documentation

Required Documentation, if applicable

- Definition of institution's research mission
- Documentation of expected outcomes for its research mission
- Documentation of the evaluation of those outcomes
- Documentation of the use of the findings from assessment to improve the institution
- If sampling is used, (1) how the sampling is representative of the institution's mission, (2) documentation of a valid cross-section of units, and a (3) case as to why sampling and assessment findings are an appropriate representation of the institution's research mission

Examples of other Types of Documentation

- Representative sample of research activities

Reference to Commission Documents, if applicable

None noted

Cross References to other related Standards/Requirements, if applicable

Core Requirement 2.5

Comprehensive Standard 3.7.3

3.3.1.5 Community/public service within its mission, if appropriate

Note: Community/public service within an institution's mission normally includes (1) centers and institutes that focus on community needs and (2) units and formal programs that deliver the outreach mission.

Relevant Questions for Consideration

- How does the institution define community/public service?
- Has the institution articulated its community/public service outcomes in relation to its mission?
- How are expected outcomes clearly defined in measurable terms?
- What is the evidence of assessment activities for community/public service?
- How are periodic reviews used for improvements?
- How does the institution's use of assessment results improve community/public service?

- What assessment instruments were used and why were they selected? Were multiple assessment methods used? If so, describe.
- If the institution used sampling, why were the sampling and findings an appropriate representation of the institution's community/public service mission?

Documentation

Required Documentation, if applicable

- Definition of institution's community and public service mission
- Documentation of expected outcomes for its community and public service mission
- Documentation of the evaluation of those outcomes
- Documentation of the use of the findings from assessment to improve the institution
- If sampling is used, (1) how the sampling is representative of the institution's mission, (2) documentation of a valid cross-section of units, and a (3) case as to why sampling and assessment findings are an appropriate representation of the institution's community and public service mission

Reference to Commission Documents, if applicable

None noted

Cross References to other related Standards/Requirements, if applicable

Core Requirement 2.5

Comprehensive Standard 3.4.2

3.5.1 The institution identifies college-level general education competencies and the extent to which students have attained them.

(General education competencies)

Rationale and Notes

Since general education requirements are central to educational programs, this standard assumes that the institution will define specifically which competencies are appropriate to the goals of its general education program and consistent with principles of good practice. The institution is responsible for identifying measures to determine the extent to which students have attained those competencies during their course of study as well as the extent to which students have actually attained those competencies.

Note: This standard addresses college-level competencies within the general education core; it does not require a specific course to address each competency. In addition, there is no requirement regarding when the institution must determine student attainment of competencies.

Relevant Questions for Consideration

- What are the specific college-level competencies within the general education program?
- What evidence is available to show the extent to which students have attained these competencies?
- What evidence exists that demonstrates that the institution identifies competencies that are college-level?
- What criteria does the institution use to set an acceptable benchmark for student attainment of competencies?

Documentation

Required Documentation, if applicable

- Identification of competencies
- Justification that all competencies are at the college level and the degree to which students have attained them are acceptable

- Evidence of the extent to which students of undergraduate degree programs have attained the college-level competencies

Examples of other Types of Documentation

- Follow up studies of graduates

Reference to Commission Documents, if applicable

“The Quality and Integrity of Undergraduate Degrees”

Cross References to other related Standards/Requirements, if applicable

Core Requirement 2.7.3

Comprehensive Standard 3.3.1.1

Federal Requirement 4.1

4.1 The institution evaluates success with respect to student achievement consistent with its mission. Criteria may include: enrollment data; retention, graduation, course completion, and job placement rates; state licensing examinations; student portfolios; or other means of demonstrating achievement of goals. (*Student achievement*)

Rationale and Notes

An institution needs to be able to document its success with respect to student achievement. In doing so, it may use a broad range of criteria to include, as appropriate, enrollment data; retention, graduation, course completion, and job placement rates; state licensing examinations; student portfolios; or other means of demonstrating achievement of goals.

Note: In accord with federal regulations, it is expected that the institution will demonstrate its success with respect to student achievement and indicate the criteria and threshold of acceptability used to determine that success. In its report, the Commission’s off-site (for reaffirmations) and on-site committees will examine and analyze (1) documentation demonstrating success with respect to student achievement, (2) the appropriateness of criteria and threshold of acceptability used to determine student achievement, and (3) data provided to document student achievement.

Relevant Questions for Consideration

- How does the institution document successful student achievement in relation to its mission?
- Are the criteria mentioned above in this standard appropriate to the mission of the institution? If so, how does the institution use the findings?
- If the institution does not use the criteria above in this standard, what are the criteria used by the institution and why are they appropriate?
- What is the expected threshold of achievement for each criterion and why is it appropriate?
- How does the institution use data to support and improve student achievement?

Documentation

Required Documentation, if applicable

- Documentation of appropriate criteria used to determine successful student achievement
- Documentation of the expected threshold of achievement for each criterion and the rationale for why each is appropriate
- Documentation of data used to demonstrate achievement of goals

Examples of other Types of Documentation

- Sample documentation of student achievement such as trend data showing course completion by discipline, pass rates on state licensing exams, job placement rates by degree program, and others

- Documentation of the institution actively following up with students who have graduated

Reference to Commission Documents, if applicable

Commission Statement on Sampling (See “sampling” in the Glossary.)

Cross References to other related Standards/Requirements, if applicable

Core Requirement 2.5

Comprehensive Standard 3.3.1.1

Policies

“Distance and Correspondence Education”

Other

“Commission Statement on Sampling”

ITEM 3F

2008 Focused Response Report

<http://dox.utdallas.edu/report1496/dcclojmeat>

The following *Principles* were reported “non-compliant” by the Off-Site Review Committee in 2008. UT Dallas responded through the Focused Response Report, providing additional information for each *Principle*. Upon review, the On-Site Review Committee concurred that UT Dallas made appropriate changes to be in compliance.

CR Principle 2.7.1 Program length

Fast track option for undergraduate students that could result in a student earning a master’s degree with less than 30 semester credit hours of graduate work as a graduate student.

CR Principle 2.8 Number of faculty members to support the institution mission

Report was unclear in providing the actual numbers of part-time instructors, showing a discrepancy between the two given numbers.

CR Principle 2.11.1 Sound financial base

UT Dallas had not submitted its FY2007 financial statement, which was unavailable when the compliance report was submitted in 2007.

CS Principle 3.2.10 Administrative staff evaluations

UT Dallas lacked documentation to indicate that periodic evaluations of academic administrators were conducted. Evidence was produced in the focused report.

CS Principle 3.6.3 Institutional credits for a degree

Transfer graduate students were allowed to transfer up to 50% of coursework which could result in less than a majority of the work done at UT Dallas.

CS Principle 3.7.1 Faculty competence/qualifications

The six faculty members in question were terminated, reassigned, or have now received the appropriate doctoral credentials.

CS Principle 3.7.2 Faculty evaluation

UT Dallas lacked documentation to indicate periodic evaluation of faculty members.

ITEM 3H

SACSCOC Top 10 Cited Principles

2013 and 2014 Preliminary Data Charts

PRELIMINARY DATA

Top 10 Most Frequently Cited *Principles* in Reaffirmation Reviews: 2013 Reaffirmation Class Institutions

OFF-Site Review			ON-Site Review			C&R Review		
Rank	Requirement/Standard	% Institutions	Rank	Requirement/Standard	% Institutions	Rank	Requirement/Standard	% Institutions
1.	3.7.1 (Faculty Competence)	100%	1.	3.3.2 (Quality Enhancement Plan)	59%	1.	3.3.1.1 (IE – Educational Programs)	21%
2.	3.3.1.1 (IE – Educational Programs)	64%	2.	3.3.1.1 (IE – Educational Programs)	36%	2.	3.3.1.2 (IE – Administrative Units)	13%
3.	3.4.11 (Academic Program Coordination)	59%	3.	3.3.1.3 (IE – Educational Support)	29%	3.	3.5.1 (General Education Competencies)	
4.	2.8 (Faculty)	53%	4.	3.7.1 (Faculty Competence)		4.	3.3.1.3 (IE – Educational Support)	12%
5.	3.3.1.3 (IE – Educational Support)		5.	3.3.1.2 (IE – Administrative Units)	24%	5.	3.3.1.5 (IE – Community/Public Service)	11%
6.	3.2.14 (Intellectual Property Rights)	52%	6.	3.3.1.5 (IE – Community/Public Service)	23%	6.	3.13.4b (Corporate Structure)	9%
7.	3.3.1.2 (IE – Administrative Units)		7.	3.5.1 (General Education Competencies)	20%	7.	3.3.2 (Quality Enhancement Plan)	5%
8.	3.3.1.5 (IE – Community/Public Service)		8.	3.3.1.4 (IE – Research)	9%	8.	3.10.3 (Control of Finances)	
9.	2.11.1 (Financial Resources)	48%	9.	3.10.1 (Financial Stability)	8%	9.	2.8 (Faculty)	4%
10.	3.5.1 (General Education Competencies)	45%	10.	3.10.3 (Control of Finances)		10.	3.3.1.4 (IE – Research)	
				3.13.4b (Corporate Structure)			3.10.1 (Financial Stability)	

Key Descriptive Statistics (Number of <i>Principles</i> Cited Per Institution)				Key Descriptive Statistics (Number of <i>Principles</i> Cited Per Institution)				Key Descriptive Statistics (Number of <i>Principles</i> Cited Per Institution)			
<i>Mean</i> = 19.8	<i>SD</i> =7.9	<i>Median</i> =18	<i>Range</i> =37	<i>Mean</i> = 3.4	<i>SD</i> =2.7	<i>Median</i> =3	<i>Range</i> =11	<i>Mean</i> = 1.2	<i>SD</i> =1.5	<i>Median</i> =1	<i>Range</i> =5
Selected General Areas of Non-Compliance (<i>Selected</i> * CR, CS, FR)			% of the Total Number of Citations of Non-Compliance	Selected General Areas of Non-Compliance (<i>Selected</i> * CR, CS, FR)			% of the Total Number of Citations of Non-Compliance	Selected General Areas of Non-Compliance (<i>Selected</i> * CR, CS, FR)			% of the Total Number of Citations of Non-Compliance
Policy-Related <i>Principles</i> (3.2.2, 3.2.3, 3.2.5, 3.2.6, 3.2.9, 3.2.14, 3.4.3, 3.4.4, 3.4.5, 3.7.4, 3.7.5, 3.9.1, 3.12.1, 3.13.1, 4.3, 4.5, 4.8.2, 4.8.3, 4.9)			26.9%	Institutional Effectiveness (2.4, 2.5, 3.1.1, 3.3.1.1-5, 3.4.7, 3.5.1, 4.1)			45.8%	Institutional Effectiveness (2.4, 2.5, 3.1.1, 3.3.1.1-5, 3.4.7, 3.5.1, 4.1)			64.8%
Institutional Effectiveness (2.4, 2.5, 3.1.1, 3.3.1.1-5, 3.4.7, 3.5.1, 4.1)			21.7%	Educational Programs/Curriculum (2.7, 3.4-6, 4.2, 4.4 + 2.12 and 3.3.2 – (3.4.7+3.5.1))			24.5%	Financial and Physical Resources (2.11, 3.10, 3.11)			9.9%
Educational Programs/Curriculum (2.7, 3.4-6, 4.2, 4.4 – (3.5.1+3.4.7))			15.5%	Faculty Issues (2.8, 3.4.11, 3.5.4, 3.7)			15.4%	Educational Programs/Curriculum (2.7, 3.4-6, 4.2, 4.4 + 2.12 and 3.3.2 – (3.4.7+3.5.1))			7.7%
Faculty Issues (2.8, 3.4.11, 3.5.4, 3.7)			16.9%	Financial and Physical Resources (2.11, 3.10, 3.11)			6.3%	Faculty Issues (2.8, 3.4.11, 3.5.4, 3.7)			6.6%
Financial and Physical Resources (2.11, 3.10, 3.11)			11.8%	Policy-Related <i>Principles</i> (3.2.2, 3.2.3, 3.2.5, 3.2.6, 3.2.9, 3.2.14, 3.4.3, 3.4.4, 3.4.5, 3.7.4, 3.7.5, 3.9.1, 3.12.1, 3.13.1, 4.3, 4.5, 4.8.2, 4.8.3, 4.9)			5.1%	Policy-Related <i>Principles</i> (3.2.2, 3.2.3, 3.2.5, 3.2.6, 3.2.9, 3.2.14, 3.4.3, 3.4.4, 3.4.5, 3.7.4, 3.7.5, 3.9.1, 3.12.1, 3.13.1, 4.3, 4.5, 4.8.2, 4.8.3, 4.9)			1.1%
Student Services/Learning Support (2.9, 2.10, 3.8, 3.9, 3.4.9, 4.5, 3.13.3)			10.1%	Student Services/Learning Support (2.9, 2.10, 3.8, 3.9, 3.4.9, 4.5, 3.13.3)			1.2%	Student Services/Learning Support (2.9, 2.10, 3.8, 3.9, 3.4.9, 4.5, 3.13.3)			1.1%

OTR || 2014 || For more information, please contact Alexei Matveev, Director of Training Research, at amatveev@sacscoc.org

PRELIMINARY DATA

PRELIMINARY DATA

Top 10 Most Frequently Cited *Principles* in Reaffirmation Reviews: 2014 Reaffirmation Class Institutions (N=83)

Review Stage I: OFF-Site Committee			Review Stage II: ON-Site Committee			Review Stage III: C&R Board of Trustees			
Rank	Requirement/Standard	% Institutions in Non- Compliance	Rank	Requirement/Standard	% Institutions in Non- Compliance	Rank	Requirement/Standard	% Institutions in Non- Compliance	
1.	3.7.1 (Faculty Competence)	94%	1.	3.3.2 (Quality Enhancement Plan)	47%	1.	3.3.1.1 (IE – Educational Programs)	12%	
2.	3.3.1.1 (IE – Educational Programs)	61%	2.	3.3.1.1 (IE – Educational Programs)	31%	2.	3.3.1.2 (IE – Administrative Units)	6%	
3.	2.11.1 (Financial Resources)	48%	3.	3.7.1 (Faculty Competence)	28%	3.	3.3.1.3 (IE – Educational Support)		
4.	3.4.11 (Academic Program Coordination)	46%	4.	3.3.1.2 (IE – Administrative Units)	14%	4.	3.10.1 (Financial Stability)		
5.	3.3.1.5 (IE – Community/Public Service)	45%	5.	3.3.1.3 (IE – Educational Support)	12%	5.	3.3.1.5 (IE – Community/Public Service)	5%	
6.	3.3.1.2 (IE – Administrative Units)	40%	6.	3.3.1.5 (IE – Community/Public Service)		6.	3.7.1 (Faculty Competence)		
7.	3.7.2 (Faculty Evaluation)	39%	7.	3.10.1 (Financial Stability)	7%	7.	3.3.2 (Quality Enhancement Plan)	4%	
8.	3.3.1.3 (IE – Educational Support)	37%	8.	3.5.1 (General Education Competencies)	6%	8.	3.5.1 (General Education Competencies)		
9.	2.8 (Faculty)	36%	9.	3.7.2 (Faculty Evaluation)		<3%			
10.	3.5.1 (General Education Competencies) 4.1 (Student Achievement)	35%	10.	3.12.1 (Substantive Change)					
Key Descriptive Statistics (Number of <i>Principles</i> Cited Per Institution)			Key Descriptive Statistics (Number of <i>Principles</i> Cited Per Institution)			Key Descriptive Statistics (Number of <i>Principles</i> Cited Per Institution)			
Mean= 16.5 SD=9.4		Median=15	Range=56		Mean= 2.5 SD=2.5		Median=2	Range=10	
Selected General Areas of Non-Compliance <i>(Selected CR, CS, FR)</i>		% of the Total Number of Findings of Non-Compliance	Selected General Areas of Non-Compliance <i>(Selected CR, CS, FR)</i>		% of the Total Number of Findings of Non-Compliance	Selected General Areas of Non-Compliance <i>(Selected CR, CS, FR)</i>		% of the Total Number of Findings of Non-Compliance	
Policy-Related <i>Principles</i> (3.2.2, 3.2.3, 3.2.5, 3.2.6, 3.2.9, 3.2.14, 3.4.3, 3.4.4, 3.4.5, 3.7.4, 3.7.5, 3.9.1, 3.12.1, 3.13.1-5, 4.3, 4.5, 4.8.2, 4.8.3, 4.9)		22%	Institutional Effectiveness (2.4, 2.5, 3.1.1, 3.3.1.1-5, 4.1)		33%	Institutional Effectiveness (2.4, 2.5, 3.1.1, 3.3.1.1-5, 4.1)		52%	
Educational Programs/Curriculum (2.7, 3.4-6, 4.2, 4.4 + 2.12 and 3.3.2)		20%	Educational Programs/Curriculum (2.7, 3.4-6, 4.2, 4.4 + 2.12 and 3.3.2)		30%	Educational Programs/Curriculum (2.7, 3.4-6, 4.2, 4.4 + 2.12 and 3.3.2)		18%	
Faculty (2.8, 3.4.11*, 3.5.4*, 3.7)		17 %	Faculty (2.8, 3.4.11*, 3.5.4*, 3.7)		16%	Financial and Physical Resources (2.11, 3.10, 3.11)		12%	
Institutional Effectiveness (2.4, 2.5, 3.1.1, 3.3.1.1-5, 4.1)		16%	Student Services/Learning Support (2.9, 2.10, 3.8, 3.9, 3.4.9, 4.5, 3.13.3)		7%	Faculty (2.8, 3.4.11*, 3.5.4*, 3.7)		10%	
Student Services/Learning Support (2.9, 2.10, 3.8, 3.9, 3.4.9, 4.5, 3.13.3)		13%	Policy-Related <i>Principles</i> (3.2.2, 3.2.3, 3.2.5, 3.2.6, 3.2.9, 3.2.14, 3.4.3, 3.4.4, 3.4.5, 3.7.4, 3.7.5, 3.9.1, 3.12.1, 3.13.1-5, 4.3, 4.5, 4.8.2, 4.8.3, 4.9)		6%	Student Services/Learning Support (2.9, 2.10, 3.8, 3.9, 3.4.9, 4.5, 3.13.3)		2%	
Financial and Physical Resources (2.11, 3.10, 3.11)		12%	Financial and Physical Resources (2.11, 3.10, 3.11)		6%	Policy-Related <i>Principles</i> (3.2.2, 3.2.3, 3.2.5, 3.2.6, 3.2.9, 3.2.14, 3.4.3, 3.4.4, 3.4.5, 3.7.4, 3.7.5, 3.9.1, 3.12.1, 3.13.1-5, 4.3, 4.5, 4.8.2, 4.8.3, 4.9)		2%	

FOCUSED REPORT

RESPONSE REPORT