

SACSCOC Compliance Certification and Review

Presented to the Academic Affairs Committee of the BOT

June 13, 2019

Principles of Accreditation

- Our submission will address 2018 *Principles*
- Largely a re-structuring of 2012 principles, with relatively few substantive changes, but considerable consolidation of closely related principles.
 - --Board evaluation (4.2.g)
 - --Student debt (12.6)
 - --Multi-level governance (4.3) [*reformulated, more than new*]
- **Our submission will be evidence driven**

The SACSCOC Reaffirmation Process

- **STAGE 1: The Off-Site Process**
 - Institution Submits Compliance Certification
 - [by September 10, 2019]
 - Off-Site Review Committee
 - 9 or 10 members
 - Spend 2 weeks on each of 3 institutions
 - Conference calls, emails, SharePoint, but no interaction with institution [except IT issues]
 - Meet in Atlanta [November 5-8, 2019]
 - Outcome: “Preliminary Findings”
 - [by early December 2019]

Issues of Broadest Attention

Institutional Effectiveness

Distinctions among related standards:

CR 7.1 (*Institutional planning*) [CR]

vs.

8.2.a (*Student outcomes: educational programs*)

8.2.b (*Student outcomes: general education*)

8.2.c (*Student outcomes: academic and student services*)

7.3 (*Administrative effectiveness*) (*no use of results required here*)

8.1 (*Student achievement*) [CR]

(Completion data- New "IPEDS" Outcome Measure – uses New Freshmen and Transfer Student Graduation for 8 Years)

Another area of frequent attention

- Faculty (Section 6)
 - especially adequate number of FT faculty (6.1; 6.2.b)
and qualifications of all faculty (6.2.a)
 - use of optional form now available for 6.2.a
("Faculty from Prior Review Form")
 - 6.2.c (*Program coordination*)

Requirement of a Policy

Implicit in every standard mandating a policy or procedure is the expectation that the policy or procedure is in writing and has been approved through appropriate institutional processes, published in appropriate institutional documents accessible to those affected by the policy or procedure, and implemented and enforced by the institution.

SACS COC

Compliance Certification

Winston-Salem State University

April 2, 2019

**John S. Hardt
Vice President**

Southern Association of Colleges & Schools Commission on Colleges

General Principles for “Making the Case” for Compliance

1. Assertions of compliance carry no weight without supporting evidence
(guide reviewers to evidence as directly, efficiently, and purposefully as possible)
2. **Linked existing documents make the case better than assertion** *(but narrative and assertion are useful to provide context, framework for the linked documents)*
3. Provide a current snapshot *(usually without past or future references)*
4. **Reviewers appreciate having links embedded in narrative and also listed again at end of each standard section**
5. Reviewers appreciate, respond favorably to, “tiered” presentation of evidence
6. **Links should take reviewers to particular relevant passage** *(not just catalog or website or Board ByLaws)*

Pointers for Documenting Compliance with Standards

- Respond directly to wording of standard
(sometimes even single words—e.g., “appropriate,” “adequate,” “sufficient,” “regular,” “periodic”)
- Address all parts of the standard
(many have multiple parts)
- Avoid information not clearly related to standard
(avoid extraneous information which may cause reviewers to miss key documentation of compliance)
- “Make the case!”
(based on your interpretation of the standard)
- Check and re-check links to supporting documents

Where Are We

- Dr. Hardt reviewed 13 of the most problematic standards
- Incorporated Dr. Hardt's suggestions into our report
- 73+ Standards have a draft completed
- 56 have final narratives and gone to 2nd level review
- 48 have gone to editor
- 17 have been returned and ready for documentation to be attached
- Committees addressing issues that have arisen
- Completing another review of the outstanding standards
- Expect to have all standards to editor by the end of June