SACS Sub-Committee Meeting  
Core Standard 2.5  
September 23, 2009  
3:00 pm - 4:45 pm

Sponsored Research, Mr. Camps’ Office

Attendees:

Committee members, Davis Camps, Alvis Moore, Ivan Walker and Chair, Tendai Johnson were joined by Institutional Effectiveness Committee Chair, Sam Adu-Mireku.

Assessments and documentation:

The SACS activity schedule was shared along with the documents CD provided by the SACS office. Discussion took place around the use of data as that was another area in which several gaps were identified. So far this appears to be the area of greatest concern with the greatest gap being identified as evidence that demonstrates use of the data. The Title III alignment document which was forwarded along with the committee minutes of September 16, 2009 was discussed a document of evidence how senior level administrative decisions were made resultant from data analyses at the institution-wide level. Formerly University Testing and Institutional Research reports were shared at the Chancellor’s cabinet meetings. The Chancellor and later the Provost made decisions to fund those areas of greatest need that would allow the university an opportunity to pilot efforts to ameliorate and address challenges confronting the university and deemed most appropriate for Title III funding. The attached alignment form demonstrates how Title III programs were aligned with the strategic priorities of the university and the State of North Carolina.

In the 2009-10 grant year the alignment will be made consistent with UNC Tomorrow, which has replaced the State/GA’s strategic Priorities, and will be aligned with Chancellor Anderson’s Six (6) strategic priorities. The alignment made in chart form to provide a visual that demonstrates how Title III is being used to address university priorities that will enhance and strengthen the university in accordance with the federal mandate of the grant. Thus as the committee reviews operational plans, committee members should look for references to Title III programs and or funding, not only as a response to strategic planning, but also because the grant requires measurable outcomes to demonstrate the effective use of federal funding.
Strategic Planning:

The remainder of time was spent discussing the point where sub-group 1’s responsibilities begin and end, and the documents that should accompany the report, and what sub-group 2 should look for, and the perspective that group should take. It was decided that sub-group 1 would contact Dr. Conway, Chief of Staff, and convener for the current strategic plan to discuss the process that the current administration engaged to select participants and vett the current strategic plan. The committee members agreed to meet again Monday, September 28, 2009 to draft questions for the discussion on strategic planning.

Recommendations:

1. Sub-committee 1 will discuss the strategic planning process with the Chief of Staff and any related persons to gain knowledge of the process and gather any related documentation

2. The group will meet as a whole to draft question for the meeting relative to strategic planning.

3. Sub-committee 2 will meet with Dr. Gillis-Olion to review operational plans to identify evidence of use of institutional data

4. Sub-Committee 2 will look for references to Title III funding and/or programs in operational plans as evidence of the implementation of actions resultant from data analyses

The committee meeting adjourned at 4:45

Tendai (Paula) Johnson, scribe.