

# **2018 SACSCOC Leadership Team**

## **Meeting Minutes**

Wednesday, December 14, 2016 2:00PM  
FO 2.702

### **I. Attendees:**

Serenity King (Chair), B. Hobson Wildenthal, Nicole Leeper Piquero, Kim Laird, Jessica Murphy, Joanna Gentsch, Clint Peinhardt, Simon Kane, Ryan Dorman, Simon Kane, Murray Leaf, Ben Porter, Michele Lockhart, Vy Trang

Guests: Mary Jo Venetis, Courtney Brecheen, Deanna Englert Britton, Jennifer Holmes, Karen Huxtable-Jester, Debbie Montgomery, Gloria Shenoy, Beth Tolan

Absent: President Richard Benson, Inga Musselman, Josh Hammers, Marilyn Kaplan

### **II. Approval of September 28, 2016 meeting minutes**

Clint Peinhardt moved to approve, Jessica Murphy seconded the motion. All in favor – minutes approved.

### **III. Announcements**

#### Workflow

Serenity and Michele has reviewed and scored the drafts of the principles that were submitted. Drafts with scores of 4 require more attention. A document with the scores for each of the drafts can be distributed if the committee members are interested.

#### SACSCOC December 2016 Accreditation Actions and Public Disclosure Statements

SACSCOC has updated their website with a list of all the institutions that were sanctioned and what principles they were sanctioned for. The URL is listed in the agenda.

### **IV. SACSCOC Annual Meeting: Debriefing**

#### Courtney Brecheen

She attended many sessions that pertained to undergraduate education and retention. She has also shared information with Marilyn Kaplan on using big data to show student success in SLOs. Courtney also attended a session on strategic plans and how the committee membership should be kept to a reasonable size.

Deanna Englert Britton

She attended the “big data” session. One of the methods presented at the session was that students provide their cell phone numbers which can be used to track how often students went to the library, where they spend their time, and how this impacts their grades.

Jennifer Holmes

At one of the sessions that she attended, it was recommended that the institution being reviewed give the review committee a handout with FAQs with useful information. Another recommendation was to not have gaps in assessment cycles, which UT Dallas does not.

Karen Huxtable-Jester

The Center for Teaching and Learning (CTL) is willing to help with any programs/efforts the university is making with regards to accreditation.

Serenity King

At the session with Dr. Crystal Baird, it was noted that the number of institutions that were found non-compliant with the QEP is raising (60%). Two components may be contributing to this. One is the institutional capacity to administer the QEP and the other is the assessment of the QEP. At the evaluator training session, Serenity was given lots of case studies, documents and ideas that are useful and can be implemented throughout campus.

**ACTION ITEM:** She will make this information available to all who are interested.

Kim Laird

The core requirements should be brief and to-the-point. Comprehensive standards should be detailed and where any issues should be explained in detail. Attention should be paid to space leases, record maintenance, master plans, and physical property records in order to use in benchmarking efforts.

Murray Leaf

He spent some time in the library looking at other institutions' Compliance Certification Reports (CCR) documents. He is concerned with the boilerplate language that was used by the institutions. Serenity clarified that the on-site review committee will not read the entire CCR but will review the principles that the off-site review team

found us to be in noncompliance with. They will also look to ensure that they agree with the findings of the off-site team regarding the other principles.

Michele Lockhart

She attended sessions that discussed how the campus community can be prepared for the site visit and how the visit can be viewed as another “report” in addition to the Compliance Certification Report (CCR).

Debbie Montgomery

She attended sessions that pertained to the library. The UT Dallas library is already doing what was discussed at the sessions.

Jessica Murphy

She learned that getting a good assessment plan comes from having clear student outcomes at the onset. This has helped in the discussions while developing the QEP.

Ben Porter

He attended a session that dealt with survey fatigue in which students were receiving a large number of surveys and the response rate decreased. It was found that having physical surveys at events increased the response rate. For a successful QEP, it was recommended that a marketing plan be implemented and included Q&A sessions with faculty, staff and students.

Gloria Shenoy

She attended a session that talked about the alignment between assessment reports, the strategic plan and program reviews. This is something that the Office of Assessment will explore in the future.

Beth N. Tolan

She attended many sessions that dealt with financial and physical resources. One of the takeaways was that Principle 3.11.3 should be reviewed carefully.

Mary Jo Venetis

SACSCOC is creating a task force that will focus on university systems and their operations. The task force will look into undue influence on policies by interest groups and how it relates to accreditation.

## **V. Evaluator Training**

Serenity has a meeting with Dr. Benson and Dr. Wildenthal in early January 2017 in which she will discuss some senior leadership concerns, one of which is the assessment of the VP level units. This is one of the principles that is frequently cited (49% is found to be noncompliant with Principle 2.5-Institutional Effectiveness).

**ACTION ITEM:** Members of the Leadership Team should review the peer review training modules by the end of Spring 2017.

**ACTION ITEM:** Vy will send an email to the Leadership Team with the link to the SACSCOC peer review training modules.

**ACTION ITEM:** Links to other CCRs will be added to our website.

**ACTION ITEM:** Serenity will follow-up with the Vice-Provost of the University of Virginia about giving a presentation at their campus.

**ACTION ITEM:** Communication will be sent to faculty and staff who will meet with the on-site review team.

## **VI. Next Meeting**

The Leadership Team will meet in February and April 2017. An update on the CCR will be sent in Summer 2017. Additional meeting will be scheduled as needed.

## **VII. Meeting Adjournment**