

2028 SACSCOC Mission, Governance, and Administration Working Group Meeting
May 20, 2026, 9:00 – 9:45am
Microsoft Teams

Attendees: Jennifer Henry, Raúl Hinojosa Jr., Angela Marin, Marco Mendoza, Kelli Palmer, Vy Trang, Mary Jo Venetis, Kayleigh Tompkins

Participant Introductions: Each participant briefly introduced themselves, stating their roles and connections to the accreditation process.

Overview of SACSCOC Reaffirmation Process and Working Group Structure: Dr. Raúl Hinojosa Jr. provided a comprehensive overview of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC) reaffirmation process for 2028, explaining the differentiated review, the formation of six working groups plus a leadership team, and the responsibilities of each group and their members.

SACSCOC Accreditation and Differentiated Review: Dr. Hinojosa explained that UT Dallas is accredited by SACSCOC and undergoes a reaffirmation process every ten years, with the next major review in 2028. The university was approved for a differentiated review, requiring responses to a reduced set of core Principles, which still include significant compliance requirements.

Working Group Structure and Responsibilities: Six working groups and a leadership team have been established to address the required Principles for the compliance certification report (CCR), with each group responsible for reviewing compliance, identifying gaps, collecting evidence, drafting narratives, and suggesting policy or procedural changes as needed.

Roles of Group Members and Chairs: Dr. Hinojosa clarified that group co-chairs coordinate meetings, assign deliverables, and draft narratives, while working group members collect and upload evidence, review drafts, and provide input based on their expertise and roles within the university.

Assigned Principles for the Group: The group was assigned 16 Principles, including integrity, mission, governance, executive leadership, athletics, fundraising, administrative qualifications, public information, and compliance with federal and state requirements, with some Principles overlapping with other working groups.

Resources and Guidance for Accreditation Work: Raul described the resources available to support the working groups, including the Resource Manual for the *2024 Principles of Accreditation: Foundations for Quality Enhancement*, sample documentation, prior reports, presentations from annual meetings, and support from the Office of Institutional Success and Decision Support (OISDS) team and external liaisons.

SACSCOC Resource Manual and Handbook: The Resource Manual for the 2024 *Principles of Accreditation: Foundations for Quality Enhancement and Handbook* provide detailed explanations, rationale, questions to consider, sample documentation, and references for each principle, serving as the primary guide for drafting compliance narratives and ensuring focused responses.

Use of Prior Reports and Website Resources: Dr. Hinojosa advised that prior reaffirmation and interim reports are available on the UT Dallas SACSCOC website for reference but recommended starting with current Principles due to changes in requirements and university operations.

Presentations and Annual Meeting Materials: Presentations from the SACSCOC annual meeting, especially those focused on academic, financial, and governance Principles, are being compiled and will be shared as relevant resources for the working groups.

Support from OISDS and External Liaisons: The OISDS team, including Vy Trang and Dr. Hinojosa, will assist with meeting logistics, document management, and communication with UT System and SACSCOC liaisons to address questions and gather best practices from recent reaffirmations at other institutions.

Timeline and Key Milestones for Compliance Certification Report: Dr. Hinojosa outlined the timeline for the reaffirmation process, including draft and final narrative deadlines, technical preparation, peer and on-site reviews, and the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) schedule, with additional details on the review and submission process.

Drafting and Review Deadlines: The first draft of the CCR narratives is due October 23, 2026, with internal reviews and feedback in November 2026, a second draft due by the end of February 2027, and final drafts completed by April 30, 2027, followed by technical preparation by OISDS and Web Application Technology teams for submission.

Submission and Review Process: The final CCR must be submitted to SACSCOC by September 8, 2027, followed by an off-site peer review in October 2027, an on-site review in March 2028, and the final reaffirmation decision in December 2028.

Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) Timeline: A separate group led by Dr. Sarah Moore is developing the QEP proposal, with university leadership approval expected in summer 2026 and the QEP submission due February 28, 2027.

Next Steps and Meeting Cadence: Dr. Hinojosa proposed that the group meet monthly, assigned homework to review the Principles of Accreditation relevant to the group, and outlined the process for collecting and organizing evidence for the CCR, with Vy Trang assisting in scheduling and logistics. Group members are asked to review the assigned Principles of

Accreditation (see [Box folder](#)) and begin identifying relevant evidence and documentation, holding onto materials until formal upload instructions are provided.

Follow-up tasks

Distribution of Accreditation Principles Documents: Share the PDF of the slides and the differentiated review document in the meeting chat for today, and ensure the recording is available there as well. (Dr. Raúl Hinojosa)

Preparation for Next Meeting: Review the *Principles of Accreditation* documents assigned to the group before the next meeting and identify any questions or potential evidence/documentation relevant to your area. (Everyone)

Meeting Scheduling: Set up and send calendar invites for monthly meetings for the group. (Vy Trang)