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Purpose

Determine MTSU’s continued compliance with SACSCOC’S *Principles of Accreditation*. 
Committee Roster

Chair-- Dr. Denise Trauth, President, Texas State University
Dr. Michael Benson, President, Eastern Kentucky University
Dr. James Byington, Provost, Coastal Carolina University
Dr. Frederick Niswander, Vice Chancellor, Ad and Finance, Eastern Carolina University
Dr. John Hardt, Vice President, SACSCOC
Roles and Responsibilities of Governing Board (SACSCOC)

- Policy-making body
- Select, evaluate, and when necessary dismiss the CEO
Board Compliance with Principles of Accreditation

• Does the Board have policies that clarify and authorize their function and operation?
• Do Board members understand their roles and responsibilities?
• Do Board members participate in training and professional development?
SACSCOC Terminology

- **Core Requirement (CR)**
  - Basic, broad-based, foundational requirements
  - Noncompliance = Sanction (warning or probation)

- **Comprehensive Standard (CS)**
  - Specific to the operations of an institution and represent good practice
  - Noncompliance = Monitoring (additional reporting)

- **Federal Requirement (FR)**
  - Required by Title IV of the Higher Education Act
  - Noncompliance = No federal financial aid funding
Compliance Status

• MTSU indicated compliance with all core requirements, comprehensive standards, and federal requirements in its substantive change in governance report.

• MTSU has to “make a case” that it is in compliance. Provide evidence.
Overview

Gives rationale for the change
- Drive to 55: by 2025, 55% of Tennesseans have degree or post-secondary certificate
- Allows universities greater autonomy and agility
- Enhances THEC’s role in coordination

• Provides detailed timeline for change
• No programs added or dropped
1.1 Integrity

The institution operates with integrity in all matters

• No MTSU response necessary
• Will be evaluated by on-site team
CR 2.1 Degree Granting Authority

The institution has degree-granting authority from the appropriate government agency or agencies.
CR 2.2 Governing Board

• The institution has a governing board of at least five members that is the legal body with specific authority over the institution.

• The board is an active policy-making body for the institution and is ultimately responsible for ensuring that the financial resources of the institution are adequate to provide a sound educational program.

• The board is not controlled by a minority of board members or by organizations or interests separate from it.

• Both the presiding officer of the board and a majority of other voting members of the board are free of any contractual, employment, or personal or familial financial interest in the institution.
The institution has a clearly defined, comprehensive, and published mission statement that is specific to the institution and appropriate for higher education. The mission addresses teaching and learning and, where applicable, research and public service.
MTSU Mission Statement

Middle Tennessee State University is a comprehensive university that embraces its role as the destination of choice for Tennessee undergraduates while expanding its reach nationally and internationally through signature programs and select master’s and doctoral programs. The University generates, preserves, and disseminates knowledge and innovation and uses scholarship to enhance teaching and public service. The University is committed to preparing students to thrive in their chosen professions and a changing global society.
CS 3.2.1 CEO Evaluation/Selection

The governing board of the institution is responsible for the selection and the periodic evaluation of the chief executive officer.
CS 3.2.2 Governing Board Control

The **legal authority** and **operating control** of the institution are clearly defined for the following areas within the institution’s governance structure:

3.2.2.1 the institution’s mission.
3.2.2.2 the fiscal stability of the institution.
3.2.2.3 institutional policy.
CS 3.2.3 Conflict of Interest
The governing board has a policy addressing conflict of interest for its members.

CS 3.2.4 External Influence
The governing board is free from undue influence from political, religious, or other external bodies and protects the institution from such influence.
The governing board has a policy whereby members can be dismissed only for appropriate reasons and by a fair process.
CS 3.2.6 Board/Administration Distinction

There is a clear and appropriate distinction, in writing and **practice**, between the policy-making functions of the governing board and the responsibility of the administration and faculty to administer and implement policy.
CS 3.7.5 Faculty Role in Governance

The institution publishes policies on the responsibility and authority of faculty in academic and governance matters.
FR 4.5 Student Complaints

The institution has adequate procedures for addressing written student complaints and is responsible for demonstrating that it follows those procedures when resolving student complaints.
FR 4.7 Title IV Responsibilities

The institution is in compliance with its program responsibilities under Title IV of the most recent Higher Education Act as amended.

- What issues exist with Title IV programs for the institution, if any? None
- Has the institution been placed on the reimbursement method? No
- Has the institution been required to obtain a letter of credit in favor of the Department of Education? No
- Have complaints related financial aid been filed with the Department of Education regarding this institution? No
- Do the independent audits of the institution’s financial aid programs evidence significant noncompliance? No
FR 4.7 Title IV Responsibilities

• Are there significant impending litigation issues with respect to financial aid activities? No
• Are there significant unpaid dollar amounts due back to the Department of Education? No
• Has adverse communication been received from the Department of Education? No
• What is the institution’s student loan default rate? 9.6 (2013)
• Is the institution aware of infractions to regulations which would jeopardize Title IV funding? No
• Has the institution been obligated to post a letter of credit on behalf of the Department of Education or other financial regulatory agencies? No
• Do the independent audits of the institution’s financial aid programs evidence significant noncompliance? No
Questions?

MTSU Substantive Change in Governance Report: http://www.mtsu.edu/sacs/ChangeInGovernance2017.pdf
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