

**SACSCOC 2018 Annual Meeting**  
**Session CS-14**  
**Focusing on the Focused Report:**  
**A ‘New Opportunity’ to Demonstrate Compliance**

**Focusing on the Focused Report**

Suzanne Ozment  
Provost and VPAA, Retired

[ 1 ]

---

---

---

---

---

**Objectives**

**Participants will**

- ✓ Understand the purpose of the Focused Report and the advantages of submitting one
- ✓ Understand reasons for non compliance ratings given by Off-Site Committees
- ✓ Know how to develop well-written, appropriately-documented, and FOCUSED responses that satisfactorily address ratings of non compliance

[ 2 ]

---

---

---

---

---

### Attendees: Where are you in the Reaffirmation process?

- ❖ Between Off Site Review and On Site Review—writing or preparing to write a Focused Report
- ❖ Drafting/Writing Compliance Certification
- ❖ Planning/organizing for upcoming Reaffirmation process

{ 3 }

---

---

---

---

### Purpose of the Focused Report

- ❖ Optional report written after the Off Site Review & before the On Site Review
- ❖ The Focused Report gives institutions a second opportunity to make its case for compliance
- ❖ The Focused Report should *focus* only on those standards that are marked as non compliant

{ 4 }

---

---

---

---

### Principles Most Frequently Marked as Non Compliant

{ 5 }

---

---

---

---

### Most Frequently Cited Principles

- 6.2.a Faculty Qualifications
- 8.2.a Student Outcomes - Educational Programs
- 8.2.b Student Outcomes - Gen Ed
- 8.2.c Student Outcomes - Academic and Student Services
- 13.2\* Financial Documents
- 6.1\* Full-time Faculty

{ 6 }

---

---

---

---

---

---

### Responsibilities of the On Site Reaffirmation Committee

- Confirm, in person, compliance with designated principles (marked with an asterisk)
- Determine compliance for principles deemed not in compliance by the Off Site Reaffirmation Committee
- Evaluate the acceptability of the QEP

{ 7 }

---

---

---

---

---

---

### Audience for the Focused Report

**On Site Reaffirmation Committee Members are committed to**

- Open-mindedness
- Objectivity

{ 8 }

---

---

---

---

---

---

**The On Site Reaffirmation  
Committee will judge  
compliance based on the**

- Institution's Compliance Certification
- Off Site Committee's Report
- Institution's Focused Report
- Institution's QEP
- Interviews conducted & documents examined during the On Site visit

{ 9 }

---

---

---

---

---

**The Focused Report:  
  
A 'New Opportunity'  
to Demonstrate  
Compliance**

{ 10 }

---

---

---

---

---

**Focused Report:  
Ineffective Responses**

- ❖ Repeating or quoting text from the original Compliance Certification
- ❖ Arguing with the Off Site Reaffirmation Committee's findings

{ 11 }

---

---

---

---

---

**Focused Report:  
Effective Responses**

- ❖ Providing clearer, more detailed explanations
- ❖ Supplying additional, updated, or new information and/or documentation
- ❖ Elaborating

{ 12 }

---

---

---

---

---

**Preparing to Write**

- ❖ Be certain you understand the reason for each negative rating from the Off Site Review Team
- ❖ Be objective; reread the pertinent section from your original report from the standpoint of someone who knows nothing about your institution

{ 13 }

---

---

---

---

---

**Reasons for Non-  
Compliance Ratings**

{ 14 }

---

---

---

---

---

**Common Reasons for Noncompliance**

1. Failure to adhere to the standard or requirement
2. No evidence of clear policy and/or procedure
3. Confusing or contradictory information submitted
4. Failure to address all components of a standard
5. Insufficient or unconvincing documentation of compliance

---

---

---

---

---

**Failure to Adhere to a Standard or Requirement**

Example of an Off Site Committee Finding:

❖ University policy does not ensure that students complete 25% of the required credit hours for the undergraduate degree at the institution (9.4)

---

---

---

---

---

**No Evidence of Clear Policy or Procedure**

Example:

**6.3 Faculty Evaluation**

Applies to Full-time and Part-Time, Permanent as well as Temporary, Faculty

---

---

---

---

---

### Confusing or Contradictory Information Presented

Examples:

- Degree Programs
- Information on Facilities (Number of Residence Halls, Off-Site Locations, etc.)
- Organizational Chart

---

---

---

---

---

### Failure to Address All Components of a Standard

Example:

13.2 The member institution provides the following financial statements: (a) an institutional audit for the most recent fiscal year . . . (b) a statement of financial position of unrestricted net assets . . . and (c) an annual budget that is preceded by sound planning, is subject to sound fiscal proceedings, and is approved by the governing board.

---

---

---

---

---

### Insufficient or Unconvincing Documentation

Example:

4.2.c The governing board selects and regularly evaluates the institution's chief executive officer.

Documentation that might be provided:

- \* Board By-laws showing Board's authority to select CEO
- \* Board minutes showing selection of current CEO
- \* Summary of process for and frequency of CEO evaluation
- \* Copy of most recent evaluations or Board minutes documenting evaluations

---

---

---

---

---

## Insufficient or Unconvincing Documentation

**Example:**

**Off-Site Team Comment on Comprehensive Standard 5.2.c:**  
The University has not presented convincing evidence that the President has ultimate responsibility for and exercises appropriate control over intercollegiate athletics.

Documentation that might be presented:

- ✓ Organizational Chart
- ✓ Entries from President's Calendar showing meetings with Athletics Director, FAR, etc.
- ✓ Minutes from meetings with Athletics Director, FAR, Coaches

{ 21 }

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Insufficient or Unconvincing Documentation

- 7.3 Administrative Effectiveness
- 8.2.a Student Outcomes: Educational Programs
- 8.2.b Student Outcomes: General Education
- 8.2.c Student Outcomes: Academic & Student Services

**Typical Problems:**

- Institution provides samples but does not explain how they present a valid cross section of programs
- Institution describes assessment measures and results but does not identify goals/targets or changes made to effect improvement
- Institution provides dated data

{ 22 }

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Insufficient or Unconvincing Documentation

**6.2.a Qualifications of faculty members**

**6.2.b Sufficient number of full-time faculty to ensure curriculum and program quality, integrity, and review**

{ 23 }

---

---

---

---

---

---



## Insufficient or Unconvincing Documentation

### 6.2.b Sufficient Number of FT Faculty

Problems:

- Percentage of credit hours taught by FT faculty is not disaggregated by program
- Inadequate description of faculty responsibilities (i.e., include expectations for advising, scholarship & service as well as teaching load)
- Inadequate evidence that FT faculty are able to meet scholarship & service expectations

24

---

---

---

---

---

## Summary

- ❖ Keep the report **FOCUSED**. Address only those standards identified by the Off Site Committee as non-compliant and only those parts of the standard that were not satisfactorily addressed in the original Compliance Report.
- ❖ Consult the *Resource Manual* for suggested documentation.
- ❖ Be concise, but detailed. The response to each non-compliant principle should be no more than 3 pages.
- ❖ REMEMBER YOUR AUDIENCE.

25

---

---

---

---

---

## Questions? Comments?

[ozmentsuzanne@gmail.com](mailto:ozmentsuzanne@gmail.com)

205-601-1055

26

---

---

---

---

---