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Overview

- Key events during two year cycle
- Compliance and Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) Processes
- Demonstration of Wake Forest web site for Reaffirmation of Accreditation
- Visit of On-Site Committee
- Summary
Key Events for Wake Forest University Class of 2006

- Leadership Team formed, April 2004
- Orientation meeting in Atlanta, June 2004
- Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) and Compliance Committees formed, Fall 2004
- Visit to University of Central Florida for workshop with other Class of 2006 research universities, February 2005
- Off-Site Committee’s review of Compliance Certification Report, November 2005
- On-Site Committee’s review of Focused Report and QEP, April 2006
Wake Forest University Schools

- College of Arts and Sciences
- Calloway School of Business and Accountancy
- Babcock Graduate School of Management
- Divinity School
- Graduate School of Arts and Sciences
- Law School
- Medical School
Compliance Process

- Compliance Committee consisted of Associate Deans for the seven schools, Dean of Students, Controller, Legal Counsel, Editor and SACS’ Liaison as Chair.
- Committee members met on two occasions and submitted electronic responses appropriately on the 74 Core Requirements, Standards and Federal Requirements.
- Responses were then welded and edited into one response for each of the 74 requirements and standards.
Data Collection and Organization for Compliance

- Form for centralized data collection
- Emailed as attachment to committee for completion of relevant schools’ data
- Completed forms returned electronically
- Data compiled into MS Word document for editing
Data Collection and Organization for Compliance (Continued)

- Converted into HTML format using Dreamweaver
- Condensed electronic format preferable
  - Links to electronic files preferable
  - Advise “host” of link to please not change the link until process is complete
  - Create links for electronic documents
INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING ASSIGNMENTS

Please provide the response to each “requirement” using this form while emailing your completed file by February 1, 2005 to Sara Gravitt, graviotr@wfu.edu, and Ross Griffith griffith@wfu.edu

Core Requirements/Standards and Federal Regulations
(Indicate number and title from Principles of Accreditation: Foundations for Quality Enhancement)

Check One: ☐ Compliance ☐ Partial Compliance ☐ Non-Compliance

Statement of Rationale for Judgment of Compliance

Documentation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>LOCATION (Link with Title)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Compliance Document—Web

Consists of:

- Table of Contents
- 74 Core Requirements, Standards and Federal Requirements
  - Supporting source documentation
Best Practices

- FINALIZE a template that will be used for all 74 items
  - This template can be used for the Focused Report – minimal modification
- Hard copies of the Compliance Document and Focused Report will likely be printed
  - Design a printer friendly template
Hindsight

- Involve technical person in planning to ensure efficient information gathering and web site creation
  - Avoid multiple copies of Compliance Items (email attachments)
- Centralized copies of working documents
- Pipe Dream? Automated “merge” of working documents to web page format
What is a Quality Enhancement Plan?

- “The QEP describes a carefully designed and focused course of action that addresses a well-defined topic or issues related to enhancing student learning”
- A required aspect of the SACS accreditation process
- “A consensus among key constituency groups that the QEP, rather than being merely a requirement for reaffirmation of accreditation, can result in significant, even transforming, improvements in the quality of student learning”

Quotations from the SACS Handbook for Reaffirmation of Accreditation
Logistics of the QEP

- Broad-based institutional participation
- Time line for implementation, assignment of responsibility, resource allocation, assessment schedule
- Structure for evaluating the extent to which the goals will be attained (5 year impact report)
- Quantitative and qualitative evaluation strategies for impact of QEP on quality of student learning
QEP Process

- QEP process was led by two faculty members and the Provost
- QEP committees developed their own web site for revision and input from the University community
- Final product was placed on the Reaffirmation of Accreditation area of the web site hosted by the Office of Institutional Research
On-Site Committee
Important Factors for Visit

- Rapport with SACS’ staff person
- Chair of Committee
- QEP Consultants on Committee
- Accommodations and dining
- Availability and active participation of administrators, faculty and students
Summary

- Using the resources of the Institutional Research Office with support of the University community can result in a most positive reaffirmation of accreditation experience.
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