

MINUTES: University Self-Study Steering Committee

DATE: October 10, 2000  
2:30 - 4:30 pm  
Old Board Room, Administration Building

PRESENT: C. Havice, Co-Chair, (presiding), B. Berdine, D. Boyd, D. Harley,  
J. Hougland, G. Hoyt, R. Jordan, D. Kalika, P. Kelley, T. Lester,  
T. Lillich, R. Mitchell, L. Nora, J. Picoro, A. Sparks, C. Todd,  
C. Vaughn

C. Havice called the meeting to order at 2:30 pm. The agenda for this meeting was to determine responsibility for the SACS must statements and areas of overlap between committees. Because of this, all Vice Chairs were invited to attend.

#### MINUTES

The Minutes of September 26 were approved as distributed.

#### DIRECTOR'S REPORT – J. Picoro

J. Picoro asked if everyone had received the e-mail announcing our first general forum. The forum will be Wednesday, October 18 from 2:00-3:30 in the Center Theater, Old Student Center. Everyone was urged to attend.

J. Picoro has received messages from several faculty members who could not attend the forum but wanted to bring items to our attention. He distributed a handout that was developed for the forum. It basically consists of the self-study goals, information to reach the self-study office, a list of committee chairs with telephone and e-mail, and a list of the questions for discussion that was developed in the last Steering Committee meeting. Doug Bruce has agreed to be the facilitator for both forums. He has been informed that committee chairs will try to attend in order to answer questions specific to individual committees.

Spindletop will be the location for our welcoming reception and dinner with the visiting committee on Monday April 15, 2002. Since Spindletop is not usually open on Monday evening, our group will be the only one there.

The surveys are almost finished. They have all been submitted to the Survey Research Center. J. Picoro met with R. Langley to finalize questions on some of the instruments. The staff survey should be out by the end of this month. The faculty survey and the survey to chairs/administrators should be out shortly after that. The SRC is putting finishing touches on the telephone surveys. Where there were issues of confidentiality or anonymity, some questions had to be eliminated.

## COMMITTEE REPORTS – C. Havice

C. Havice called for committee reports.

### Administrative Processes – T. Lester

The total group met last week and came to closure on 22 questions for focus groups. These are based on the must statements in the administrative area and will be divided among the various focus groups. Individuals were also identified with whom the committee needs to meet. D. Toon is scheduling rooms for meetings with deans, chairs, chancellors, vice chancellors, budget officers from individual colleges, and people regarding risk management.

### Institutional Purpose – D. Boyd

The committee met the day after our last Steering Committee meeting. The purpose of the meeting was to determine that the mission statement template is in compliance with the SACS Criteria.

### Institutional Effectiveness – D. Kalika

The committee has divided into subgroups dealing with various constituencies and examining what they have been doing regarding institutional effectiveness. They are currently focusing on those units that have undergone periodic review within the last two years. This is being done to see if these units are using recommendations to make changes.

### Distance Learning – B. Berdine

The committee is divided into subgroups. They have designed a matrix that shows those must statements for which the group is responsible. Subgroups have been examining various areas. The committee will meet again the first week of November and individuals will report their findings. This group originally had a number of questions about overlap. They went through every section in the Criteria to determine the must statements which deal with distance learning. The group will examine all of these. Questions the committee had about the survey have been satisfactorily resolved.

### Staff – C. Todd

Since this group had no must statements, they have isolated issues that seem relevant to staff across campus and are examining these. They are also looking for a representative from the Medical Center and would like to have more hourly employees as committee members. The committee has met with many people for interviews/discussions. They have divided into subgroups focusing on specific areas. Examples of issues the group is looking at are educational opportunities for employees and the PDP evaluation process. C. Todd asked that anyone having issues that deal with staff please let her know so that they can be included in the group's work.

#### Intercollegiate Athletics – R. Jordan

This committee has finished most of their interviews. They met with the President, Registrar and other specific University officers. They still have interviews with a few coaches left to complete. This seems to have been one of the more enjoyable committees on which to serve.

#### Student Development – G. Hoyt

The total committee has met 10 times since May and has around 10 meetings to go. They have divided into subgroups also. They spent a lot of time early in their work talking about the process of student development and the kinds of information they needed to gather. Since this is the student development committee, they have added additional student members. There are four student members. Student members are added as needed to replace those who leave. This group has met with various administrators, vice chancellors, etc. for interviews. They reviewed the Student Satisfaction Survey done by C. Ray's office. G. Hoyt also conducted a survey of students asking them what they liked the most and what they liked the least about UK. An overwhelming response is that students do not like the dry campus. G. Hoyt asked how other groups are gathering information and what types of things we are supposed to be looking for. In answer to the question of whether other groups are getting input from students, no other groups are doing so at this time.

C. Havice and J. Picoro pointed out that several self-study committees may need to be in touch with the various student groups that have regular meetings in order to gather information. Telephone surveys will also be conducted with undergraduate, graduate, and professional students.

B. Berdine asked who is looking at disability issues for students. There is very little on record for faculty, staff, or students. This is a new issue since the last visit. G. Hoyt said that her group is looking at the disability issue for students. C. Todd's group has been looking at the issue for staff. The staff subcommittee had a presentation on disability issues and would be glad to share this information.

J. Picoro reminded the groups that any suggested changes should be made as soon as possible, before the SACS review committee visit. Let someone in the self-study office know, and we can refer the issue to the appropriate person who can follow through on getting the changes put into place.

#### SURVEY –

J. Houglund reported that the surveys are essentially finished. The TA/PTI instrument will be divided into two surveys. The former faculty survey is still to be written. Otherwise, we have just about finished. The Survey Research Center will review, request needed modifications, and begin sending the surveys out. J. Houglund encouraged everyone to complete the survey when they receive it. Also encourage others to do so.

C. Havice said that she had an opportunity to look at the return rate from last time. It was fairly high. It has been suggested that the current environment and circumstances on campus would encourage people to respond.

#### AREAS OF OVERLAP – C. Havice

C. Havice said that the main item of business for this meeting is to talk about where there are areas of overlap in committee responsibility. She distributed a handout of the must statements taken from the Clemson web site and a handout of committees. She asked if everyone had taken the opportunity to review the must statements for their areas and determine if overlap exists. Each committee chair/vice chair responded regarding the various individual committees.

#### Principles & Philosophy of Accreditation – T. Lillich

T. Lillich noted that his committee has discussed this and that it was brought up at a prior meeting of the Steering Committee. It seems that a portion of this committee's work either overlaps with or depends on the work of a number of the other committees. However, this has not been formally stated. When overlap occurs, who will address the must statement and gather the information? We have a large amount of work to do and need to avoid duplication of effort as much as possible. We also want to make sure that every must statement is addressed.

Specific statements of concern are:

-1.1 – Institutional commitment      Appears there could be overlap with other groups.

-"Committed to the search for knowledge and dissemination"

-"Integrity in the pursuit of knowledge is expected to govern the total environment of the institution"      This may overlap with the research committee

-"The institution must be in operation and have students enrolled in degree programs at the time of the committee visit"      Will the Education Committee address this statement?

-"Must have a clearly defined, published statement of purpose appropriate to an institution of higher education"      Will this be handled by the Institutional Purpose Committee?

Adequate financial base and operating deficit should be addressed by the Administrative Processes Committee.

T. Lillich will e-mail the chairs of those committees where there may be overlap requesting their information. He will include it in his chapter of the report. Each of the other committees will also include this information in their chapters.

It was noted that the statements dealing with the educational programs are also the purview of the Faculty committee.

Institutional Purpose – D. Boyd

The last must statement in Section II may overlap with Administrative Processes and Institutional Effectiveness. The Institutional Purpose committee will act as a check at the end of the process.

Institutional Effectiveness – D. Kalika

-Will need to re-evaluate item 3.1. Are currently focusing on implementation.  
-Evaluation of student achievement should be handled by the educational programs subcommittees. The Institutional Effectiveness group will need to meet with each of the three subcommittees since the vice chairs of those groups could not attend this meeting.

B. Berdine suggested that the distance education policy statement be sent out to all chairs and vice chairs. This was very helpful to him in determining their groups' must statements. C. Vaughn will forward this information.

The faculty and libraries subcommittee vice chairs were unable to attend this meeting so their must statements could not be reviewed.

Staff – C. Todd

This group has no must statements.

Student Development – G. Hoyt

There is overlap with the Principles & Philosophy Committee for the must statement that deals with Title 4 financial aid. G. Hoyt asked what sort of supporting documentation groups were expected to gather.

J. Piccoro stated that for any source committees use in their reports, they need to reference the source and submit a hard copy with all attachments for the library we are required to put together for the visiting committee. We will also load as much of the supporting information as possible onto the web. A set of writing guidelines is in the process of being developed and will include a section on documentation. These should be finished soon and will be distributed to all committee members.

AR's and GR's do not have to be provided. The last self-study report, the Undergraduate Bulletin, and the Strategic Plan are all available publicly. If you have a document that cannot be provided because it cannot leave the office where it is located, we need to provide evidence of where that document is located so that any member of the visiting committee who needs to see the document can be taken to that location.

Intercollegiate Athletics – R. Jordan

There is no overlap.

Administrative Processes – T. Lester

Did not see a lot of overlap. Is unsure how they will document some of the must statements. Some of these will have to be done through meetings with various groups and asking for their input. This committee needs to meet with the Board of Trustees and a number of administrators.

R. Jordan asked how specific her group needs to be in providing documentation. If an external audit is called for, do they need to supply a copy of the letter provided by the auditors as well as the audit? J. Picoro said that these documents are needed as supporting evidence.

Public Service – R. Mitchell

The first statement in Section 3.1 states that the "educational activities of an institution include teaching, research, and public service." This expands public service's involvement with a number of the must statements. For example, several statements below the first, the institution "must use the results of these evaluations to improve educational programs, services, and operations." R. Mitchell assumes that his group will respond to that must statement in their report. He recommended that each group go through all the must statements and provide a written response to whether they are responding to each individual statement. There was discussion of this. The self-study office will prepare a table listing and numbering the must statements. Each chair/vice chair will review all the must statements and will indicate with a check the statements for which his/her group has primary responsibility and the statements for which they have shared responsibility. Chairs and vice chairs will then send this information to the self-study office. At a future meeting, we will review the information.

NEXT MEETING:

The next meeting of the Steering Committee will be October 24<sup>th</sup> from 2:30-4:30 pm in room 104 of the Gillis Building.

ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 pm.

---

C. Vaughn, Recorder