

SACSCOC Reaffirmation Steering Committee Meeting
 Randolph Hall, President's Boardroom
 April 15, 2016

1. SACSCOC VP, John Hardt visit - May 24-25, 2016

- a. Draft agenda for John Hardt visit
- b. Standards to be sent to John Hardt - (CR 2.2, Group 1; CR 2.5, CS 3.3.1, CS 3.3.1.1, CS 3.3.1.2, CS 3.3.1.3, CS 3.3.1.4, and CS 3.3.1.5, Group 2; CR 2.73, and CS 3.51, Group 6; CR 2.8, and CS 3.71, Group 7; FR 4.1, Group 4; FR 4.5, Group 11; and FR 4.9, Group 5)

2. Working group updates - Review by Consultants

Group#/Coordinator	Sent to External Consultant	Returned from External Consultant	Due date for Revision
1: E. Kassebaum	Pending		
2: D. Bhati	Pending		
3: M. White	N/A	N/A	N/A
4: B. McGee	4/18/16		
5: C. Francis	4/18/16		
6: L. Ford	4/25/16		
7: B. McGee	4/18/16		
8: C. Fund	3/25/16	4/6/16	4/27/16
9: E. Pope	4/18/16		
10: C. Tobin	3/25/16	4/6/16	4/27/16
11: A. Caudill	4/15/16		
12: S. Jones	4/25/16		
13: P. Patrick	4/25/16		
14: A. McCandless	3/25/16	4/7/16	5/15/16
15: J. Foster	4/11/16	4/13/16	5/5/16
16: A. Mulholland	4/11/16	4/14/16	5/6/16

Please prepare your Working Group standards for review by the consultants the Friday prior to the date assigned to your working group. To do this, please:

1. Remove all track changes/comments and finalize the draft
2. Collect evidence and save it in the evidence folder for the standard
3. Save all draft narratives (with title 'ready for external consultant') in the network drive reader folder, when steps 1 and 2 are complete.
4. Introductory paragraph after the header "Narrative"

"We recommend that you include an introductory paragraph that describes why the institution is in compliance and summarizes the evidence that you will present to demonstrate compliance. Think of this introductory paragraph as the one that the reviewer has to write in the compliance report—it is a summary of the evidence that demonstrates compliance. Make it usable for the reviewer to cut and paste in her report." At the end of the narrative a concise concluding paragraph.

3. Common issues identified by External Consultants

a. Inconsistencies in policies - in narratives versus CofC website

"As a general comment, we are finding inconsistencies among various policies in the references provided and when we go to the CofC website. We think that will be a problem for reviewers because you are not presenting a single story and they will wonder which version is accurate? Moreover, they will wonder how will a prospective student or a matriculated student know what is the right policy? Having two versions of the mission statement, both approved by the Board of Trustees on the same day is also a big problem. When folks like us, who know virtually nothing about the College can find these kinds of errors with a minimal review, it may cause one to wonder whether anyone at the College is actually reviewing the materials. The College experts should see these inconsistencies instantly."

b. Evidence - linking, assertions, and bookmarking of big files

"A consistent issue that we are seeing across multiple narratives is that CofC makes a lot of assertions that various processes are being used (e.g., review of publications, admissions procedures), without providing evidence to support these assertions. We think you may need to remind folks that it is not enough to describe processes/procedures; they need to provide evidence that those processes/procedures have actually taken place."

c. Reference to UCSC - mandate

"We believe that the College should state the official name for the Graduate school and mandate that it is the only way to which it can be referred."