# Call to Conversation:
## SACSCOC Reaffirmation

St. Philip's College
September 18, 2013

Dr. Adena Williams Loston

ALAMO COLLEGES

ST. PHILIP'S COLLEGE

# CLASS OF 2016    REAFFIRMATION

1. Principle of Integrity
2. Compliance Certification
3. Quality Enhancement Plan
4. The Off-Site Review
5. The On-Site Review
6. Review by the Commission's Board of Trustees
7. Announcement

# St. Philip's College – Class of 2016, Track A

## Timeline For Compliance Audit

**Track A Institutions**

| Planning Activities | Formation and Training of Audit and Leadership teams | Readiness Audit Process | | Orientation of Leadership Team in Atlanta | Work on Compliance Certification | Continue to Work on Compliance Certification | Submit Compliance Document | Off-Site Review | QEP and Focused Reports | On-site Review | Response Report | Review by SACSCOC |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| January or earlier | March | April -December | | January | Feb - Dec | Jan - February | March | March-May | Six Weeks before Vist | Sept-Nov | March | June |
| 2013 | | | | 2014 | | 2015 | | | | | 2016 | |
| Three Years Prior to Reaffirmation | | | | Two Years Prior to Reaffirmation | | One Year Prior to Reaffirmation | | | | | Year of Reaffirmation | |

# Compliance Certification Document

- Submit in March 2015

- Provides judgment, narrative and evidence of the extent of compliance with Core Requirements, Comprehensive Standards and Federal Requirements

- Certification by chief executive officer and accreditation liaison that the "document is truthful, accurate, and complete."

# Stages, Documents, and Results

1. SPC submits Compliance Certification document
2. Off-site Committee issues "Preliminary Findings"
3. QEP submitted 6 weeks prior to on-site review
4. On-site review
5. SPC Submits Focused Report(s)
6. On-site Committee issues "Report of the Reaffirmation Committee"
7. Commission review
8. SPC submits Response to Report to SACSCOC
9. Commission issues "Action Letter"

# Possible Outcomes

- **Reaffirmation!**
- **Response Report,** Reaffirmation



- Response Report, **Monitoring**, Reaffirmation

- Response Report, Monitoring, **Warning**, Reaffirmation

- Response Report, Monitoring, Warning, **Probation**, Reaffirmation

- Response Report, Monitoring, Warning, Probation, **Loss of Accreditation**

NO FINANCIAL AID  - NO FEDERAL GRANTS

# Track 2010 A (47 Institutions)

**Off-site Review (27 standards with >25% noncompliance)**

- CS 3.7.1 Faculty Competence—94%
- CS 3.5.4 Terminal Degree of Faculty—80%
- CS 3.3.1 I.E. Any Section—79%

**On-site Review (12 standards with >10% recommendations)**

- CR 2.12 QEP—64%
- CS 3.7.1 Faculty Competence—47%
- CS 3.3.1 I.E. Any Section—43%

**C&R Review (11 standards with >5% monitoring)**

- CS 3.3.1 I.E. Any Section—21%
- CS 3.3.1.1 I.E. Educational Programs—17%
- CS 3.10.1 Financial Stability—15%

# Common Reasons for Noncompliance

**Insufficient evidence**
- Doesn't exist
- Doesn't exist yet—recently implemented
- Couldn't find it
- Didn't document it

**Poor narrative**
- Didn't clearly make the case

**Real issues**
- Insufficient faculty, no I.E. process, financial instability, issues with faculty qualifications

# Current Status - QEP

April 2013     Input was gathered from across the institution using the QEP Topic Survey.

May 2013       Student input was gathered through student organizations.

May 2013       Personal Responsibility - final focus area identified at Good to Great Retreat

August 2013    Faculty development addressing assessment of "personal responsibility"

* QEP committee will be composed of as many individuals who volunteered as possible

# Current Status - Compliance

April 2013      Cursory audit review by cabinet, "red flag" items identified

August 2013      Team leaders attended SACSCOC Summer Institute (Mecca Salahuddin, Karen Sides, Art Hall, George Johnson)

Sept. 2013      Compliance Detailed Timeline developed

Sept. 2013      Cabinet oversight assignments identified

*Sub-committees under development

# Who Creates the Compliance Document?

**Everyone!**

**Everyone** has a role to contribute to and support the process

We **ALL** own Reaffirmation

We are **ALL** responsible for the outcome