Preparing for Reaffirmation at Doctoral/Research Institutions: Special Challenges and Opportunities

2006 SACS-COC Annual Meeting
December 9-12, 2006
Orlando, FL
Participants

- Ross A. Griffith, *Wake Forest University*
- Denise L. Young, *University of Central Florida*
- David P. Aday, Jr., *William and Mary*
- Lynn Williford, *UNC-Chapel Hill*

- Moderator: Bobbi Owen, *UNC-Chapel Hill*
Wake Forest University

Ross A. Griffith
Director of Institutional Research

http://www.wfu.edu/ir/
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, gravitsr@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>
</tbody>
</table>
2006 Reaffirmation of Accreditation

Commission on Colleges (COC) of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS)

- Accrediting Standards Required by COC
- Compliance Certification Report
- Focused Report
- Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP)
- Leadership Team and Committees
Core Requirement 2.6
The institution is in operation and has students enrolled in degree programs.

Rationale for Judgment of Compliance

College
Wake Forest University is a private, coeducational institution; it was founded in 1834 and has been a university since 1967. In the fall semester of 2004, the undergraduate student enrollment was 4,128 and the University’s total was 6,504.

Calloway
The Calloway School had 470 students enrolled in fall 2004, including 53 Masters of Accountancy students.

Babcock
Students have been continually enrolled in all of our programs since the inception of the School with 556 students enrolled in fall 2004.

Graduate
In fall 2004, the Graduate School had a total of 666 students enrolled. The Graduate School had 699 students enrolled for the 2003-2004 year: 422 on the Reynolda Campus and 277 on the Bowman Gray Campus. Of these students, 321 were in doctoral programs (88 Reynolda, 233 Bowman Gray) and 342 were in master's level programs (319 Reynolda, 23 Bowman Gray). There were also 36 graduate unclassified students (15 Reynolda, 21 Bowman Gray). General enrollment statistics and the number of students enrolled per program are listed on pages 39-43 in the 2003-04 Graduate School Annual Report.

Divinity
Wake Forest University Divinity School has enrolled students since fall 1999 and has graduated three classes (2002, 2003, and 2004). New student enrollment in the Master of Divinity Program has been in the range of 32-35 for the past several years. The entire enrollment for the Divinity School was 96 for fall 2004.

Law
The Law School is in operation and had 495 students enrolled in degree programs, fall 2004.

Medicine
This requirement is confirmed by the academic calendar and class enrollment and graduation data. For fall 2004, there were 427 M.D. students enrolled.
# Documentation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fact Book 2004-2005, p. 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wake Forest University Admissions Fact Sheet</td>
<td><a href="http://www.WakeForestUniversity.edu/admissions/student-life.html">http://www.WakeForestUniversity.edu/admissions/student-life.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Calloway</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calloway School Facts</td>
<td><a href="http://www.WakeForestUniversity.edu/calloway/facts.html">http://www.WakeForestUniversity.edu/calloway/facts.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Babcock</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babcock Enrollment - Fall 2004</td>
<td>2004 Babcock Enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Graduate</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Divinity</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Law</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medicine</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wake Forest University Medical School web site</td>
<td><a href="http://www1.WakeForestUniversitybmc.edu/MDprogram">http://www1.WakeForestUniversitybmc.edu/MDprogram</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA Program Web site</td>
<td><a href="http://www1.WakeForestUniversitybmc.edu/PAprogram/">http://www1.WakeForestUniversitybmc.edu/PAprogram/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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
University of Central Florida

Denise L. Young
Associate Vice President
Academic Affairs

http://www2.oeas.ucf.edu/oeas/sacs/sacsreaff.asp
THE CHALLENGE

This circus has many more than 3 rings
THE TEAM
The overall coordinator needs to be a ‘big picture’ person who provides direction to all
The coordinator needs two levels of teams: those who see where the rubber hits the road and.....
those who see below the surface on issues and processes
THE DESIGN
Go outside your institution to find ideas and get advice
THE KEY

Leadership and Support of the CEO
UCF Leadership Team

- President, Leadership Team Co-chair
- SACS Accreditation Liaison, Leadership Team Co-chair
- Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs
- Compliance Certification Team Chair
- QEP Planning Team Chair
- VP and Chief of Staff
- VP for Administration and Finance
- VP for Student Development and Enrollment Services
- Faculty Representative and current Chair of the Faculty Senate
- Faculty Representative
- Faculty Representative
- Staff support
You will need leaders and followers for all your tasks
Compliance Certification Team

**Compliance Certification Team**
- **Chair**: Selected from Planning & Evaluation Division
- General Counsel
- Assistant VP of Undergraduate Admissions
- Registrar
- Associate Dean for Graduate Studies
- Assistant Vice President and Dean, Undergraduate Studies
- Vice President and Chief of Staff
- Vice Provost, Information Technologies and Resources
- Director of Institutional Research
- Associate VP, Academic Development and Retention
- Assistant VP, Administration and Finance
- Faculty from each college
- Assistant VP, Academic Programs
- **Ex Officio**: SACS Liaison Officer
Compliance Certification Team

Liaisons: representatives from the following offices should be assigned as liaisons

- Office of Research
- Provost’s Office
- Regional Campuses
- Distance Learning
- University Relations
- UCF Foundation
- College and School Deans and Directors
- International Studies
- Diversity Initiatives
- Computer Services
- Library
- Human Resources
- Faculty Senate
- Student Government Association
- Student Development and Enrollment Services
- Faculty Center for Teaching and Learning
QEP Planning Team

- Chair and Facilitator
- Undergraduate Studies
- Graduate Studies
- Chair of Strategic Planning
- Arts and Sciences
- Engineering and Computer Science
- Interdisciplinary Studies
- Faculty Teaching and Learning
- College of Health and Public Affairs
- Library

- Regional Campuses
- College of Education
- College of Business Administration
- College of Hospitality Management
- Education and Technology
- Senior Faculty Member
- Student Discipline Office
- Student Advising Office
- SACS Liaison
THE TASK
Divide and conquer: break it into slices and bites
General Plan for Next Two Years

- conduct a compliance readiness audit (to identify potential issues) followed by the actual compliance certification
- have monthly updates on the compliance certification and QEP progress with the Leadership Team
- develop internal and external websites to communicate information about reaffirmation process and collect evidence of compliance
- establish regular communication about SACS reaffirmation with the university community
- develop compliance certification document and submit to SACS in an electronic form
- identify QEP topic, develop QEP document, and submit to SACS
Map out ALL the timelines and processes in one place
Report and Activity Timeline

Leadership Team Orientation—Atlanta
June 14, 2004

Annual Institutional Profiles
Fall (mid-Nov)
Winter (June)

Compliance Certification
September 10, 2005

Off-site Review
Nov. 7-11, 2005

Focused Report

Quality Enhancement Plan
Between January 30, 2006
and March 17, 2006

On-site Review
March 13, 2006 to April 28, 2006

Unresolved issues
UCF’s Approach to Compliance Certification

- conduct a **compliance readiness audit**
  - January to July 2004

- develop website to support compliance certification
  - October 2003 to July 2004
    - [http://www2.oeas.ucf.edu/oeas/sacs/sacsreaff.asp](http://www2.oeas.ucf.edu/oeas/sacs/sacsreaff.asp)

- conduct compliance certification
  - July 2004 – September 2005
    - identify supporting evidence, including creation of rosters
    - develop narratives
    - edit narratives
    - obtain approvals
    - develop document
      - website
      - CD
      - printed version
Compliance Certification Workload

- primarily administrative activity
- evidence of compliance
  - find it
  - transform it
  - ensure accessibility
- website
  - [http://www2.oeas.ucf.edu/oeas/sacs/sacsreaff.asp](http://www2.oeas.ucf.edu/oeas/sacs/sacsreaff.asp)
Purpose of Compliance Readiness Workgroup on Faculty Credentials

- carefully examine the standard on faculty credentials
  - interpret what it means for UCF
- examine information on faculty and determine whether we have any problems that need fixing
  - data issues
  - documentation issues
  - assignment issues
- implement short-term fixes
- develop recommendations for institutionalizing the faculty credentialing process
Purpose of Technology Team

- provide technical support for compliance certification preparation and reporting
- develop internal and reporting websites
- examine requirements for electronic submission of electronic submission
- examine software, hardware, organizational, design and other technical considerations for electronic submission
- overview of prototype internal website
  - [http://www2.oeas.ucf.edu/oeas/sacs/sacsreaff.asp](http://www2.oeas.ucf.edu/oeas/sacs/sacsreaff.asp)
# Proposed Schedule (Revised)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Milestone</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 2003</td>
<td>Begin readiness audit and website development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2003</td>
<td>Present SACS framework and timeline to President and Provost for approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2004</td>
<td>First Meeting of the Leadership Team to finalize committee structures and approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-July 2004</td>
<td>Readiness audit and development of QEP topics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 14, 2004</td>
<td>SACS Orientation of Leadership Team in Atlanta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July-Nov 2004</td>
<td>Study and select QEP topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2004-August 2005</td>
<td>Conduct Compliance Certification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec 04-Dec 05</td>
<td>Develop QEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep 10, 2004</td>
<td>Submit Compliance Certification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2006</td>
<td>Submit QEP and focused reports</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Avoid bottlenecks
Identify all gatekeepers and possible barriers: these can be time eaters
Communicate, re-communicate, and communicate again
Protect your health and the health of your team
Keep your sense of humor at all times
The College of William and Mary

David P. Aday, Jr.
Professor of Sociology and American Studies
Director of SACS Re-accreditation Project

http://www.wm.edu/sacs/
Compliance Report

- Method
  - Electronic submission

- Problem
  - Underestimated the amount of time necessary to prepare the number of paper copies
Compliance Report

- **Method**
  - Organized efforts using a “compliance team” with membership determined through existing College governance structure (faculty by area; administration, with special emphasis on administration and student services)

- **Problem**
  - Concerns about loss of faculty control. For us, faculty leadership was critical. Explained changed model of review, from “audit” to “evidence of compliance”
  - With that rationale, streamlined the organization of the review, always linking to existing governance structure
Compliance Report

- **Method**
  - Encouraged transparency through the review process by posting all information (beginning with the “Plan”) to the website. The website was current virtually throughout the review.

- **Problem**
  - We occasionally lost the sense of urgency among people on campus. Some began to forget that the process was happening. That became particularly urgent as we moved to consider and develop a QEP. We also were a little concerned about the site-visit. Information was widely available but not necessarily widely availed.
Compliance Report

- **Method**
  - We did not – and do not yet – have a system for preparing the Faculty Roster. As a result, our Office of Institutional Research collected data department and school at a time

- **Problem**
  - It was sometimes difficult to get the needed information and to make clear to faculty members that we were not challenging faculty credential. Rather, we simply need to document them.
Quality Enhancement Plan

- Method
  - The “Compliance Team” was involved principally with the review and around the mid-point, shifted attention to the QEP. Our “leadership team” had principal responsibility for the development of initial ideas for the QEP.

- Problem
  - As we neared the time for final selection of the QEP, some faculty members felt that they had not been involved sufficiently in the decision making. And this happened in spite of the fact that the QEP focuses on a goal that is articulated in our faculty-approved curriculum — a goal that is strongly endorsed but on which we have not made significant progress as yet.
The Review Process

- We found the off-site review to be thorough, thoughtful, and accurate. The review identified 9 questions, with several of those representing points of duplication in the standards.

- Preparation of the “Focused Report” was clear and unproblematic.
The Review Process

- The On-site review was less clear.
  - We had trouble finding QEP evaluators who could accommodate our late spring schedule.
  - The on-site team did not begin to organize until very near the time of the visit.
  - The QEP evaluators did not seem to understand their role as it is defined by the Principles.
  - There was some confusion about the role of the on-site team. For example, sometimes the on-site team would indicate that there was no question about compliance on an issue addressed in our Focused Report, but they nonetheless asked to examine the matter further.
Leadership Team

- Chancellor
- Executive Vice Chancellor & Provost
- Vice Chancellor for Finance
- Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs
- Associate Provost for Internationalization
- Assistant Provost for Institutional Research & Assessment
- Senior Associate Dean (Arts & Sciences)
- Professor (Biology)
- Professor (Business)
- Professor (Public Health)
- Student Representative
Compliance Review

- Co-chairs
  - Academic Programs
  - Faculty
  - Planning & Assessment
  - Graduate & Professional
  - Legal & Policies
  - Learning Resources
  - Student Services
  - Student Development
  - Finances
Quality Enhancement Plan
Making Critical Connections

- Chair
  - Curricular Innovation
  - Internationalization
  - Undergraduate Research

- Implementation Committee
Overall Strategies

- Institutional Research and Assessment took the lead for:
  - Keeping the process organized and moving according to established timelines;
  - Data Collection
    - Instructor credentials;
    - Assessment plans and reports;
    - Documentation (all in PDF format)
  - Creating electronic and print versions of the report;
  - Editing and revision process.
General Lessons Learned

- Surround yourself with good people because you will be with them a lot;
- Be aware that the goodwill and sense of loyalty from existing employees fades quickly as the weeks go by so adding a few outsiders can be helpful – especially as other work also needs to be accomplished;
- Protect the folks you are depending on from other obligations;
- Insist on a pre-visit;
- Recommend appropriate QEP evaluators (outside the SACS region is possible);
- The summer is prime vacation time for many faculty members and administrators so be sure you have access to the resources you need;
General Lessons Learned: Creating the Report

- Hire a neutral party to edit and rewrite for consistency;
- Develop a style sheet early on;
- Hire some external readers who have experience with SACS expectations to read drafts and look for “holes,” lack of clarity, and sufficient documentation;
- Recruit long-time faculty members and administrators who know a lot about the University and its policies to serve as independent readers of the committee reports (history, validity);
- Read your reports as if you are on the outside committee – wide and deep knowledge about the campus is critical
General Lessons Learned: Technical Production Work

- Outsource some (or all) of it if possible – especially if your institution is at all stretched with IT resources. This is a big commitment that stretches over two years;
- Website design;
- Assessment documentation system;
- Creating multiple copies
General Lessons Learned

- Consult with your reaffirmation “class,” consult with the previous group, and call on your friends.

- We used the opportunity to make The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill a better place, to make a great university greater – and recommend you do the same.
Class of 2006
Level VI Research Universities
Questions?