

MINUTES: University Self-Study Steering Committee

DATE: July 19, 2001  
10:00 AM –12:00 Noon, Room 359 Student Center

PRESENT: C. Havice (presiding), T. Birdwhistell, D. Boyd, C. Currens,  
L. Edgerton, D. Harley, J. Hougland, R. Jordan, R. Mitchell,  
M. Molinaro, L. Nora, J. Piccoro, H. Schach, C. Vaughn

C. Havice called the meeting to order at 10:00 AM. She welcomed M. Molinaro back from sabbatical and thanked everyone for coming.

### **MINUTES:**

The Minutes of June 13, 2001 were approved as distributed.

### **DIRECTOR'S REPORT:**

#### Meeting with D. Crump

D. Crump, formerly of the University of Alabama (now our SACS liaison), visited us about a month ago and met with the Executive Committee. During the meeting, he commented on the format of the final report. C. Currens will discuss this.

Several people were discussed as possible chairs for the visiting committee. D. Crump was to meet with one of these individuals this week. The number one choice is the Emeritus President of Alabama, Roger Sayers. We should be finalizing this matter soon.

We submitted a mid-term progress report to D. Crump indicating where we are in the study and letting SACS know about the fire and loss of documents.

During the meeting, the group put together a preliminary list of possible visiting committee members. The list was constructed by area and number of visitors needed. For example, distance learning will require several members on the visiting committee in order to travel to select distance learning sites. Other areas, such as athletics, should require only one member on the visiting committee. The preliminary list was distributed to the group.

We can add to the preliminary list if needed. We can also make recommendations of people to serve as members of the visiting committee. Individuals nominated have to come from the SACS region.

D. Boyd will submit the name of an individual from the University of Georgia. L. Nora questioned having only one person for student services.

J. Picoro has asked to attend a site visit at another institution. The problem is that visits to those institutions similar to UK are scheduled close enough to our site visit that it may be too late to be of help in our planning. Other visits are scheduled at institutions smaller than UK. J. Picoro may plan to attend one of these to gain some insight into the process.

L. Nora also questioned the number of reviewers for Athletics. C. Currens said that we discussed that issue in the meeting with D. Crump and had actually removed one person from the preliminary list of visitors. Intercollegiate Athletics has a very small number of must statements in the Criteria. If there is more than one reviewer, concern was expressed about what else the person could do with his/her time. C. Havice said that many of our committees are not addressed alone. There is a lot of overlap.

D. Boyd asked if it might be better to consider the president of an institution that has a Medical Center as Chair of our visiting committee. The only example in our region is North Carolina.

#### Cut-Off Dates

There has been some instance of committees wanting to extend their reports into the period that begins the new administration. We need to use the cut off date of June 30, which is the last day of the previous administration. The Administrative Processes Committee will extend the period covered by their report to the end of July.

#### Faculty Credentials

J. Picoro and C. Vaughn have been visiting individual colleges regarding faculty credentials. Medicine, Agriculture, and Communications are yet to be scheduled. There has been some complaint from people who do not want to provide an official transcript of the terminal degree. There was an AR put in place by the University stating that people hired after 1992 must provide an official transcript. When we checked with SACS, they said that all faculty (both full and part-time) must provide an official transcript. Those teaching at the baccalaureate level must provide the transcript and have the minimum of a master's degree with 18 hours in the area they are teaching. At the graduate level, faculty must provide a transcript of the terminal degree and an updated curriculum vitae listing their research and publications. There are some faculty members on campus with degrees from institutions that do not provide transcripts. Those faculty can bring in the official diploma and a copy can be made and placed in the faculty member's file along with a letter of explanation. K. Tagavi asked if the transcript is a SACS requirement or a requirement of the University AR. J. Picoro responded that the transcript is required by SACS. Some colleges have individuals teaching without a faculty appointment. We have asked that these people be given some sort of appointment.

Colleges also have to provide a list of instructional staff for the academic year. This will be broken down into fall and spring semesters. The Registrar's Office will be asked to provide a list of all courses taught during the fall and spring. We have requested the faculty roster for fall by mid-October and the roster for spring as early in February as possible.

### Thank You Letters

The President will be sending out thank you letters to all committee members who have participated in the self-study process to this point.

### Fix-It Committee

At our last meeting, we requested that everyone suggest possible people/positions that should be represented on a fix-it committee. J. Picoro had sent out a preliminary list and asked for the Steering Committee's response. One list consisted of the Provost, Vice President for Research, Senior Vice President for Administration and the Senior Vice President and Chancellor of the Medical Center. A second list consisted of those four individuals plus additional people who would likely be asked to "fix" some of the recommendations put forth in our final report. Both lists were forwarded to President Todd for his review.

### **REPORT FORMAT:**

C. Currens discussed the report format suggested by D. Crump during his visit. Dr. Crump thought it would work better to break the report down into several small volumes instead of submitting one or two larger volumes. He suggested that these be organized into areas that fit well together. Using this criteria, chapters 1-3 would fit well together and would make up one volume. Chapters dealing with the educational program, continuing education, and distance learning would make up a volume. This volume may also include the chapter dealing with faculty. Supporting services would be one volume. The problem is where to fit research and public service in the report. Although these two areas do not have specific must statements, the mission of the institution is described in terms of education, research, and public service. We have to portray these areas as being of equal importance to the educational component.

In terms of what the reviewers will be looking for, they will want to know whether we are meeting the criteria, if we have a policy in place, and whether we have adhered to this policy. They will also want to know if committees have completed a thoughtful analysis of specific areas. We need to document particularly with regard to an existing AR or policy. When considering broader questions, reviewers will not be considering documents as much. Most documentation deals with only a few documents such as the Boling and Reedy reports, AR's, GR's etc. For actual format, D. Crump suggested that we follow the format used in the Prairie View report.

C. Havice stressed that committees are not responsible for laying out the format. The Editor will take care of that.

### **DRAFT REPORTS:**

C. Havice informed the group that report drafts are loaded on the web site so that members of the Steering Committee can log on and review the draft documents. One committee has not submitted a first draft. The Faculty Committee has requested that their

first draft not be posted as it is being revised. The Professional Education report is not available on line. A lot of second drafts (referred to as May drafts) have been received but have not been posted to the web. The second, or May drafts, were requested for the middle of May in order to obtain as much input as possible from 10-month faculty. To keep committees from having to continue to re-write/revise their reports, we chose a June 30th cut off date. Any additional information after that date can be put into an addendum and submitted to SACS. Committee members need to begin keeping an addendum file. Forward these items to one of the Executive Committee for inclusion in the addendum when it is prepared.

We have revised the schedule again. We will try to begin moving through the entire report and have a final draft ready to submit to the President by the end of August. After this, the report will be put on the web for review by the University community. The President's office will send out an e-mail asking people to review the report and provide feedback. The final report has to be reviewed and approved by the Board of Trustees and will then be printed and submitted to SACS in December.

### **MEETING SCHEDULE:**

Chapters 2 and 3, Institutional Purpose and Institutional Effectiveness, will be reviewed at a meeting on July 30 from 1-3 PM. The idea is for the authors and anyone else available to attend. In this way, we can review reports and also see if any overlap exists. C. Currens has been reviewing reports, making comments and sending back to the authors.

C. Currens asked people to note where wording is not clear and to write down any questions about clarity of recommendations or suggestions. For those unable to attend a meeting, please review reports and send written comments to C. Currens. He will include these in report revision.

C. Havice said that the Steering Committee will also be reviewing suggestions and recommendations made by individual committees and deciding which of these should be combined, deleted, changed. Some recommendations submitted by committees may go forward as suggestions, for example. The ultimate responsibility for these decisions is with the Steering Committee.

C. Currens noted that there is a great deal of cross-referencing between different chapters of the report. M. Molinaro asked if that would make it difficult for visitors and if they would need to carry the entire report with them while on campus. C. Currens explained that the report would include an overview and an executive summary.

### **PREPARING CAMPUS:**

C. Havice asked what we plan to do to prepare the campus for the site visit. J. Piccoro and C. Vaughn have already been meeting with individuals from all the colleges regarding faculty credentials. We also need to have a meeting with all deans to prepare

them and let them know what they need to have available. Each unit should have a copy of its mission statement available. Policy and procedures from the unit also need to be on hand. We will plan to meet with the deans sometime in October.

L. Nora asked if colleges need to have space available for the visitors. If so, arrangements need to be made now. J. Picoro said that we have told colleges that the key dates are April 16 and 17. These are the dates when reviewers will want to meet with faculty, staff and students. We will be given a month to 6 weeks notice for some interviews. Others will be requested once the visitors are here. We need ask colleges/departments to reserve their conference rooms for the Self-Study visit on April 16<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup>.

H. Schach asked if the accreditation reports used by his committee should be housed in the individual colleges or sent to the Self-Study Office. He was told to send the reports to the Self-Study Office so that they can be put with other supporting documentation.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

The meeting adjourned at 11:15 AM.

---

Connie Vaughn, Recorder