Key Ingredients to a Healthy Fifth-Year Report:

How to Avoid Ending Up in the Stew
What each of us brings to the table

• Denise Young – former SACSCOC liaison and peer reviewer

• Diane Chase – current SACSCOC liaison and peer reviewer

• Heidi Watt – responsible for substantive change and faculty qualifications reporting

• Tace Crouse – coordinator of Fifth-Year Report and peer reviewer
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Standards that spoiled the flavor as provided by SACS in Sept 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>2016 Track A (41)</th>
<th>2016 Track B (34)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CR 2.8 Number of Full-Time Faculty</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR 2.10 Student Support Programs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS 3.2.8 Qualified Administrators</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS 3.3.1.1 IE</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS 3.4.3 Admissions Policies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS 3.4.11 Qualified Academic Coordinators</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS 3.11.3 Physical Facilities</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR 4.1 Student Achievement</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR 4.2 Program Curriculum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR 4.3 Publication of Policies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR 4.4 Program Length</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR 4.5 Student Complaints</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR 4.6 Recruitment Materials</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS 3.10.2/FR 4.7 Financial Aid Audits/Title IV Responsibilities</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QEP Impact Report</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Referrals for the new requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Additional Standards</th>
<th>2016 Track B (34 institutions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number and percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS 3.13.1 Accrediting Decisions</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR 3.13.3 Complaint Record</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS 3.13.4 Review of DE</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS 3.13.5 Separate Accreditation</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR 4.8.1 Student Verification</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR 4.8.2 Protecting Student Privacy</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR 4.8.3 Additional Student Charges</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR 4.9 Credit Hours</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. What might prevent you from receiving le cordon bleu?

- insufficient time
- missing section(s)
- inconsistencies
- not answering the question asked - providing irrelevant, insufficient, or too much information
- bringing in issues that cause reviewers to be confused or to question your reasons
- difficult navigation through the materials keeps reviewers from finding the information
QEP

• majority of content on the plan merits, not what actually transpired

• no clear rationales for incomplete or changed activities

• missing or unclear assessment results

What are other QEP report spoilers?
2. What will keep you out of the stew and leave you with a satisfying result?

**Prep**

- **read the recipe carefully**: highlight all the pieces of each standard; clarify terms and time spans to be reported

- **plan your time**: allow adequate completion time

- **check the pantry**: take stock of how your *unique* institution addresses each standard

- **learn from other chefs**: review other reaffirmation reports from your sister institutions – remembering you are unique
Process

• **assemble all the raw ingredients**: identify and collect required data for the necessary time periods

• **measure carefully**: be precise and only address the specific standards: don’t say too much; don’t say too little

• **knead the dough**: analyze and assemble the information so it clearly communicates compliance

• **let it rest**: build in some time to mull over it to gain some perspective

• **knead it again**: readdress the narrative and use of data
Presentation

• **serve it to the critics:** use multiple reviewers (internal and external) to judge clarity and completeness

*What are other ways to keep you out of the stew?*
3. What are the optimal characteristics needed by the Fifth-Year Report leadership team?

_It takes a village… but it also takes a president who is strongly committed to accreditation through peer review_

Leadership team members are:

- effective delegators and facilitators (managing all the tasks - harvesting, cooking, and critiquing)

- able to “cut to the chase” in addressing each requirement
• pragmatic: able to move the process along; intervene when needed

• respectful of the process and those who implement it

What are other characteristics of the leadership team?
4. What are the new ingredients in the Fifth-Year Report?

• language changes in 2.8, 2.10, 3.2.8, 4.1, 4.2, and 4.7

• new standards: 4.8 (4.8.1, 4.8.2, 4.8.3) and 4.9

• policy compliance: 3.13.1 (four policies)
5. What opportunities arise from the Fifth-Year Report preparation?

- collaboration of a team from across the institution with a common goal
- communication and education of institutional strengths to internal and external audiences
- validation of quality by peers
- clarification of definitions, policies and procedures
• identification of areas where improvements can be made even when currently in compliance

• preparation for the next decennial report

What are other opportunities arising from the report?
To rehash all the ingredients...
What will ensure you receive le cordon bleu of accreditation?

• Prep: read, plan, check, learn

• Process: assemble, measure, knead, rest, knead

• Presentation: serve
What are the optimal characteristics needed by the Fifth-Year Report leadership team?

- effective delegators, facilitators, and communicators
- able to cut to the chase
- pragmatic
- committed to and respectful of the accreditation process
What are the new ingredients in the Fifth-Year Report?

• five changes in language

• four new federal requirements

• four policies
What opportunities arise from the Fifth-Year Report preparation?

• collaboration
• communication and education
• validation
• clarification
• identification
• preparation
...and the reason we do all this
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Tace Crouse</td>
<td>Director, Special Projects</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tace.crouse@ucf.edu">tace.crouse@ucf.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Heidi Watt</td>
<td>Associate Director for Accreditation and Program Review</td>
<td><a href="mailto:heidi.watt@ucf.edu">heidi.watt@ucf.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Diane Chase</td>
<td>Executive Vice Provost SACSCOC Liaison</td>
<td><a href="mailto:diane.chase@ucf.edu">diane.chase@ucf.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Denise Young</td>
<td>Associate Vice President Former SACSCOC Liaison</td>
<td><a href="mailto:denise.young@ucf.edu">denise.young@ucf.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>