



## 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 Reaffirmation Leadership Team Meeting

August 4, 2016

BBS Dean's Conference Room, Room JO 4.306

1. Call to Order / Approval of Minutes Serenity King
  
2. Informational Announcements Serenity King
  - A. President's Office Representation
  - B. CR 2.5 Institutional Effectiveness, FR 4.1 Student Achievement
  - C. UT Dallas Observer Opportunity, Northwestern State University-Louisiana, March 14-16, 2017
  - D. UT Dallas SACSCOC website materials: <http://sacscoc.utdallas.edu/>
    1. Reaffirmation Committees' webpages updated with agenda packets and minutes
  - E. Technical Support / Workspace: <http://sacscoc.utdallas.edu/ptg>
    1. Working folders for each principle's narratives created
    2. New web version for 2007 narratives and other report
  
3. Lisa Berry, UH-Downtown, Visit Recap Serenity King  
Mary Jo Venetis  
Josh Hammers
  
4. Summer Institute Feedback Marilyn Kaplan  
Jessica Murphy  
Nicole Piquero  
Ryan Dorman  
Serenity King
  
5. QEP Update / Topic Selection Jessica Murphy
  
6. Concerns / Comments from Committee All
  
7. Adjournment Serenity King

# **ITEM 1**

May 05, 2016 Meeting Minutes

# **2018 SACSCOC Leadership Team**

## **Meeting Minutes**

Thursday, May 5, 2016 1:30PM  
BBS Dean's Conference Room, JO 4.306

### **I. Attendees:**

Serenity King (Chair), Clint Peinhardt, Marilyn Kaplan, Josh Hammers, Mary Jo Venetis, Nicole Leeper Piquero, Jessica Murphy, Joanna Gentsch, Vy Trang, Simon Kane, Ryan Dorman, Simon Kane, Caroline Ries

**Absent:** B. Hobson Wildenthal, Kim Laird

### **II. Approval of April 7, 2016 meeting minutes**

Clint Peinhardt moved to approve, Nicole Leeper Piquero seconded the motion. All in favor – minutes approved.

### **III. Announcements**

#### Burnham Site Visit, University of Alabama, Huntsville

Dr. Gerry Burnham served as an evaluator for a site visit at the University of Alabama-Huntsville. He reported several items to note as UT Dallas prepares for its reaffirmation.

1. There is a principle that involves intellectual property and copyright. Many institutions are not in compliance with the principle because they do not make the information easily accessible to students. UT Dallas' policy is not specific to one group or the other but it is in the Handbook of Operations and Procedures. There is also a Senate committee on intellectual property. The copyright notice is included in the syllabi policy. If the Student Handbook (from Student Affairs) does not include the policy, then the policy will need to be included and updated as needed.

**ACTION ITEM:** The syllabi policy will need to be checked to ensure that the most current copyright notice is included.

**ACTION ITEM:** Josh Hammers will check the Student Handbook to see if the intellectual property and copyright policy is included and up-to-date.

2. The on-site evaluators need a printer, computers, a shredder, reliable wireless connection, etc. The Leadership Team will have further discussions regarding the technology provided to the on-site evaluation team at the hotel. The evaluators were impressed that the University of Alabama-Huntsville provided on-site technical support at the hotel.

3. The evaluators did stop and ask students, faculty, and staff what the QEP was during the on-site review.

**ACTION ITEM:** The Leadership Team needs to continue to think about ways to do a massive marketing campaign for the QEP.

#### Chair/Vice-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 will 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, new letters will be generated.

#### 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.

#### DOE Letter

The Department of Education has issued a letter to the regional accreditors, which includes SACSCOC, regarding both flexibility and tighter scrutiny of applying standards. Two major impacts of this letter are the following: 1) it would allow accreditors to perform an abbreviated review of institutions based on the level of the institution, and 2) there will be more focus on the outcomes and achievements (quantitative measures) of the institutions.

**ACTION ITEM:** Serenity will update the Leadership Team as more information becomes available.

#### State Audit

Earlier, the State Auditor's Office had announced that their yearly audit was being suspended and they would no longer include the student financial aid. However, due to the strong responses from all UT System schools undergoing reaffirmation, the State Auditor's Office has decided to reinstate the student financial aid audit. The State Auditor's Office is working on a schedule for the audits.

#### Lisa Berry Campus Visit

Lisa Berry, Assistant Director of Library Planning and Assessment at the University of Houston-Downtown, has been invited to visit UT Dallas to meet with the Office of Assessment staff, Josh Hammers, Debbie Montgomery, and library staff in April. She is involved with the University of Houston-Downtown reaffirmation process, is a part of

their SACSCOC Leadership Team, and has experience with an on-site visit. It may be beneficial to hear about her experience regarding the on-site visit and nonacademic assessment.

**ACTION ITEM:** Josh Hammers will meet with the Student and Learning Resources Committee and determine if the committee members would like to meet with Lisa Berry.

### **Status on Technical Assistance/Support**

The committee workspace structure is an adaptation of the system that was used in 2007. All committee work will be done in the DEGAS server. The DOX repository will be available upon request by individual committee members. An eform (<https://eforms.utdallas.edu/ptg-dox-access-request>) has been created for these requests. A new reaffirmation technical support webpage is available at <http://sacscoc.utdallas.edu/ptg>. This will serve as a one-stop shop for all technical questions. PTG will email all committees if there are significant updates to the workspace or technical support webpage. Committee members can download an editable version of the responses to the principles at <https://sacscoc.utdallas.edu/repnav/>. Most of the committees have been given access to the workspace. Simon and PTG is working on giving access to the remaining committees.

Several committees are asking about the supporting documentation process.

A question was asked regarding the timeline for the availability of the workspace for committee members. Simon responded that it may be one or two weeks before the workspace is ready.

## **IV. QEP Update**

The top 5 QEP topics have been selected and posted on the QEP webpage. The topics are: First-Year Experience, Communication Counts, Wellness, Curricular Globalization, and Digital Learning: Innovation and Integration. A brief description of the topics and examples of implemented QEPs is included on the webpage. A guided proposal form is posted on the QEP website. QEP proposal submissions are due by June 1, 2016. There have been 3-4 proposal submissions and Jessica has had 2 face-to-face meetings with personnel about proposal submissions.

**ACTION ITEM:** A NewsCenter article with the top 5 topics and the call for proposals has been published. Announcements will be made at Student Government meetings, Faculty Senate meetings and Staff Council meetings.

**ACTION ITEM:** The QEP Topic Selection Committee will vote on the proposals, recommend a QEP proposal to the Leadership Team, the President, Provost and various stakeholders.

## **V. Steering Committee Report**

The Steering Committee met on April 25, 2016. All committees gave progress reports. No problems were reported. All committees are working on their assigned principles. The need for an updated strategic plan is still a concern for most of the committees. Committee members are beginning to realize how all the principles are connected on some level and assessment is only a small part of institutional effectiveness and the reaffirmation process.

## **VI. *Principles CR 2.5, CS 3.3.1 and its subsets***

**ACTION ITEM:** All Leadership Team members need to read and be familiar with Principle CR 2.5 and CR 4.1 because day-to-day operations tie into these two principles.

**ACTION ITEM:** Faculty members can speak to their respective School Deans, program heads and associate deans on how the information obtained from principles can be used during budget presentations and incorporated into the School's strategic plans/missions.

## **VII. Summer Meetings**

All members agree that the Leadership Team will not meet until the first week of August.

## **VIII. Meeting Adjournment**

# ITEM 2B

## Core Requirement 2.5 Institutional Effectiveness Federal Requirement 4.1 Student Achievement

### Excerpts from *Resource Manual for the Principles of Accreditation: Foundations for Quality Enhancement, 2012* edition

#### Core Requirement 2.5 Institutional Effectiveness

**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

## **Federal Requirement 4.1 Student Achievement**

**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 5**

QEP Update / Topic Selection

## Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) Topic Selection Committee Request August 4, 2016

The Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) Topic Selection Committee requests approval to transition into a QEP Development Committee that will fully develop a QEP proposal that focuses on the first year experience for first-time-in-college, transfer, and new graduate students at UT Dallas.

Formed in March 2016, the QEP Topic Selection Committee was charged with identifying possible topics for UT Dallas' QEP that will be part of our Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC) Reaffirmation. The committee, whose membership represents a wide range of campus stakeholders, used data gathered as part of UT Dallas' ongoing institutional effectiveness process, submissions from over 200 members of the campus community, and UT Dallas' current mission statement to identify the five top high-impact practices that could become the topic of UT Dallas' next QEP. Campus stakeholders were given another opportunity to participate in the process when the QEP Topic Selection Committee solicited proposals on the top topics. The committee reviewed the proposals and the institutional data, and we recommend that UT Dallas' next Quality Enhancement Plan focus on the topic of the First Year Experience (FYE) for all new students at UT Dallas. We provide evidence for this recommendation, the details that we suggest the QEP Development Committee consider as they develop the plan, and a brief description of other noteworthy topics the committee considered.

### **First Year Experience**

As part of its process of evaluation, the committee reviewed data from the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), UT Dallas' Office of Strategic Planning and Analysis (OSPA), and the submissions from campus stakeholders. These data together suggest that a QEP that targets the experience of students new to UT Dallas has the potential to improve our retention rates, student engagement, and student success.

Six of the thirteen proposals submitted by faculty, staff, and students focused on the first year experience. At least two proposals in other categories contained suggestions that might enhance a first year experience program. Each of the proposals has high-impact practices to improve student learning, and the Topic Selection Committee recommends blending some of the best ideas from the proposals to create UT Dallas' Quality Enhancement Plan. The committee felt strongly that any first year experience QEP should incorporate transfer and new graduate students. Dan Long and Alex Ewing propose the creation of a First Year Experience Committee "to target retention and success in first-year students by providing intentional, consistent programming and support." As part of their proposal, they list the many first-year programs we already have going on at UT Dallas and suggest that bringing together representatives from the offices

responsible for each of these pieces would help improve the experience of first-year students at UT Dallas. A good example of the collaboration of the many departments and programs across campus concerned with the first year experience for first-time-in-college students is Welcome Week. A QEP could build upon that collaboration, and help carry it throughout the students' first year at UT Dallas.

In the proposals submitted to the Topic Selection Committee, there were many excellent suggestions for high-impact practices that could be incorporated into a QEP focused on the first year experience. Because NSSE data also suggest that students are looking for more cross-cultural experiences, the Topic Selection Committee recommends incorporating a component to the first year experience that includes cross-cultural exchange and learning opportunities. Faculty and students alike also see the need for better communication instruction. The committee recommends including a written/oral communication component in the first year experience. Since the first year at a new institution, whether as a first-time-in-college student, a transfer student, or a new graduate student, is one that can be hard on students' well being, the committee would like the Development Committee to consider including wellness in its first year experience program design.

#### *Potential Major Elements of the Plan*

1. Form a First Year Experience Committee to bring together key departments and programs from across campus that already participate in the existing Freshman Year Experience and include those from Transfer Orientation and Graduate Studies:

A few examples of existing resources, programs, and offices that target students in their first year:

- New Student Programs
- Office of Undergraduate Education
- Student Engagement
- Residential Life
- Living Learning Communities
- Student Transition Programs
- Graduate Studies
- Library Instruction Staff
- Writing Center

2. Revise current Freshman Seminar UNIV 1010 as per the recommendations of the First Year Experience Committee.

2A. This revision should consider incorporating global learning and wellness.

3. Work with schools to identify common campus-wide goals for the school-specific Freshman Seminar.

3A. These goals should include communication skills.

### *Measuring Success*

Retention rates and engagement surveys are two ways that UT Dallas could measure a QEP focused on the first year experience. If the QEP includes multiple components such as cross-cultural exchange and communication as the Topic Selection Committee recommends, then the QEP can also use assessments specific to those components as a form of measurement. Because there are two required courses as part of the QEP, assessment of the Student Learning Outcomes of those two courses might also be used. The QEP Development Committee should have representation from the Office of Assessment to assist with developing appropriate outcomes and measures.

### *Recommendations for Development and Implementation Committee*

Representatives from the Office of Undergraduate Education, Student Success Center, New Student Programs (in Student Affairs), Graduate Studies, International Student Services, Student Government, Core Curriculum Faculty, University Housing, Living Learning Communities, Library Instruction, Office of Assessment, Office of Strategic Planning and Analysis, Office of Budget and Finance, Office of Communications, and at least one alumnus/a.

## **Noteworthy Topics from Submitted Proposals**

### *Curricular Globalization*

The NSSE data show that students would like to have more opportunities for cross-cultural learning opportunities. The committee sees a place for a global component in the first year experience.

### *Communication Counts*

NSSE data and faculty assessment reports show that our students could use more opportunities to improve their written and oral communication skills. The committee sees a place for developing communication skills in the first year experience.

### *Wellness*

The committee could not identify institutional data to support a QEP focused solely on wellness, though the submitted proposal included ample literature demonstrating the link between wellness and improved student learning.