

Wednesday, February 26, 2014

SACS Leadership Committee

9:00 a.m.

Conference Room, Building 1

Chair: Jay Sullivan

Vice Chair: Rick Anderson

Secretary: Rebecca Adams

Members Attending: Ben Morris, Dixon Boyles, Brenda Rogers, Jennie Singleton, Erica Schatz

Members Absent: Crystal Ange, Karen Eckert

Minutes from Meeting (2/26/14)

I. Approve 1/15/14 Minutes

Presenter: Jay Sullivan

- Jay asked if anyone had corrections on the last meeting minutes. On the first page under the Prospectus heading and second bullet, change the last sentence to read, "The deadline was lengthened." Also on the first page under the MOU heading and first bullet, change the wording in the last sentence to read, "MOUs need..." On the second page under the heading PSLO and first bullet, change the next to last sentence to read, "Jay noted that the template for 2.8 is changing." Delete the last sentence. Rebecca will make these corrections. After corrections were discussed, Jay asked for a motion to approve the minutes. Jennie made a motion, and Rick seconded. Minutes approved.

II. Updates on SACS Notifications

Presenter: Jay Sullivan

- Jay asked Ben, Dixon, and Erica to share any information they've received regarding SACS notifications. Erica said she has letters of termination going to SACS for a lateral entry certificate and the BCCC/FTCC SLPA instructional service agreement. We have not submitted the prospectus for the off sites yet. Two of these are the automotive program at Plymouth and the welding program at Creswell. They are both in editing mode. Jay said a teach-out plan for drafting has been accepted. Ben said we may have to do a prospectus for a welding program at Columbia.

III. Review SACS Narratives

Presenter: Jay Sullivan

- Jay reported that so far we have received eight narratives out of nineteen total that will be submitted for our review. He feels that we are making good progress. The SACS narratives will continue to be sent through email. We feel that this is best because of future changes with the N Drive. We can think of a more collaborative tool this summer.
- Prior to the meeting, Jay asked everyone to review the narratives he sent via email. He asked for our overall impression. For the most part, they are all consistent with the writing guidelines. Dixon did note that he saw usage inconsistencies, one being singular and plural collective nouns. He suggested making all nouns singular throughout to correctly correspond with the verbs. We would treat them as a unit rather than an individual. Dixon also mentioned the use of commas in a series of items. When listing a series of items, it is best practice to insert a comma before the conjunction "and."
- Jay asked for everyone's ideas on how to review the narratives. We do need to start reviewing the drafts we have received in order to stay on track. Jay said rather than reviewing them collectively as a group, we could break off into subcommittees and assign each one a couple of the narratives. The group thought about this, but it was eventually decided to review them as a group. It will probably be a matter of reading each one line by line.

- Rick suggested allocating 20-25 minutes of our meetings for review. He wanted to know if we're more concerned with the narrative as a whole or the grammar. Jay responded that both are important. Jay also mentioned that it's important the committees who submitted the narratives understand the changes we have made; it could be a learning experience for them. Dixon recommended inviting the chair or a representative from each committee to our meetings.
- Rick asked if we need to meet more often to have ample time to review the narratives. Jay said most of them are short. If we meet every two or three weeks and review two or three narratives in 20 minutes, we are moving at a good pace. Erica suggested reviewing the longer narratives first and the shorter ones second. We should be okay with the drafts we've received so far because those particular chairs will be here this summer.

IV. Standards **Presenter: Jay Sullivan**

- Jay said that Crystal will schedule a meeting with him and each of the deans to discuss standard 2.8 regarding full-time faculty. Standard 3.3.1.1 and the QEP impact report are both a concern. Many institutions are reviewed on this particular standard, and we need to make sure we touch base with those responsible for reports.
- We need to address standard 3.13, which has three parts: A, B, and C. Part A refers to accrediting decisions of other agencies, or external agencies which accredit a program on campus. Examples of external agencies are our BLET, MLT, and nursing programs. This particular standard is not assigned to any committee. Jay asked for everyone's thoughts on which committee this standard should be assigned to. We debated between the Marketing/PR/Recruitment Committee and the Admissions & Academic Affairs Committee. After some discussion, it was decided this standard would be shared between the two committees. Erica made a motion to approve the decision, and Jennie seconded.
- Part B refers to complaints against the institution. This ties to standard 4.5, Student Complaints, which Rick has submitted. He will work on adding 3.13 Part B to the 4.5 narrative. There was discussion about the Student Appeals Committee. Dixon believes Crystal wrote a response for the 5th year report. This was about reducing the number of students serving on the Student Appeals Committee. However, it was decided to leave two students on the committee, being its purpose is to address student complaints.
- Part C refers to institutional reviews of distance education. Everyone felt this should go to the Distance Education Committee.

V. Other **Presenter: All**

- Dixon has spoken with Emily and Morgan in Human Resources about the job description forms. He asked whose comments were on the narratives. Jay said these were made by the committee who wrote the narrative.
- Brenda was concerned about the web links mentioned throughout most of the narratives. Jay said it is important to include as much information as possible, especially so we can direct the reviewers to a relevant and specific location. We certainly need to make sure the web links are correct, especially the BCCC catalog.

VI. Next Meeting **Presenter: Jay Sullivan**

- At our next meeting, we will review narratives 4.2 and 4.5. The 4.2 narrative is lengthy, and there are some concerns with the titles mentioned throughout. The 4.5 narrative is short and should be easy to review. Jay said for consolidation, we will look at our previous submission, what SACS recommended, and our response to them. Note: A recommendation from SACS is a recommendation to correct our first submission. No other business was discussed. Meeting adjourned at 10:00 a.m.

Other Information

Next Meeting: Wednesday, March 12, 2014 at 9:00 a.m. in the building 1 conference room