

SACSCOC

SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND SCHOOLS
COMMISSION ON COLLEGES

July 9, 2014

Dr. Mark P. Becker
President
Georgia State University
300 Alumni Hall
P. O. Box 3999
Atlanta, GA 30302-3999

Dear Dr. Becker:

The Committee on Fifth-Year Interim Reports reviewed the institution's compliance with the 17 select standards of the *Principles of Accreditation* outlined in the Commission's Fifth-Year Interim Report. Based only on those reviewed standards, the institution is requested to submit a Referral Report due April 1, 2015, addressing the following referenced standards of the *Principles*:

CS 3.4.3 (Admission policies)

The institution provided hypertext links to screen shots of web sites (such as Admissions website, admission policies for undergraduates, Enrollment Management Committee, etc.), instead of the actual admissions policies, thus making it impossible to verify that admissions policies published on these sites are uniform with those published in the Undergraduate Catalog and Graduate Catalog. The institution should provide evidence that it publishes admissions policies consistent with its mission.

CS 3.11.3 (Physical facilities)

The institution did not provide sufficient documentation to demonstrate that it maintains its off-campus physical facilities. In the Institutional Summary Form, the institution identified five off-campus locations: Alpharetta Center, Buckhead Center, the Pallasades, the WeiiStar Center, and the Bermuda College Center. In the narrative section for this standard, the institution refers to additional off-campus instructional sites in Panthersville, at Mt. Wilson in California, the Language Research Center in DeKalb County, and leased space at 200 Tower Place. The Committee assumed that these additional four sites do not qualify as off-campus instructional sites that offer 50% or more credits to a degree. The institution did not provide any narrative or documentation on the operations or maintenance of most of the off-site facilities.

The institution also stated that its facilities are either maintained by its own employees or by contract employees, depending on the size, scope and mission of the facility. However, it did not provide documentation to determine how each facility is maintained. In addition, the institution did not identify its responsibility for its leased sites.

The institution should provide sufficient evidence as to how it operates and maintains each of its off-campus instructional sites.



Dr. Mark P. Becker
July 9, 2014
Page Two

FR 4.9 (Definition of credit hours)

The institution demonstrated that it has policies and procedures for determining the credit hours awarded for courses and programs that conform to commonly accepted practices. However, the institution did not provide evidence of the implementation and enforcement of its credit hour policy.

QEP Impact Report

The Committee also reviewed the institution's QEP Impact Report. The report was accepted with the following comments:

The institution has adequately described the initial goals and intended outcomes of its QEP, discussed the limited changes made in the QEP, discussed the impact on student learning and/or the environment supporting student learning, and described what the institution has learned as a result of the QEP.

Guidelines for the Referral Report are enclosed. Because it is essential that institutions follow these guidelines, please make certain that those responsible for preparing the report receive the document. When submitting your report, please send **five copies** to your Commission staff member.

Reports requested by the Committee on Fifth-Year Interim Reports will be forwarded to the Committees on Compliance and Reports (C & R), standing committees of SACSCOC Board of Trustees, for action at the meeting immediately following the due date of the Referral Report. The review by C & R will begin a two-year monitoring period within which your institution must document compliance with all the identified standards above.

We appreciate your continued support of the activities of SACS Commission on Colleges. If you have questions, please contact the Commission staff member assigned to your institution.

Sincerely,

t.r.f !elan, Ph.D.
President

BSW:dr

Enclosure

cc: Dr. Michael T. Hoefler



Southern Association of Colleges and Schools
Commission on Colleges
1866 Southern Lane
Decatur, Georgia 30033-4097

REPORTS SUBMITTED FOR COMMITTEE OR COMMISSION REVIEW

Policy Statement

Institutions accredited by the Commission on Colleges are requested to submit various reports to an evaluation committee or to the Commission's Board of Trustees for review. Those reports include:

Response Report to the Visiting Committee
Monitoring Report or Referral Report

When submitting a report, an institution should follow the directions below, keeping in mind that the report will be reviewed by a number of readers, most of whom will be unfamiliar with the institution.

Information Pertaining to the Preparation of All Reports

Preparation of a Title Page

For any report requested, an institution should prepare a title page that includes the following:

1. Name of the institution
2. Address of the institution
3. Dates of the committee visit (*not applicable for the Referral Report*)
4. The kind of report submitted
5. Name, title, and contact numbers of person(s) preparing the report

Presentation of Reports

For any report requested, an institution should

1. *For print copies*, copy all documents front and back, double-space the copy, and use no less than an 11 point font. If the report requires binding beyond stapling, do not submit the report in a three-ring binder. Ring binders are bulky and must be removed before mailing to the readers.
2. *For electronic copies*, copy the report and all attachments onto an electronic memory device (e.g., external hard-drive, DVD, CD, or flash/thumb drive). Provide the name of the person who can be contacted if the readers have problems accessing the information. Provide *one print copy* of the response without the attachments.

Each electronic memory device smaller than 4" by 4" should be submitted in a paper or plastic envelope not smaller than 4 x 4 inches and the envelope should be labeled with the name of the institution, the title of the report, and the list of document contents. The electronic memory device should be labeled with the name of the institution and the title of the report.

Each electronic memory device larger than 4" by 4" should be in a paper or plastic envelope and clearly labeled with the name of the institution, the title of the report, and the list of document contents. The electronic memory device should be labeled with the name of the institution and the title of the report.

3. Provide a clear, complete, and concise report. If documentation is required, ensure that it is appropriate to demonstrating fulfillment of the requirement. Specify actions that have been taken and, when possible, document their completion.
4. When possible, excerpt passages from text and incorporate the narrative into the report. Provide definitive evidence, not documents that only address the process (e.g., do not include copies of letters or memos with directives).
5. Specify actions that have been taken and provide documentation that such actions have been completed. Avoid vague responses indicating that the institution plans to address a problem in the future. If any actions remain to be accomplished, the institution should present an action plan, a schedule for accomplishing the plan, and evidence of commitment of resources for accomplishing the plan.
6. When possible and appropriate, provide samples of evidence of compliance rather than all documents pertaining to all activities associated with compliance.
7. Reread the report before submission and eliminate all narrative that is not relevant to the focus of the report. If sending electronic copies, ensure that all devices are virus free and have been reviewed for easy access by reviewers external to your institution.

Information Specific for the Response to the Visiting Committee Report

- Definition:** A Response Report addresses the findings of a visiting committee. It provides updated or additional documentation regarding the institution's compliance with the *Principles of Accreditation*.
- Audience:** The Response Report, along with the Committee Report and other documents, is reviewed by the Commission on Colleges' Board of Trustees and is subject to the review procedures of the Commission's standing committees, including the continuation of a monitoring period, the imposition of a sanction, or a change of accreditation status.
- Report Presentation:** Structure the response so that it addresses committee recommendations in the order that they appear in the report. Tabs should separate each response to a recommendation.
- For each recommendation, provide the number of the Core Requirement, Comprehensive Standard, or Federal Requirement and state the recommendation exactly as it appears in the visiting committee report. Describe the committee's concerns that led to the recommendation by either summarizing the concerns or inserting verbatim the complete narrative in the report pertaining to the recommendation. Provide a response with documentation.
- Due Date:** The Response Report is due on the day indicated in the transmittal letter from Commission staff accompanying the visiting committee report.
- Number of Copies:** See the transmittal letter from Commission staff accompanying the visiting committee report.

Information Specific to the Preparation of a Monitoring Report or a Referral Report

Definition: These reports address recommendations and continued concerns of compliance usually identified by the Committee on Compliance and Reports or the Executive Council (or, for a Referral Report, identified by the Committee on Fifth-Year Interim Reports). It usually follows the C & R Committee's review of an institution's response to a visiting committee report.

Audience: The Monitoring Report and the Referral Report are reviewed by the SACSCOC Board of Trustees and are subject to the review procedures of the Commission's standing committees, including the continuation of a monitoring period, the imposition of a sanction, or a change of accreditation status.

Report Presentation: For a Monitoring Report, structure the response so that it addresses committee recommendations in the order that they appeared in the report. Tabs should separate each response to a recommendation.

For each recommendation, {1} restate the number of the Core Requirement, Comprehensive Standard, or Federal Requirement, the number of the recommendation, and the recommendation exactly as it appeared in the visiting committee report; {2} provide a brief history of responses to the recommendation if more than a first response (to include an accurate summary of the original concerns of the visiting committee, a summary of each previous institutional response and an explanation of what had been requested by the Commission); {3} cite verbatim the current request of the Commission that is related to the recommendation {reference notification letter from the President of the Commission}; and {4} prepare a response to the recommendation.

For a Referral Report, structure the response so that it addresses the concerns described in the letter from the Commission's President in the order that they appeared. Tabs should separate each response to each standard cited.

For each standard cited, (1) restate the number of the Core Requirement, Comprehensive Standard, or Federal Requirement exactly as it appeared in the letter; (2) cite verbatim the current request of the Commission that is related to the standard cited (reference notification letter from the President of the Commission); and (3) prepare a response to the recommendation.

Due Date: The Monitoring Report and the Referral Report are due on the date specified in the notification letter sent by the President of SACSCOC. Requests for extensions to the date must be made to the President of SACSCOC two weeks in advance of the original due date. (See Commission policy "Deadlines for Submitting Reports.")

Number of Copies: See the letter from the President of SACSCOC requesting the Report.

Document History

*Edited and Revised for the Principles of Accreditation: December 2003
Updated: January 2007, January 2010, May 2010, January 2012*