

Intel & Insight Report for RACEA

Information Category for I&I Web Posting: Fifth-Year Report

Web Label for the I&I Report Link: Annual SACS Staff Analysis of Fifth-Year Report Citations and Georgia Tech's Analysis for Compliance Planning

Source(s): Carol Luthman's Presentation at the 2009 Annual Meeting and Subsequent Analysis by Susan Paraska at Georgia Tech

Document Address (if applicable): Included next following this I&I Report

Annotation of Intel & Insight: The top six citations that were issued to institutions in their reviews of 2009 Fifth-Year Reports were presented by Carol Luthman at the SACS-COC Annual Meeting (handout attached). CR 2.8 and CS 3.3.1.1 led the list and tripped up half of the institutions. Susan Paraska, Director of Program Review and Accreditation at Georgia Tech, prepares an analysis of those findings annually to share with the institution's Leadership Team and its SACS Working Committee. A copy of that analysis is also attached.

Submitted by: Susan Paraska

For more information contact: susan.paraska@carnegie.gatech.edu

Date: 2-16-10

Please email this completed report with any cited documents included in a single PDF attachment to the Chair of the RACEA Task Force on Current Issues in Accreditation (currently barbara.brown@gpc.edu). Last updated 2/10

Analysis by SACS Staff of Fifth-Year Interim Reports and QEP Impact Reports
 140 reports reviewed by Fifth-Year Committee: 76 in 2013 Cohort; 39 in 2014 Cohort.
 (Carol Luthman, December 2009)

# Citation(s)	2013 Class	2014 Class
	# Institutions Cited	# Institutions Cited
0	17	0
1	16	5
2-3	29	22
4-5	7	9
6-9	5	2
10 or more	2	1
	76	39

2014 Class--Top 6 Citations:	SACS Standard	# Institutions Cited (of 39)	Percentage
Faculty adequate	2.8	23	59%
IE of education programs	3.3.1.1	20	51%
Program Coordination and Development	3.4.11	11	28%
Student Complaints	4.5	11	28%
Physical Facilities	3.11.3	9	23%
Student support services	2.10	5	13%

2014 Class, QEP Report Results: 11 of 39 institutions submitted QEP Impact Report
 9 reports ACCEPTED with comment
 2 reports REFERRED to Compliance & Reports Committee

NEED 2009 DATA

Report #	# of Institutions out of Compliance	Percentage	SACS Compliance Area	SACS Principle	Principle Short Title	Areas and Examples of Institution's Non-compliance	How GT could show evidence of Compliance
12	23 of 32	72%	Federal	4.5	Procedures for addressing student complaints	Actions did not follow stated policies; lack of documentation; no examples given	? Written, disseminated policies & procedures ? Evidence followed in resolving complaints
4	18 of 32	56%	Comprehensive	3.3.1.1	Educational programs--assessment of; expected outcomes; evidence of improvement based on analysis	Examples not given; samples not given; no description of how all programs are assessed; no information on what was learned from assessment, how used, and what changed	? All/each academic programs have outcomes & assessed regularly ? Assessment results incorporated in planning & budgeting ? Evidence of improvement based on assessment
14	13 of 32	41%	Federal & Comprehensive	4.7; 3.10.3	Title IV; Audit reports of financial aid programs	Did not provide recent audit reports; did not have current information on audit requirements	? Designated office to manage Title IV programs & issues ? Infractions addressed
6	13 of 32	41%	Comprehensive	3.4.11	Academic Program Coordination & Development	Incomplete information on person(s) such as names, titles, and why qualified; each academic program did not have a names curriculum coordinator, and for some, their credentials were questionable	? All programs assigned coordinator & evaluated ? Qualified faculty assigned & evaluated
1	9 of 32	28%	Core	2.8	Adequate number of FT faculty members to support the mission and ensure quality and integrity of academic programs	Incomplete and contradictory reporting of total number of instructors, their titles and employee classification (FT, PT, adjunct, etc.), and their qualifications. Roster not presented by department and not cross-linked with assigned courses.	? Institution's process for determining adequate number of faculty for its academic mission unclear ? Credentials/qualifications clearly matched (CIP) and addressed in hiring process to support academic mission ? Clear identification/updates in reporting databases of each course's instructor of record
3	8 of 32	25%	Comprehensive	3.2.8	Qualified administrative and academic officers	Incomplete list of key decision makers as compared to organization charts, and institutions did not provide evidence as to how the persons included were connected to key decision-making processes.	? Have/Use current org. charts ? Job summaries current, describe responsibilities ? Clear connection to Institute decision-making process
13	8 of 32	25%	Federal	4.6	Recruitment materials	Incomplete documentation and/or no materials were provided or referenced in report	? Written process for review, approval of ALL recruitment materials & presentation
8	4 of 32	13%	Federal	4.1	Student achievement evaluation (data)	Data lacking or not provided on course/program completion; no data on job placement, etc. Analysis of data lacking.	? Evidence of student achievement ? Evidence relates to stated mission and goals
9	4 of 32	13%	Federal	4.2	Curriculum is directly related to purpose & goals of institution	No linkage evident in the report as to how curriculum is tied to the mission	? Curriculum related to stated mission ? Curriculum current with mission and goals
5	4 of 32	13%	Comprehensive	3.4.3	Admissions Policies	Incomplete information on institution's policies, how published/disseminated, where documented; admissions process, who involved	? Accessible, consistent in all publications, media ? Reviewed, updated annually ? Clear, written procedures for process & appeal
2	4 of 32	13%	Core	2.10	Student support programs, services and activities	Incomplete information and failed to show how this area promotes student learning and development	? Serve ALL students--ALL locations ? Promote student learning ? Assessed regularly for effectiveness
7	4 of 32	13%	Comprehensive	3.11.3	Physical facilities--operations & maintenance--on & off campus	Inadequate support documentation; did not address both on- and off-campus	? Current physical inventory ? Clear line planning & budgeting ? ALL facilities managed
10	3 of 32	10%	Federal	4.3	Public & student access to academic calendars, policies, etc.	Incomplete documentation provided in the report	? Public access to approved academic calendars, grading policies, refund policies
11	3 of 32	10%	Federal	4.4	Program length is adequate for each program	Did not include ALL programs--especially ones other than "norm" for the institution	? Written criteria on program length ? Determined and reviewed by faculty