



January 15, 2013

COPY

Dr. Thomas F. Moore
Chancellor
University of South Carolina Upstate
800 University Way
201 Administration Building
Spartanburg, SC 29303

Dear Dr. Moore:

The following action regarding your institution was taken at the December 2012 meeting of the Board of Trustees of SACS Commission on Colleges:

The Commission on Colleges reaffirmed accreditation with a request for a First Monitoring Report due **April 15, 2013**, addressing the visiting committee's recommendations applicable to the following referenced standards of the *Principles*:

CS 3.3.1.2 (Institutional effectiveness: administrative support services), Recommendation 2

Only one example is provided in the institution's response. Given the changes reported in the response and the indication that seven administrative divisions are involved with these services, the institution should provide additional examples that are representative across divisions and units in those divisions. Demonstrate that administrative support services develop outcomes, assess the extent to which they achieve those outcomes, and demonstrate the use of results from that assessment for improvements. Should sampling be used, the institution should indicate the rationale for the sample, and the sample should be representative of the various departments on campus.

CS 3.3.1.3 (Institutional effectiveness: administrative and student support services), Recommendation 3

Only one example is provided in the institution's response. Given the changes reported in the response report and the indication that five administrative divisions are involved with these services, the institution should provide additional examples that are representative across divisions and units in those divisions.

Provide evidence that academic and student support services develop outcomes, assess the extent to which they achieve those outcomes, and demonstrate the use of results from that assessment for improvements. Should sampling be used, the institution should indicate the rationale for the sample, and the sample should be representative of the various departments on campus.



Dr. Thomas F. Moore
January 15, 2013
Page Two

**CS 3.3.1.5 (institutional effectiveness: community/public service),
Recommendation 5**

The institution describes outcomes, assessment of those outcomes, and use of results, especially for the Metropolitan Studies Institute which is the primary avenue through which the institution engages in community/public service. However, the institution's report does not clearly delineate between outcomes, assessment methods, assessment results, and use of results. A clearer indication of the various components of the full institutional effectiveness cycle is necessary. Demonstrate that the institution develops appropriate outcomes, assesses the extent to which it achieves those outcomes, and demonstrates the use of assessment results to improve its community/public services (especially the Metropolitan Studies Institute).

CS 3.5.2 (Institutional credits for a degree), Recommendation 9

It is unclear whether the overall requirement that 25% of credit hours required in a degree program be taken in residence can be waived. Though the institutional form provided for waiving residency requirements indicates that only the last 25% of credits may be so waived, there does not seem to be a clear policy that requires 25% of the total credit hours required for a degree to be taken in residence, even if the last 25% in residence is waived. Demonstrate that at least 25% of the total credit hours required for the degree must be earned through instruction offered by the institution and that this requirement cannot be waived.

CS 3.7.1 (Faculty competence), Recommendation 10

Insufficient information is provided to determine the competence of one faculty member. Demonstrate that the faculty member listed on the attached *Request for Justifying and Documenting Qualifications of Faculty* form is qualified to teach the course(s) in question.

Your institution's next reaffirmation will take place in 2022 unless otherwise notified.

Please submit to your Commission staff member, preferably by email, a one-page executive summary of your institution's Quality Enhancement Plan. The summary is due February 15, 2013, and should include on the same page the following information: (1) the title of your Quality Enhancement Plan, (2) your institution's name, and (3) the name, title, and email address of an individual who can be contacted regarding its development or implementation. This summary will be posted to the Commission's Web site as a resource for other institutions undergoing the reaffirmation process.

All institutions are requested to submit an "Impact Report of the Quality Enhancement Plan on Student Learning" as part of their "Fifth-Year Interim Report" due five years before their next reaffirmation review. Institutions will be notified 11 months in advance by the President of the Commission regarding its specific due date.



Dr. Thomas F. Moore
January 15, 2013
Page Three

Guidelines for the monitoring 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. If there are any questions about the format, contact the Commission staff member assigned to your institution.** When submitting your report, please send four copies to your Commission staff member.

Please note that Federal regulations and Commission policy stipulate that an institution must demonstrate compliance with all requirements and standards of the *Principles of Accreditation* within two years following the Commission's initial action on the institution. At the end of that two-year period, if the institution does not comply with all the standards and requirements of the *Principles*, representatives from the institution may be required to appear before the Commission, or one of its standing committees, to answer questions as to why the institution should not be removed from membership. If the Commission determines good cause at that time, the Commission may extend the period for coming into compliance for a minimum of six months and a maximum of two years and must place the institution on Probation. If the institution has been placed on Probation within the two-year period, extension of accreditation beyond the two-year period for good cause is dependent on the amount of time the institution has already been on Probation. An institution may be on Probation for not more than two years. If the Commission does not determine good cause or if the institution does not come into compliance within two years while on Probation, the institution must be removed from membership. (See enclosed Commission policy "Sanctions, Denial of Reaffirmation, and Removal from Membership.")

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

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Belle S. Wheelan".

Belle S. Wheelan, Ph.D.
President

BSW:sf

Enclosures

cc: Dr. Steven M. Sheefey

This page intentionally left blank.