



Reaffirmation Steering Committee

Meeting Minutes

December 11, 2024, 10am-11am

ACAD 700H

Approval of Minutes

The meeting started at 10:03 AM with the approval of the minutes from October 30th.

The minutes were approved unanimously.

External review of Reports

- Fifteen standards were submitted for external review, 7 and 8 received minor revision requests, and 4 standards are at the level of submission.
- It was noted that updates from the recent SACSCOC conference indicated significant changes that affect some standards, necessitating further discussion.

Policy Updates Needed for Standard 5.4

- Standard 5.4 is about Academic and Administrative Officers and their evaluation.
- Previously, in the 5th year report, evaluations were provided for all individuals at the director level and above. This approach was acceptable during the last fifth-year report. The external feedback this time indicated that the number of individuals included (200+) was excessive.
- SACSCOC now specifies that evaluations should occur every 3–5 years. Including evaluations for over 200 individuals is no longer feasible.
- Proposed Solution was to narrow the definition of individuals to include:
 - The President's Extended Cabinet.
 - Assistant/Associate Vice Presidents (AVPs).
 - Individuals identified by SACSCOC as overseeing a major component or area of the institution.
- Motion: A motion was made to adopt the proposed definition. Everyone voted in favor. The motion was approved.

Standard 9.1 Program Content

- We discussed the need for clearer rules and policies regarding the structure of undergraduate studies.

- It was noted that a policy for course leveling had been previously passed to indicate progression and rigor.
- Action identified:
 - The catalog and Coordinating Board guidelines should be reviewed to ensure alignment with requirements for majors, minors, electives, and minimum upper-division courses.
- A motion was made and approved for the working group assigned to Standard 9.1 to:
 - Review existing policies from the Coordinating Board and the university catalog.
 - Determine how the structure of undergraduate studies is determined, including guidelines for majors, minors, and electives.

Standard 13.2 Financial Docs

- The university is projected to be in non-compliance for this standard in September due to the unavailability of the most recent audit report. While the most recent audit will not be ready, it was emphasized that all preliminary work completed to date should be submitted to reviewers.
- A focused report will address this issue after the audit is available.

Standard 13.7 Physical resources

- Current narrative on the adequacy and sufficiency of physical resources needs to be more compelling, demonstrating "appropriate usage" of resources.
- We know the issue is usage, not lack of space. How we define appropriate in that respect is important.

SACSCOC Conference Takeaways

Mission Evaluation

- Divya shared that every five years, the institution must evaluate its mission.
- A decision was made to review Board Minutes to determine when the mission was last evaluated.

Faculty Rosters

- Divya emphasized the need to include degree dates in faculty rosters.

12.6 Financial Literacy Standard

- This standard requires us to select a KPI for this. And we selected cohort default rate. SACSCOC deferred implementation that was expected to begin in September 25.

Standard 6.2.A

- Judith noted that most institutions are using Watermark for compliance with Standard 6.2.A.

Standard 8.2.A

- Sedef shared positive feedback from conference sessions, indicating that we are on the right track with prompts in Nuventive and the mental moves we are asking everyone to engage in with their assessment data.
- Concerns were raised about current reports not having substantive responses under Implemented Changes area, as previous reports lacked focus on continuous improvement. She reiterated that consistency across responses will take 2-3 cycles.
- The Provost emphasized focusing on actions already implemented rather than future plans (such as “we plan to”).

QEP Takeaways

- Tim shared we learned a lot about QEP from the conference. This morning’s QEP steering committee meeting focused on key takeaways. We got reassurance that we are on the right track. Important networking with consultants happened. And we had new understandings with the timeline. The focus should be on deliberate and mindful implementation rather than rushing.
- Judith inquired about common issues leading to QEP citations:
 - 50% of citations are due to assessment issues.
 - Over 20% are due to budgeting concerns.
- The Provost requested preliminary budget estimates for QEP planning.

7. Insights on Compliance Report Writing

- Christian found the conference experience eye-opening. They noted that some institutions use discipline-agnostic individuals with strong management skills to manage report writing. Sedef added this approach could also apply to a potential QEP Director.

8. Resource Room Insights

- Maria found the resource room helpful. She also emphasized the importance of aligning SACCO accreditation efforts with program accreditation (a key finding from a session she attended)

Maintaining Momentum Gained at the Harvesting Event

- Sedef highlighted feedback from the community on making data more accessible and actionable. She gave an example of how the Office of Assessment acted on this feedback recently. Example: A two-hour data deep dive session with 3SL and advising groups using College Student Inventory survey results.

- Dr. Maxwell noted the need to close the loop with data. He mentioned new initiatives and transitions in leadership were the types of movements that made us miss some key things about data.
- Divya stressed the need for OIE to make sure data is in the hands of stakeholders.

Next Steps: Facilitators of the Harvesting event emphasized avoiding duplicate initiatives and adopting a collaborative, prioritized approach with the feedback collected at the event. Divya proposed a facilitator meeting in the second week of January to maintain momentum and discuss commonalities and intersections in community feedback, which can then be brought to the larger group for further discussion.