



Reaffirmation Steering Committee

Meeting Minutes

January 29, 2025, 10am-11am

ACAD 700H

Dr. Bhati welcomed the group

Motion to Approve December Meeting Minutes: Lisa Braysen

Second: Judith Quander

Vote unanimous to approve

The group acknowledged the new microphone in ACAD 700 and the online audience affirmed its strong functionality.

Decision on Documentation of Program Effectiveness for Standard 12.1

This is the standard related to student support services; cuts across divisions (parking, advising, etc.). In the standard, the expectation is to describe what the services are, and what usage looks like. We also must demonstrate assessment of efficiency and satisfaction.

During work on that standard, we had transition of leadership in 3SL. Also, 3SL is only two years old, and we need three years of longitudinal data.

In our 5th year report, we included some surveys that were generated ad hoc, but they have not been generated recently, and there is no longitudinal data.

The team decided to not include data from previous years (using an email communication from Dan Maxwell as evidence for the report).

This is an issue, but moving forward, the solution is to use some data from our current cycle to capture satisfaction and effectiveness of services.

We wanted the Steering Committee to be aware of the issue and the solution decision.

Question: how many units were missing data? Not every unit in 3SL, but a few missing. We were able to collect SOME data from some others from NSSE and other sources.

Highlights from External Consultant Feedback

- a. Key insights and recommendations provided by the external consultant
- b. Examples of how this feedback is shaping and improving our work

Of our 40 standards, we have 15 that have been reviewed by the external consultant. Many had positive feedback; others received constructive information

Standard 5.4, for example, received feedback that HR can reduce the volume of individuals reported from Directors and above to a new definition. HR is working on a new definition.

Standard 9.2 Program Content standard; rules around having a structure of our undergraduate programs (minimum number of lower level and upper level courses; sequencing; requirements for majors and minors). Per DAVID, these are defined in many places (transfer policy, etc.); APC just sent out the policy out for comment period – it would be helpful to use the open Qualtrics survey to submit updates per this standard.

Question: what would be required for sequencing? PS 03.A.12 addresses progression, upper/lower division. We referenced these policies in standard 9.1; see feedback from Steve Sheeley. The group interpreted “structure” as “guardrails.”

Divya will make a comment on the qualtrics survey to share Sheely’s comments with APC

Standard 13.7 - we make a good case asserting that we have good use of physical space, but we are missing evidence. How do we demonstrate that our facilities are adequate to meet the needs of students, faculty, and staff?

Standard 5.2c - similarly, more evidence required (fundraising efforts)

Standard 8.1 Student Achievement – key indicator for student achievement measures; most institutions use 6-year graduation rates. When we disaggregate by Pell, First Gen, etc., Dr. Sheely indicated that when the rates are low, we need to link to our initiatives to how we are connecting to the Student Success Initiatives.

Standard 10.5 Admission Standards – we are missing a redacted example of an undergraduate application (we have the graduate); we need to include one example.

Standard 6.2 Faculty Roster – Sheely recommended we remove the inclusion of ABD; highest degree will be Masters.

Standard 6.1 is raising a flag about overloads, so we are looking at the data to be sure we are reporting overloads appropriately.

Standard 6.2b is waiting on the final table of data (IR); also need examples from 9.1 to add to 6.2b (David)

Update from Christian Purdy regarding HRs work on their standard; the reduced list of administrative leaders will be loaded into Watermark for profile maintenance.

Reflections on the Process of Reaffirmation

Part of the point of all the working groups was to set the structure for continuous improvement, so can you share your experiences so far?

Jonathan Davis – when we are doing our work as an institution, we have not been doing that work with accreditation in mind. If we can begin to weave accreditation into our work on a regular basis, we will not have as much work to do in the reporting period. This is an opportunity for us moving forward.

Christian Purdy – in HR, they have discovered there are several sources of truth for information; we need to have ONE source of truth. Then on other occasions, we OVER-complied, and created too much work. This process has identified double-work and inefficiencies, so we hope to create processes to optimize work and make this information easier to replicate.

Also, continuity has been a challenge. As people leave, many balls have been dropped. Our goal is to create systems for continuity so when people leave, the process continues.

David – agreed; we sometimes create problems in other areas, when we try to solve another problem. The working group model is good for bringing in lots of other people to engage in the process.

Judith – yes, improving process has been a tremendous outcome of this work. We will have a much smaller task in the future, and we will be able to do these faculty credentialing checks on a more regular basis.

David – in some administrative areas, we had learning outcomes that were impossible to assess (example of Study Abroad). So we have modified the learning outcomes to make sure the administrators are focused on their priorities and not getting bogged down in assessment

Sedef – a lot of the co-curricular areas are redoing their assessment plans and we are aligning these updated plans with the guidance from SACSCOC standards and each group's mission. What is the core of what we do, and assess that.

Divya – we have already made a great deal of progress on policies thanks to improved technology and committee participation. Nuventive launch has been successful. We have embraced our Strategic Plan as an institution.

Next Steps in the Reaffirmation process

Thanks to Maria Benzon for the graphic for the SACSCOC Timeline. Divya talked through the timeline. Carol Tucker asked about the availability of the report; this will be behind UHD credential login.

We will post this on the reaffirmation website.

Meeting adjourned

Upcoming

Next meetings:

February 26, 2025, March 26, 2025, April 30, 2025, May 28, 2025