



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 Steering Committee Meeting

June 14, 2016

ECSS 3.503, Osborne Conference Room

1. Call to Order and Approval of Minutes Serenity King

2. Announcements Serenity King
 - A. SACSCOC Updates to Policy/Documents
 - B. SACSCOC Annual Meeting, Atlanta, GA, Dec. 3-6, 2016
 - C. Wheelan and Elgart's *Chronicle of Higher Education* article: response to Department of Education letter
 - D. UT System web resources for SACSCOC CCR
 - E. Reaffirmation Committee webpages updated
 - F. Sue Sherbet's retirement

3. Workspace / Technical Support Simon Kane

4. Committee Chair Reports by Chairs and/or Vice-Chairs
 - A. Mission, Governance, and Administration Committee David Cordell
 - B. Financial and Physical Resources and Information Technology Committee Kimberly Laird
 - C. Faculty Committee Murray Leaf
 - D. Learning and Student Resources Committee Josh Hammers
 - E. Programs, Curriculum Instruction Committee Poras Balsara /
Marilyn Kaplan
 - F. Institutional Effectiveness Committee Serenity King
 - G. QEP Topic Selection Committee Jessica Murphy

5. Questions / Concerns Serenity King

6. Adjournment Serenity King

ITEM 1

April 25, 2016 Meeting Minutes

2018 SACSCOC Steering Committee

Meeting Minutes

Monday, April 25, 2016 3:00 – 4:00PM
Undergraduate Dean's Conference Room, FO 2.706

I. Attendees:

Serenity Rose King (chair), Poras Balsara, David Cordell, Cary Delmark, Vladimir Dragovic, Marilyn Kaplan, Jessica C. Murphy, Nicole Leeper Piquero, Lawrence J. Redlinger, Josh Hammers, Calvin D. Jamison, Kim Laird, Debbie Montgomery, Catherine Parsonneault, Gloria Shenoy, Sue Sherbet, Toni Stephens, M. Beth Tolan, Mary Jo Venetis, Vy Trang, Caroline Ries

Absent: Murray J. Leaf (vice-chair)

II. Approval of March 25, 2016 Meeting Minutes

Mary Jo Venetis motioned to approve, Catherine Parsonneault seconded the motion. All in favor – minutes approved.

III. Announcements

Committee Meeting Minutes and Agendas

ACTION ITEM: All committees need to keep meeting minutes and submit the approved minutes and meeting agendas to Vy Trang or Mary Jo Venetis.

Status on Workspace

Simon Kane is not present to deliver an update on the status of the workspace.

ACTION ITEM: Simon Kane will provide an update on the status of the workspace to the Leadership Team. The team will decide on the most effective method for the workspace. Either Simon or Serenity will come and demonstrate the workspace at each of the next committee meetings.

Annual Meeting Presentations

Three proposals submitted by Serenity, Gloria Shenoy, Jessica Murphy and Karen Huxtable were accepted by SACSCOC and will be presented at the 2016 SACSCOC Annual Meeting.

ACTION ITEM: If members are interested in presenting at the SACSCOC Summer Institutes or Annual Meetings, let Serenity know. She will send information about the call for proposals for both events as she receives it.

SACSCOC Summer Institute

ACTION ITEM: Vy Trang will send registration and hotel confirmations to members who are attending the Summer Institute.

Department of Education Letter to Accreditors

Several media outlets have published the letter from the Department of Education (DOE). If members have questions or concerns about the contents of the letter, this can be added as a discussion item for the next committee meeting.

ACTION ITEM: Serenity will send the DOE letter to all members. When SACSCOC issues a response to the letter, Serenity will forward the response to the members.

IV. Chair/Vice-Chair versus Chair/Co-Chair

There has been some confusion regarding the chair/vice-chair and chair/co-chair titles. All committees have a chair and vice-chair with the exception of the Programs, Curriculum Instruction Committee.

ACTION ITEM: Each committee can decide which titles they would prefer to use (chair/co-chair or chair/vice-chair). If appointment letters need to be revised to reflect the changes, email Serenity and new letters will be generated.

V. Committee Chair Reports by Chairs and/or Co-Chairs

Each committee chair or co-chair gave a brief report about their committees' April meetings.

Mission, Governance, and Administration Committee: David Cordell

The first committee meeting occurred on April 11, 2016. The next committee meeting is scheduled on May 4, 2016. All members were present. The committee will meet monthly during the summer.

Financial and Physical Resources and Information Technology Committee: Kim Laird

The first committee meeting occurred on April 22, 2016. Thirteen of the sixteen committee members were present. The committee will meet monthly during the summer. The committee plans to divide into sub-committees at the next meeting and discuss the workspace.

Learning and Student Resources Committee: Josh Hammers

The first committee meeting occurred on April 19, 2016. Fourteen of the seventeen committee members were present. Josh Hammers and Debbie Montgomery met with the three absent members the following day and provided a recap of the committee meeting. Serenity gave a presentation about the reaffirmation project at the April 19 meeting. The next meetings will be on May 19, mid-summer, and regular monthly

meetings will resume in August. The committee plans to divide into sub-committees at the next meeting and assign work assignments.

ACTION ITEM: Josh Hammers will email the Qualtrics survey the committee used to assign work assignments to Steering Committee members who are interested.

Programs, Curriculum Instruction Committee: Poras Balsara

The committee scheduled two committee members due to scheduling conflicts – not all members were able to meet at one time. Serenity gave presentations about the reaffirmation project at both meetings. Two of the thirty members have been not responsive.

ACTION ITEM: Two members will be replaced due to job position changes. Vy Trang will contact the student representative via alternative methods.

The committee will not meet in the summer. The assigned principles have been divided amongst the members. The committee plans to finish a first draft of each sub-committee's assigned principles by early September and the committee will have a meeting to discuss the drafts.

ACTION ITEM: Poras Balsara and/or Marilyn Kaplan will follow-up with members periodically since the committee is not meeting during the summer.

Institutional Effectiveness Committee: Serenity King

All but three members attended the April 20, 2016 meeting. Two of the three members sent representatives to the meeting. At the next meeting, the principles will be divided and sub-committees will be created. The members of this committee were chosen based on their expertise and knowledge of the principles. This committee has the fewest number of assigned principles but the most cited and comprehensive principles. One of the challenges for the committee is the need for a new strategic plan.

ACTION ITEM: The outcomes webpage (www.utdallas.edu/outcomes) on the Office of Admissions and Enrollment website needs to be updated. Cary Delmark will be invited to the next Institutional Effectiveness Committee meeting to discuss what needs to be done.

QEP Topic Selection Committee: Jessica Murphy

The committee met prior to the first Steering Committee meeting. The open submission period has closed. The committee met, discussed the trending topics and chose the following five topics: First-Year Experience, Communication Counts, Wellness, Curricular Globalization, and Digital Learning and Innovation. The QEP website and the online proposal form is presented. Executive summaries of successful QEPs for each topic can also be found on the QEP website. The QEP proposal submission deadline is June 1, 2016.

ACTION ITEM: Jessica Murphy requests the Steering Committee members help to spread the word about the QEP proposal submission deadline.

The Development Board will be approached about the QEP closer to the proposal submission deadline.

Faculty Committee: Nicole Leeper Piquero

The committee met on April 18, 2016. There are three member replacements: Dr. John Barden, Dr. Jillian Duquaine-Watson, and Dr. Marilyn Waligore. All schools are now represented on the committee. The next meeting will be on May 2, 2016.

VI. Questions/Concerns

Serenity asked for suggestions on how to disclose the monitoring situation to the university and public at large that would prevent further miscommunication and misinformation. A one-page summary will be posted on the website that committee members can direct any university and/or community members for more information regarding the situation.

ACTION ITEM: If members have suggestions, email Serenity.

ACTION ITEM: If any members are interested in participating in any additional committees, let Serenity know.

VII. Adjournment

ITEM 2A

SACSCOC Updates to Policy/Documents

SACSCOC made additional revisions to its website, indicating that changes were made to some of its Commission policies and policy statements effective May 2016.

1. Substantive Change for SACSCOC Accredited Institutions

- Last edited in January 2015, adopted by SACSCOC Executive Council in March 2016
- The matrix for “Reporting the Various Types of Substantive Change” has been revised
 - UT Dallas’ website will be updated accordingly
- Additional forms, including documentation templates, have been created for various substantive changes for the SACSCOC Substantive Change Committee reviewers/visits

2. Compliance Certification Document

- Updated in May 2016 to replace policy wording in CS 3.13.2 and CS 3.13.4a.
 - CS 3.13.2 Agreements Involving Joint and Dual Academic Awards: Policy and Procedures
 - CS 3.13.4.a: Applicable Policy Statement: Distance and Correspondence Education under Reaffirmation of Accreditation and Subsequent Reports

3. Report of the Reaffirmation Committee (for off-site and on-site reviewers)

- Revised in January 2012, updated in May 2016.

4. Direct Assessment Competency-Based Educational Programs: Policy Statement

- Edited in May 2016.

5. Mergers, Consolidations, Change of Ownership, Acquisitions, and Change of Governance, Control, Form or Legal Status

- Revised in December 2015, updated in May 2016.

6. Requests for Data or Research Assistance

- Approved by SACSCOC Executive Council in December 2015

7. Preliminary Top 10 Most Frequently Cited Principles – 2015

- Chart has been added to the UT Dallas’ website / sidebar menu
- New cited Principles: CS 3.2.9, CS 3.2.14, CS 3.10.3, and CS 3.3.1.4

Top 10 Most Frequently Cited *Principles* in Reaffirmation Reviews: 2015 Reaffirmation Class Institutions (N=81)

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)	90%	1.	3.3.2 (Quality Enhancement Plan)	59%	1.	3.3.1.1 (IE – Educational Programs)	16%	
2.	3.3.1.1 (IE – Educational Programs)	60%	2.	3.3.1.1 (IE – Educational Programs)	31%	2.	3.10.1 (Financial Stability)	7%	
3.	3.3.1.2 (IE – Administrative Units)	49%	3.	3.7.1 (Faculty Competence)	25%	3.	3.3.1.2 (IE – Administrative Units)	6%	
4.	3.7.2 (Faculty Evaluation)	48%	4.	3.3.1.2 (IE – Administrative Units)	19%	4.	3.3.1.3 (IE – Educational Support)		
5.	3.3.1.3 (IE – Educational Support)	47%	5.	3.5.1 (General Education Competencies)	15%	5.	3.5.1 (General Education Competencies)	5%	
6.	2.8 (Faculty)	46%	6.	3.3.1.3 (IE – Educational Support)	14%	6.	3.3.2 (Quality Enhancement Plan)		
7.	3.3.1.5 (IE – Community/Public Service)	42%	7.	3.3.1.5 (IE – Community/Public Service)	10%	7.	3.7.1 (Faculty Competence)		
8.	2.11.1 (Financial Resources)	40%	8.	3.10.1 (Financial Stability)	9%	8.	3.3.1.4 (IE – Research)	4%	
9.	3.2.9 (Personnel Appointment)	38%	9.	3.10.3 (Control of Finances)	6%	9.	3.10.3 (Control of Finances)		
10.	3.2.14 (Intellectual Property Rights)			10.		3.12.1 (Substantive Change)			≤2%
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> = 17.5 <i>SD</i> =9.3		<i>Median</i> =15	<i>Range</i> =37		<i>Mean</i> = 2.8 <i>SD</i> =2.6		<i>Median</i> =2	<i>Range</i> =13	
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)		23%	Educational Programs/Curriculum (2.7, 3.4-6, 4.2, 4.4 + 2.12 and 3.3.2)		35%	Institutional Effectiveness (2.4, 2.5, 3.1.1, 3.3.1.1-5, 4.1)		47%	
Educational Programs/Curriculum (2.7, 3.4-6, 4.2, 4.4)		21%	Institutional Effectiveness (2.4, 2.5, 3.1.1, 3.3.1.1-5, 4.1)		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)		16%	Faculty (2.8, 3.4.11*, 3.5.4*, 3.7)		15%	Financial and Physical Resources (2.11, 3.10, 3.11)		18%	
Institutional Effectiveness (2.4, 2.5, 3.1.1, 3.3.1.1-5, 4.1)		16%	Financial and Physical Resources (2.11, 3.10, 3.11)		9%	Faculty (2.8, 3.4.11*, 3.5.4*, 3.7)		12%	
Student Services/Learning Support (2.9, 2.10, 3.4.9*, 3.8, 3.9, 3.13.3*, 4.5)		12%	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)		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, 3.13.1-5, 4.3, 4.5*, 4.8.2, 4.8.3, 4.9)		5%	
Financial and Physical Resources (2.11, 3.10, 3.11)		10%	Student Services/Learning Support (2.9, 2.10, 3.4.9*, 3.8, 3.9, 3.13.3*, 4.5)		3%	Student Services/Learning Support (2.9, 2.10, 3.4.9*, 3.8, 3.9, 3.13.3*, 4.5)		2%	

INSTITUTIONAL FOCUSED REPORT

INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSE REPORT

ITEM 2C

Wheelan and Elgart's *Chronicle of Higher Education* article: response to Department of Education letter

Wheelan, B. S. & Elgart, M. A. (2016, May 25). Let accreditors do what does the most good for students. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Retrieved from <http://chronicle.com/article/Let-Accreditors-Do-What-Does/236594>

COMMENTARY

Let Accreditors Do What Does the Most Good for Students

By Belle S. Wheelan and Mark A. Elgart | MAY 25, 2016



Doug Paulin for The Chronicle

When too many colleges have low rates of graduation and high rates of student-loan default, you would expect the U.S.

Department of Education to take bold action. But it came as a surprise recently when the department sent a letter to leaders of regional accrediting agencies asking them to shift from evidence-based institutional oversight to more like a data-collection service.

The letter offers guidance on a series of executive actions the department announced in November to "move toward a new focus on student outcomes and transparency."

Accreditors at all levels of education share the goal of using data and other evidence that shed light on factors that inhibit quality and undermine student success. The new focus, however, crosses the line between what accreditors do

and what government seeks to accomplish, and requires us — leaders of accrediting groups responsible for oversight of schools and colleges in dozens of states — to speak with one voice about our concerns.

The Department of Education's letter urges accreditors to go beyond their work of providing qualitative assessments of every aspect of an institution to tilt the focus toward a few narrow measures of performance using uniform metrics, or else risk being shut down.

To the department's credit, its request for more data comes with a promise of allowing greater flexibility in how accrediting agencies choose to scrutinize performance. Institutions and programs with solid track records do not need review with the same frequency and depth of assessment, allowing the agencies to home in on struggling institutions.

But the department's determination to have accreditors give greater weight to bright-line indicators — rates of retention, graduation, job placement, student-loan repayment and defaults — is disturbing. There are differences between the data we collect to assess quality, the data the department requires to enforce financial-aid and regulatory compliance, and the data legislators seek to develop policy. This new guidance "encourages" accrediting agencies to collect data for purposes that are clearly outside of their missions.

As we've seen with the department's heralded College Scorecard initiative, data dumps and rating systems lack any degree of nuance and force institutions to focus more on outcomes — some of which they have no control over — rather than explore the myriad underlying causes of low performance in an effort to map a path toward improvement.

Accreditation can reveal useful information about why students aren't graduating; how, why, and when they fail; and how to make adjustments in teaching and learning, course sequencing, and other factors. But reporting on only a few outcomes provides no such useful data.

Nor do simple bright-line measures tell the college-going public about the experience of attending an institution. They merely provide information to the U.S. Department of Education that can help it determine how to better administer federal financial-aid programs. That purpose was the intent of the scorecard, a more appropriate place for such an effort (although it was not welcomed by colleges).

Moreover, putting too much weight on a few metrics will not improve results. Fourteen years of the federal No Child Left Behind law have caused the nation's public schools to focus their improvement efforts on a few narrow measures but have led to no better outcomes and a host of unintended consequences, including overuse of testing, skewing of curricula, demoralization of educators, and rampant cheating and efforts to game the system.

The Department of Education's letter should raise red flags for colleges nationwide. That is because:

- Striving for common rate thresholds for outcomes could cause colleges to limit the access of underserved populations. Applying the same metric to all colleges could also lead the government to shut down or withhold resources from some institutions, such as historically black colleges and universities, Hispanic-serving colleges, and tribal colleges, serving some of the least advantaged students. And what about community colleges grappling with returning adult students who may never have envisioned themselves in college or who need help reacquiring learning skills? We need these institutions to train both the entry-level and transitioning work force and not

be judged solely by an indicator of their graduation rates.

- Student-loan repayments and defaults and job placements are important outcomes of college but are often beyond an institution's control. They more often reflect economic conditions and employment trends than what colleges do to prepare people with degrees that have value in the real world.
- The proposed shift would provide impetus for institutions to manipulate data and change admissions or grading policies to produce higher graduation rates. Such gamesmanship would actually limit educational opportunity and lead to inadequate academic and career preparation.

Setting standards and evaluating their use on campus, engaging institutions in the reflective process of self-study, and using expert and peer review to promote continuous improvement are activities that accrediting agencies have been conducting and refining for more than 100 years. This self-regulation and respect for the uniqueness of institutions is a reason that American higher education continues to be the best, most diverse system in the world.

Equally important, holding accreditors accountable for data collection raises a host of questions: Who is the information for? How reliable is it? How will it be used? What are the consequences for colleges? Do the data help advance improvement?

There are other problems with the bright-line measures, most notably the limitations of the information itself. For example, the Department of Education relies upon its Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System, which provides information about some of what we need to know, but not so much about the majority of those attending college, who don't fit the definition of "traditional student." IpedS has looked only at first-time, full-time students who enroll in an institution in the fall term and receive a degree from that same institution; they now amount to fewer than half of all college students.

This year, IpedS has begun asking colleges to report data on part-time and non-first-time students, which will address some limitations. But the department still has not taken on key issues. For example, how should colleges account for students who complete a credential elsewhere? This requires access to individual student data, like those collected by the nonprofit National Student Clearinghouse (on whose board one of us serves).

Today's students are young and not so young, attending part time, stepping in and out, and transferring in state and out of state. The clearinghouse provides a more complete demographic picture, one that shows the complications of reducing student behaviors to a simple graduation rate.

The proposal for accreditors to assess institutional compliance with federal data requests also requires greater definition about what we mean by "completion," "student achievement," and other outcomes within the contexts of our diverse institutions. We need to clarify the roles and responsibilities of the oversight triad — federal government, states, and accreditors — and ensure that neither states nor the federal government asks accreditors to perform roles that more appropriately belong to government.

For accreditation to help improve quality at the institutional level, accrediting teams and colleges rely on reams of data appropriately collected and applied. The data that inform federal policy is not the same as those collected to guide institutional performance. We need to resist efforts to redefine the purpose of accreditation and the missions of our institutions in misguided ways.

Belle S. Wheelan is president of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges. Mark A. Elgart is founding president and chief executive officer of AdvancED.



Copyright © 2016 The Chronicle of Higher Education