

SACSCOC Student Success Outcomes, Assessment and Support Working Group Meeting

June 10, 2026 1:00 – 1:45pm

Microsoft Teams

Attendees: Bethany AuHoy, Brandon Davidson, Travis Goode, Matt Grief, Melissa Hernandez-Katz, Raúl Hinojosa Jr., John Jackson, Relius Johnson, Nidhi Mehrotra, Sarah Moore, Vicky Morris-Dueer, Julie Murphy, Robin Paige, Stephen Rogers, Elizabeth Samuel, Ruth Schemmer, Gloria Shenoy, Amanda Smith, Vy Trang

Absent: Jeremy Head, Md Eyasin UI Islam Pavel, Daniel Long

Overview of SACSCOC Reaffirmation Process: Dr. Raúl Hinojosa Jr. provided an overview of the SACSCOC reaffirmation process, explaining the University's accreditation cycle, the differentiated review for 2028, and the importance of compliance with the *Principles of Accreditation*.

Accreditation Cycle Explanation: Dr. Hinojosa explained that UT Dallas undergoes reaffirmation of accreditation with SACSCOC every ten years, with interim reports every five years, and that the next reaffirmation is scheduled for 2028. The University recently completed its 2024 interim report, and the current effort is focused on preparing for the 2028 reaffirmation.

Differentiated Review Details: Dr. Hinojosa noted that UT Dallas has been approved for a differentiated review for the 2028 reaffirmation, which reduces the number of *Principles of Accreditation* to address from over 70 to 40, though many core requirements remain and must be addressed thoroughly to avoid sanctions.

Importance of Compliance: Dr. Hinojosa emphasized that demonstrating compliance with the assigned Principles is critical, as failure to do so could result in sanctions, and highlighted the need for early identification of areas of concern and potential policy or practice changes.

Working Group Structure and Roles: Dr. Hinojosa outlined the structure of the working groups, the roles of members, and the responsibilities of co-chairs Dr. Gloria Shenoy and Dr. Amanda Smith, clarifying expectations for evidence collection, narrative drafting, and communication within the group.

Working Group Organization: Dr. Hinojosa described that the reaffirmation effort is divided into six working groups, each assigned specific *Principles of Accreditation*, with this group responsible for four Principles. Members were selected for their subject matter expertise or oversight roles.

Co-Chair Responsibilities: Dr. Shenoy and Dr. Smith serve as co-chairs, coordinating meetings, tracking deliverables, communicating progress to Dr. Hinojosa as the accreditation liaison, and serving as primary writers for the group's draft narrative.

Member Responsibilities: Working group members are responsible for collecting and uploading evidence, reviewing drafts, providing input, and informing the integration of compliance evidence into the narrative. Members are also expected to help identify areas of concern and suggest necessary changes.

Assigned Principles of Accreditation: Dr. Hinojosa detailed the four *Principles of Accreditation* assigned to the group - student outcomes for educational programs, library and learning resources, student support services, and student complaints - and explained the group's responsibility for these areas.

Student Outcomes Principle: The group is responsible for addressing Principle 8.2.a, which focuses on evaluating and assessing the effectiveness of academic programs and using that information for improvement.

Library and Learning Resources: Principle 11.1 requires the group to document the adequacy, development, and curation of library and learning information resources, including how adequacy is determined.

Student Support Services: Principle 12.1 covers the adequacy of student support services, both curricular and co-curricular, and requires comprehensive documentation of how students are supported.

Student Complaints: Principle 12.4 involves documenting the processes for collecting, tracking, and responding to student complaints, as well as notifying students of their rights to submit complaints, in accordance with SACSCOC guidelines.

Group Responsibility: Dr. Hinojosa clarified that these four Principles are not shared with other working groups, making this group solely responsible for the University's response and documentation for these areas.

Resources and Guidance for Compliance: Dr. Hinojosa introduced key resources for the group's work, including the SACSCOC Resource Manual, sample documentation, reference documents, and internal support from the OISDS team and external contacts.

SACSCOC Resource Manual: The group will use the 2024 SACSCOC Resource Manual, which provides detailed explanations, rationale, notes, questions to consider, and sample documentation for each Principle, guiding the drafting of compliance narratives.

Sample Documentation and Reference Documents: Sample documentation sections in the Resource Manual help identify the types of evidence needed, while reference documents and policy links provide additional guidance and are kept up-to-date on the SACSCOC website.

Internal and External Support: Dr. Hinojosa and Vy Trang from OISDS offer logistical and technical support, while Dr. Amanda Smith brings experience as a peer reviewer. Dr. Hinojosa also maintains contact with other accreditation liaisons and the SACSCOC Vice President for additional guidance.

Access to Past Reports and Presentations: The group will have access to previous compliance certification reports, interim reports, and presentations from SACSCOC annual meetings, with recommendations to use these as checkpoints rather than templates due to changes in Principles and institutional context.

Project Timeline and Milestones: Dr. Hinojosa presented the timeline for the reaffirmation project, including key deadlines for draft submissions, reviews, and final submission, as well as important dates for off-site and on-site reviews and the Quality Enhancement Plan.

Draft and Review Deadlines: The first draft of the compliance certification report (CCR) is due October 23, 2026, with feedback provided in November 2026, a second draft due February 26, 2027 and the final draft due by the end of April 2027. OISDS will finalize the report in May 2027, with technical preparations by the Web Applications Technology team over summer 2027.

Final Submission and Review Dates: The CCR must be submitted to SACSCOC by September 8, 2027. The off-site peer review will occur on October 31, 2027, with feedback and follow-up responses required. The on-site review is scheduled for March 20–23, 2028, and the final reaffirmation decision will be announced December 5, 2028.

Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP): The QEP process runs in parallel, with topic selection underway, a proposal due in February 2028, and feedback from the on-site review team to be incorporated before full implementation.

Meeting Cadence and Next Steps: Dr. Smith and Dr. Hinojosa led a discussion on meeting frequency, with consensus leaning toward biweekly meetings initially, and outlined next steps for members to review assigned Principles and prepare evidence for future meetings.

Meeting Frequency Discussion: Dr. Smith suggested holding meetings every other week to maintain momentum, with the option to cancel if not needed, and Dr. Hinojosa encouraged members to share scheduling conflicts to help coordinate meeting times.

Preparation for Next Meeting: Members are asked to review the assigned *Principles of Accreditation* and the Resource Manual before the next meeting, and to identify and set aside

relevant evidence or documentation, with instructions for systematic submission to be provided later.

Follow-up tasks

Meeting Scheduling Preferences: Submit any days or times that will not work for meetings in the meeting chat to assist with scheduling. (All)

Review of Assigned Accreditation Principles: Review the four assigned *Principles of Accreditation* and the relevant sections of the Resource Manual before the next meeting. (All)

Evidence Collection Preparation: Identify and set aside evidence or documentation relevant to the CCR for future submission, flagging them for later upload once the process is finalized. (All)