AGENDA
2018 SACSCOC Institutional Effectiveness Committee Meeting
April 20, 2016
JSOM, Room 2.804

1. Call to Order and Introductions
   A. Additional member recommendations

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

3. Committee Resources
   A. SACSCOC and other resources located on UT Dallas SACSCOC website
      http://sacscoc.utdallas.edu/
      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/frrnav/
   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

5. Questions/Concerns

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

1 Will serve until Chief Budget Officer hired.
ITEM 3C

IE Committee’s Assigned Principles with web links

Online, interactive version found here: http://sascoc.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

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 ongoing 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 (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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Requirement/Standard</th>
<th>% Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>3.7.1 (Faculty Competence)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>3.3.1.1 (IE – Educational Programs)</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>3.4.11 (Academic Program Coordination)</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>2.8 (Faculty)</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>3.3.1.3 (IE – Educational Support)</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>3.2.14 (Intellectual Property Rights)</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>3.3.1.2 (IE – Administrative Units)</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>3.3.1.5 (IE – Community/Public Service)</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>2.11.1 (Financial Resources)</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>3.5.1 (General Education Competencies)</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## ON-Site Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Requirement/Standard</th>
<th>% Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>3.3.2 (Quality Enhancement Plan)</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>3.3.1.1 (IE – Educational Programs)</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>3.3.1.3 (IE – Educational Support)</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>3.7.1 (Faculty Competence)</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>3.3.1.2 (IE – Administrative Units)</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>3.3.1.5 (IE – Community/Public Service)</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>3.5.1 (General Education Competencies)</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>3.3.1.4 (IE – Research)</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>3.10.1 (Financial Stability)</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>3.10.3 (Control of Finances)</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.13.4b (Corporate Structure)</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## C&R Review

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Requirement/Standard</th>
<th>% Institutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>3.3.1.1 (IE – Educational Programs)</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>3.3.1.2 (IE – Administrative Units)</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>3.5.1 (General Education Competencies)</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>3.3.1.3 (IE – Educational Support)</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>3.3.1.5 (IE – Community/Public Service)</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>3.13.4b (Corporate Structure)</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>3.3.2 (Quality Enhancement Plan)</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>3.10.3 (Control of Finances)</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>2.8 (Faculty)</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>3.3.1.4 (IE – Research)</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.10.1 (Financial Stability)</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Key Descriptive Statistics (Number of Principles Cited Per Institution)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement/Standard</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy-Related Principles</td>
<td>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, 3.4.6, 3.4.7, 3.5.1, 3.5.2</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Effectiveness</td>
<td>2.4, 2.5, 3.1.1, 3.1.1-5, 3.4.7, 3.5.1, 4.1</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Programs/Curriculum</td>
<td>2.4, 2.5, 3.1.1, 3.1.1-5, 3.4.7, 3.5.1, 4.1</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Programs/Curriculum</td>
<td>2.4, 2.5, 3.1.1, 3.1.1-5, 3.4.7, 3.5.1, 4.1</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Issues</td>
<td>2.8, 3.4.11, 3.5.4, 3.7</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial and Physical Resources</td>
<td>2.8, 3.4.11, 3.5.4, 3.7</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services/Learning Support</td>
<td>2.9, 2.10, 3.8, 3.9, 3.4.9, 4.5, 3.13.3</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Key Descriptive Statistics (Number of Principles Cited Per Institution)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement/Standard</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational Programs/Curriculum</td>
<td>2.4, 2.5, 3.1.1, 3.1.1-5, 3.4.7, 3.5.1, 4.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Effectiveness</td>
<td>2.4, 2.5, 3.1.1, 3.1.1-5, 3.4.7, 3.5.1, 4.1</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Programs/Curriculum</td>
<td>2.4, 2.5, 3.1.1, 3.1.1-5, 3.4.7, 3.5.1, 4.1</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Issues</td>
<td>2.8, 3.4.11, 3.5.4, 3.7</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial and Physical Resources</td>
<td>2.11, 3.10, 3.11</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy-Related Principles</td>
<td>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, 3.4.6, 3.4.7, 3.5.1, 3.5.2, 3.13.1, 3.13.2, 4.3, 4.5, 4.8.2, 4.8.3, 4.9</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services/Learning Support</td>
<td>2.9, 2.10, 3.8, 3.9, 3.4.9, 4.5, 3.13.3</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Key Descriptive Statistics (Number of Principles Cited Per Institution)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement/Standard</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Effectiveness</td>
<td>3.4.7, 3.5.1, 4.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial and Physical Resources</td>
<td>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, 3.4.6, 3.4.7, 3.5.1, 3.5.2, 3.13.1, 3.13.2, 4.3, 4.5, 4.8.2, 4.8.3, 4.9</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy-Related Principles</td>
<td>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, 3.4.6, 3.4.7, 3.5.1, 3.5.2, 3.13.1, 3.13.2, 4.3, 4.5, 4.8.2, 4.8.3, 4.9</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services/Learning Support</td>
<td>2.9, 2.10, 3.8, 3.9, 3.4.9, 4.5, 3.13.3</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Top 10 Most Frequently Cited Principles in Reaffirmation Reviews: 2014 Reaffirmation Class Institutions (N=83)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review Stage I: OFF-Site Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Key Descriptive Statistics

(Number of Principles Cited Per Institution)

Mean=16.5 | SD=9.4 | Median=15 | Range=56

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selected General Areas of Non-Compliance</th>
<th>% of the Total Number of Findings of Non-Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy-Related Principles</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Programs/Curriculum</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Effectiveness</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services/Learning Support</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial and Physical Resources</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Review Stage II: ON-Site Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Requirement/Standard</th>
<th>% Institutions in Non-Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>3.3.2 (Quality Enhancement Plan)</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>3.3.1.1 (IE – Educational Programs)</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>3.7.1 (Faculty Competence)</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>3.3.1.2 (IE – Administrative Units)</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>3.3.1.3 (IE – Educational Support)</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>3.3.1.5 (IE – Community/Public Service)</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>3.10.1 (Financial Stability)</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>3.5.1 (General Education Competencies)</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>3.7.2 (Faculty Evaluation)</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>3.12.1 (Substantive Change)</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Key Descriptive Statistics

(Number of Principles Cited Per Institution)

Mean=2.5 | SD=2.5 | Median=2 | Range=10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selected General Areas of Non-Compliance</th>
<th>% of the Total Number of Findings of Non-Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Effectiveness</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Programs/Curriculum</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Services/Learning Support</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy-Related Principles</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial and Physical Resources</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Review Stage III: C&R | Board of Trustees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Requirement/Standard</th>
<th>% Institutions in Non-Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>3.3.1.1 (IE – Educational Programs)</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>3.3.1.2 (IE – Administrative Units)</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>3.3.1.3 (IE – Educational Support)</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>3.10.1 (Financial Stability)</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>3.3.1.5 (IE – Community/Public Service)</td>
<td>&lt;3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>3.7.1 (Faculty Competence)</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>3.3.2 (Quality Enhancement Plan)</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>3.5.1 (General Education Competencies)</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Key Descriptive Statistics

(Number of Principles Cited Per Institution)

Mean=0.6 | SD=1.2 | Median=0 | Range=7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selected General Areas of Non-Compliance</th>
<th>% of the Total Number of Findings of Non-Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Effectiveness</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Programs/Curriculum</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial and Physical Resources</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy-Related Principles</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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