

**2028 SACSCOC Faculty and Academic Administration Working Group -
August 31, 2026, 1 pm – 2 pm
Microsoft Teams**

Attendees: Sean Cotter, Lev Gelb, Raúl Hinojosa, Jr., Muhammad McIntee-Masud, Vicky Morris-Dueer, Mehrdad Nourani, Stephen Spiro, Vy Trang, Eric Van Leeuwen, Mary Jo Venetis, Chris Wendt, Angela Franklin

Absent: Alex Lazos

Meeting notes:

- **Faculty Data Collection And School Review:** Dr. Stephen Spiro asked Vicky Morris-Dueer and Dr. Chris Wendt to report the faculty methodology data gathered to date. Both Vicky Morris-Dueer and Dr. Wendt reported that the Office of Institutional Success and Decision Support (OISDS) team is combining certified state data with PeopleSoft HCM information into a single, reviewable faculty dataset, which will be sent to schools for program-affiliation confirmation by the end of September.
 - o **Data Sources:** Vicky Morris-Dueer explained that the dataset combines certified data submitted to the state coordinating board for formula funding with PeopleSoft HCM data containing additional personnel information. The fall November 1 employee roster is being used because it provides the primary annual faculty and staff snapshot.
 - o **Included Personnel:** The data includes faculty teaching courses, tenure-related faculty, administrators who teach, and teaching assistants. Dr. Wendt confirmed that teaching assistants (TAs) remain in the file because they support the calculation distinguishing full-time from part-time personnel; TAs will receive the same information fields for review.
 - o **Program Affiliations:** Dr. Wendt clarified that HCM primary department information does not always represent a faculty member's academic program, particularly in schools without department-level reporting. Teaching load by school will help assign faculty, but schools must connect each faculty member to the relevant degree programs.
 - o **School Review Process:** Dr. Wendt will provide selectable program options at each academic level, together with instructions in a read-me document specifying how many options may be selected. Vicky Morris-Dueer expects the file and guidance to be ready within a few days after review by Dr. Spiro and Dr. Mary Jo Venetis, after which the materials will be distributed to schools for confirmation and returned by the end of September.
 - o **Multiple Time Points:** Vicky Morris-Dueer confirmed that the file covers three fall teaching periods when applicable, with a separate row for each fall, such as Fall 2025, rather than three separate files.
- **Faculty Program Contribution Method:** Dr. Spiro, Dr. Wendt, and Eric Van Leeuwen clarified that faculty may contribute to multiple degree programs at each academic level, with contributions divided evenly when no more detailed allocation is available.

- o **Multiple Programs:** In response to Eric Van Leeuwen’s question, Dr. Wendt confirmed that the task is not to assign each faculty member to only one program. A faculty member may contribute to multiple bachelor’s, master’s, or doctoral degree programs at the same level.
 - o **Contribution Percentages:** Dr. Wendt stated that the prior process divided a faculty member’s contribution evenly among the programs at a given level—for example, 50/50 across two programs or one-third each across three programs. The split applies to the person’s program contribution, not to dividing their FTE.
 - o **Terminology:** Dr. Mehrdad Nourani explained that DPA—department, program, or area—is used for internal academic organization and tenure-track affiliation. Dr. Wendt noted that the project uses “program” primarily to mean a degree program, which is distinct from a department, program, or area used in organizational terminology.
- **Principle Assignments And Evidence Responsibilities:** Dr. Spiro and Dr. Raúl Hinojosa began assigning working-group members to accreditation principles and identified faculty qualifications, full-time faculty sufficiency, program faculty, workload, and administrative officer qualifications as areas requiring coordinated evidence collection. The assigned principles spreadsheet will be updated by the working group members.
 - o **Principle 6.1:** Dr. Hinojosa described Principle 6.1 as covering sufficient full-time faculty by program, faculty hiring and recruitment, and related employment policies. Dr. Wendt said the institution-level full-time faculty data has already been preliminarily pulled and needs only cleanup and correct categorization. Dr. Sean Cotter added that workload evidence also helped establish faculty sufficiency; Dr. Venetis clarified that workload is considered generally by school and depends on how each school defines workload.
 - o **Principle 6.2A:** Dr. Hinojosa explained that Principle 6.2A addresses faculty qualifications for teaching in specific areas and the policies governing faculty credentialing. Dr. Spiro identified himself and Dr. Venetis as participants, and Eric Van Leeuwen agreed to be included.
 - o **Principle 6.2B And 6.2C:** Principle 6.2B covers faculty associated with degree programs, including full-time and part-time designation practices. Principle 6.2C covers workload, faculty evaluation, and academic-program organizational structure; Dr. Hinojosa indicated that Mehrdad’s DPA expertise would be relevant to this work.
 - o **Principle 5.4:** The group identified administrative and academic officer qualifications as part of Principle 5.4. Dr. Venetis noted that she should be included along with Dr. Spiro, while Dr. Hinojosa clarified that Dr. Wendt had been added accidentally and should not be assigned to 5.4.
 - o **Evidence Planning:** Dr. Spiro will maintain an assignment spreadsheet in Box and add immediate deliverables for each principle. Dr. Hinojosa will provide the questions each section must answer and sample policies, guidance memoranda, and other documentation so members can begin collecting evidence and uploading it to the document-review system.
- **Administrative Officer Documentation:** Dr. Venetis reported that job descriptions for cabinet members and senior academic administrators have been collected, while current

work focuses on obtaining CVs and documenting periodic evaluations for deans and associate deans.

- o **Collected Materials:** Dr. Venetis said they had already collected job descriptions for the new cabinet members, vice presidents, provost, and related senior administrators. The remaining primary documentation for those officers is their CVs.
- o **Academic Administrators:** For deans and associate deans holding academic offices, the team must ensure that periodic administrator evaluations and updated CVs are available. Dr. Venetis confirmed that Dr. Spiro's question about "proper evaluation" referred to the periodic evaluation process.
- o **Prior Report Guidance:** Dr. Spiro directed members to review the prior Fifth-Year Interim Report and its supporting documentation. The prior materials illustrate the expected product, including administrator biographies, CV links, and centrally maintained evidence links.
- **Evidence Upload And Narrative Workflow:** Dr. Hinojosa established that the upload portal is for evidence documents in PDF format, while draft narratives will be maintained separately in Box and later standardized and cited by Dr. Hinojosa's team.
 - o **Evidence Format:** Dr. Hinojosa instructed members to upload evidence documents as PDFs, including webpages saved as PDFs and Excel spreadsheets converted into readable PDFs. Vy Trang and Dr. Hinojosa can assist when documents do not render accurately or spreadsheet conversions are difficult.
 - o **Evidence Versus Narratives:** In response to Dr. Cotter, Dr. Hinojosa clarified that the upload portal is only for evidence, not narrative drafts. Draft narratives may be placed in the [working-group Box folders](#), where contributors can develop and combine Word documents.
 - o **Document Maturity:** Uploaded evidence does not need to be final. The team may request additional data or updates, and new versions can be uploaded as the work progresses.
 - o **Final Standardization:** Dr. Hinojosa's team will handle the later formatting and quality-control stage, including combining narratives into a consistent voice, ensuring citations match the evidence, and applying submission standards. Contributors only need to ensure that documents are legible and usable during collection.
 - o **Training Support:** Dr. Hinojosa will send a short video explaining how to upload evidence. Dr. Venetis also noted that presentation guidance with enlarged screenshots has been posted, and members can contact the support team for login or upload assistance.
- **Accreditation Timeline And Immediate Actions:** Dr. Hinojosa set October 27 as the first narrative-draft milestone, while Dr. Spiro confirmed that members will spend the next two weeks collecting evidence, assigning narrative leads, and reconvening to assess progress.
 - o **October Milestone:** Dr. Hinojosa identified October 27 as the target for completing the first draft of the narratives. Some data-heavy sections may require additional time because returned faculty data must be analyzed, cleaned, and interpreted, while established policies and processes can be drafted sooner.

- o **Next Two Weeks:** Members are expected to continue collecting evidence and upload it to the document-review tool before the next meeting. Dr. Hinojosa proposed using the following meeting to inventory available documentation, identify gaps, and begin shaping narrative drafts.
- o **Narrative Leads:** Dr. Spiro proposed identifying one person to lead narrative drafting for each principle. Members were asked to consider leadership assignments in the Box-based assignment spreadsheet.
- o **Next Meeting:** Dr. Spiro summarized that the group would reconvene in approximately two weeks to review the evidence inventory and move toward narrative drafting. In parallel, the OISDS team will finish the faculty data package and send it to the schools for review.

Follow-up tasks:

- **Principle Assignments:** Update the [assignment spreadsheet](#) on Box with members' preferred principles and identify a lead author for each narrative section. (Stephen Spiro, working group members)
- **Faculty Data Package:** Complete the remaining data work, add the read-me guidance and contact information, and provide the faculty spreadsheet package to Dr. Spiro and Dr. Venetis for review. (Vicky Morris-Dueer, Chris Wendt)
- **Faculty Program Validation:** Review the school-level faculty spreadsheet, associate each faculty member—including teaching assistants—with the applicable degree program(s), and return the completed information. (The schools)
- **Faculty Data Distribution:** Send the finalized, school-specific faculty files and read-me guidance to the schools for validation. (Vicky Morris-Dueer, Chris Wendt, Raúl Hinojosa)
- **Evidence Collection:** Upload relevant evidence documents for the assigned principles to the evidence tool in readable PDF format, converting Excel files to PDF where necessary. (Working group members)
- **Evidence Upload Guidance:** Send the short training video or guidance for uploading evidence to Mehrdad and Sean and the rest of the group as needed. (Raúl Hinojosa)
- **Principle Evidence Requirements:** Provide the questions each principle must answer and relevant sample documentation so the working groups can identify and collect missing evidence. (Raúl Hinojosa)
- **Administrative Leadership Evidence:** Collect current CVs for cabinet members and academic administrators and ensure dean and associate-dean evaluation documentation and CVs are available for the interim report evidence. (Mary Jo Venetis)