

SACSCOC Student Success Outcomes, Assessment, and Support Working Group Meeting

June 26, 2026 10:00 – 11:00am

Microsoft Teams

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

Absent: Bethany AuHoy, Jeremy Head, Sarah Moore, Md Eyasin Ul Islam Pavel, Elizabeth Samuel

Project Timeline and Meeting Schedule: Dr. Gloria Shenoy outlined the project timeline, noting eight meetings before the October 23rd deadline, and clarified the schedule to ensure everyone understood the submission dates and addressing confusion about holiday meetings.

Principles Review and Evidence Collection Process: Dr. Amanda Smith, Dr. Raúl Hinojosa, and Dr. Shenoy discussed the review of four Principles, encouraging participants to identify areas for contribution and emphasizing the importance of collecting supporting evidence.

Principles Assignment: Dr. Shenoy asked members to review the four Principles and identify which ones they could best support, suggesting that smaller groups may form based on individual areas of expertise.

Evidence Submission Guidance: Dr. Smith stressed the importance of submitting comprehensive evidence for each Principle, recommending that members compile lists of supporting documents and data from their areas and beyond, as committees require proof for all claims.

Templates and Previous Reports: Dr. Robin Paige and Dr. Nidhi Mehrotra inquired about examples and templates from prior Principles submissions. Dr. Shenoy and Dr. Hinojosa provided a link to previous reports and supporting documents, noting that while these are useful for context, members should not simply edit old submissions due to changes in Principles and University context.

Repository and Submission Format: Dr. Shenoy explained that the system for evidence submission is not yet available, recommending that participants use a Word document to list items, with brief explanations of their relevance to each Principle, until the system is ready.

Managing Duplication and Collaborative Evidence Collection: Dr. Paige suggested using a shared spreadsheet to minimize redundant submissions, which Dr. Shenoy and Dr. Smith supported, while Dr. Hinojosa advised that duplication is preferable to missing evidence, and

the team discussed workflow and tagging for future document repository use. Dr. Shenoy and Dr. Smith will review and remove document redundancies during the refinement process.

Workflow and Tagging: Dr. Hinojosa described ongoing work with the Web Applications and Technology (WAT) team to develop a repository with tagging capabilities, allowing evidence to be assigned to relevant Principles and streamlining review and approval.

Evidence Types, Data Collection, and Continuous Improvement: Dr. Julie Murphy, Dr. Mehrotra, and Travis Goode raised questions about the types of evidence to submit, including survey and program data, with Drs. Hinojosa, Shenoy, and Smith clarifying acceptable formats, timeframes, and the importance of demonstrating continuous improvement for accreditation.

Data Timeframe: Dr. Murphy asked about the starting point for data collection, and Dr. Hinojosa clarified that evidence should cover at least four years, beginning with the academic year 2025, but newer programs can submit more recent data.

Survey and Program Data: Dr. Mehrotra questioned whether survey data counts as evidence, and Dr. Shenoy explained that while survey data can be referenced, evidence should primarily demonstrate resources and program effectiveness, with Dr. Hinojosa noting that survey results can support claims about program utilization and effectiveness.

Library Evidence Challenges: Travis Goode described the difficulty of demonstrating the library's impact on student success, suggesting starting with overarching themes and seeking feedback on the level of detail required, as the library supports all departments.

Continuous Improvement Emphasis: Dr. Smith highlighted that accreditation bodies prioritize evidence of continuous improvement, expecting the University to use feedback and outcomes to refine processes, rather than focusing solely on success metrics.

Principle Sign-Up and Next Steps: Dr. Shenoy and Dr. Smith coordinated the Principles sign-up process, asking members to indicate their areas of contribution in the meeting chat, and outlined interim steps for evidence collection before the document repository is available.

Principle Sign-Up: Dr. Shenoy posted the four Principles in the meeting chat and asked members to self-select which ones they could support, using thumbs-up reactions to track assignments.

Interim Evidence Collection: Dr. Smith instructed members to begin drafting lists of evidence for their chosen Principles, referencing previous reports for guidance, and will provide a temporary collection method (such as a Box folder) before the document repository is live.

Document Repository Status Update: Vy Trang reported that the document repository is under development, with Muhammad McIntee-Masud from WAT is working on a document upload

solution expected within a few weeks, and Dr. Hinojosa estimated a two-to-three-week timeline for completion.

Communication and Message Retention: Dr. Mehrotra noted that Teams messages are deleted after one year, suggesting email as a more permanent communication method. Vy Trang agreed to consult OIT about archiving options.

Follow-up tasks

Previous Report Access Issues: Resolve any access problems to the previous reports website for team members who encounter login issues. (Dr. Hinojosa)

Teams Message Archiving: Consult with OIT to determine if Teams messages can be archived to address concerns about message deletion after one year. (Vy Trang)

Document Repository Launch Timeline: Coordinate with Muhammad McIntee-Masud from WAT to ensure the document repository is made live within the next two to three weeks. (Dr. Hinojosa, Vy Trang)