



# SACSCOC Working Group

Curriculum Design and Educational Policies and Practices

June 3, 2026

# Agenda

1. Welcome and introductions
2. Review charge of working group and roles of members
3. Review *Principles of Accreditation* assigned to working group
4. Review key milestones
5. Discuss meeting cadence
6. Other business

# Working Group Charge and Roles

Support the University's SACSCOC decennial reaffirmation by reviewing the University's compliance with the group's assigned *Principles of Accreditation*, collecting evidence of compliance, and preparing drafts of the Compliance Certification Report

**Working Group Co-Chair(s):** Coordinate meetings of working group, assign members deliverables and track progress, communicate progress with the accreditation liaison, serve as the primary writer of the group's draft narrative

**Working Group Members:** Collect and upload evidence, review drafts, provide insight into the University's compliance with selected principles

# Resources for Support

- SACSCOC [Resource Manual](#) for the *2024 Principles of Accreditation: Foundations for Quality Enhancement*

**5.4** The institution employs and regularly evaluates administrative and academic officers with appropriate experience and qualifications to lead the institution. (*Qualified administrative/academic officers*)

## Rationale and Notes

In order to ensure that an institution has effective leadership to accomplish its mission, the institution employs academic and administrative officers with the credentials and expertise appropriate to the duties and responsibilities associated with their positions. Administrator qualifications align with position descriptions. There is an expectation that these administrative and academic officers are regularly evaluated to allow feedback on performance.

## NOTES

*There are separate standards regarding policies pertaining to appointment and evaluation of other personnel [(Standard 5.5 (Personnel appointment and evaluation) and Standard 6.3 (Faculty appointment and evaluation)]. It would be appropriate to reference the current standard in those other standards if the evidence of evaluation of senior leadership appears only in Standard 5.4 (Qualified administrative/academic officers).*

## Questions to Consider

- Is the combination of credentials and experience appropriate for the positions held?

## Sample Documentation

- Organizational chart to clarify the leadership roles and the names of the persons to be reviewed.
- Position descriptions and details as to appropriate qualifications for each person to be reviewed.
- Résumés, as appropriate. Résumés should be current.

## Reference to SACSCOC Documents, If Applicable

None noted.

SACSCOC good practices: [Developing Policy and Procedures Documents](#)

# Resources for Support

- SACSCOC Annual Meeting Session Presentations (link to be provided)
- UT Dallas SACSCOC Website ([sacscoc.utdallas.edu](http://sacscoc.utdallas.edu) – refresh coming)
  - Recommend you do not start with 2018 CCR or 2024 Fifth Year Interim Report
- Your Institutional Accreditation Liaison (IAL) and OISDS Team
  - IAL can contact other UTS or Texas Liaisons
  - IAL can contact SACSCOC Vice President (Dr. Matthew Melton)
  - Support for meetings and logistics

# Assigned *Principles of Accreditation*

9.1 Program content

9.2 Program length

9.3 General education requirements

10.5 Admissions policies and practices

10.6 Distance and correspondence education

14.3 Comprehensive institutional review

Resource: Excerpts from SACSCOC Resource Manual

\* denotes principle is assigned to multiple working groups

# Key Working Group Milestones

| Date              | Milestone                                                           |
|-------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|
| November 2025     | UT Dallas Approved for Differentiated Review                        |
| May/June 2026     | Working Group Organizing Meetings Completed                         |
| October 23, 2026  | Working Groups Submit First Draft of CCR Narratives                 |
| November 2026     | OISDS Reviews First Drafts and Provides Feedback to Working Groups  |
| February 26, 2027 | Working Groups Submit Second Draft of CCR Narratives                |
| March 2027        | OISDS Reviews Second Drafts and Provides Feedback to Working Groups |
| April 30, 2027    | Working Groups Submit Final Drafts of CCR Narratives                |
| May 2027          | OISDS Reviews Drafts and Coordinates Final Narrative                |
| Summer 2027       | OISDS Completes Final CCR and Prepares for Submission to SACSCOC    |
| September 8, 2027 | CCR Due to SACSCOC                                                  |

# Other Key Reaffirmation Dates

| Date                          | Milestone                                                  |
|-------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------|
| Summer 2026                   | QEP Focus Identified and Approved by University Leadership |
| October 31 – November 3, 2027 | SACSCOC Off-Site Peer Review                               |
| March 14 – March 18, 2027     | SACSCOC Liaison Observes Peer Site Visit                   |
| February 4, 2028 (tentative)  | QEP Proposal Due to SACSCOC                                |
| March 20-23, 2028             | SACSCOC On-Site Visit at UT Dallas                         |
| December 5, 2028              | Official Decision from SACSCOC                             |

# Next Steps

- Discuss working group's meeting cadence
- Review selected *Principles of Accreditation* Resource Manual documentation prior to next meeting
- Identify evidence and documentation for CCR
  - Do not submit yet – we will share process for uploading documentation next time



Questions? Thank you!