

OVERALL SACS REAFFIRMATION TIMELINE

Dates subject to change based on further information from SACS. This timeline was created based on the earliest due dates required by SACS.

| Date | Activity |
|---|---|
| January 31, 2011 | Orientation of Reaffirmation Leadership Team in Atlanta |
| March 15, 2012 | Compliance Certification Due to SACS (not including the QEP) |
| May 14 – May 18, 2012 | SACS Off-Site Review Conducted |
| <u>July 1, 2012</u> | <u>QEP and Nomination for QEP Lead Evaluator Due to SACS</u> |
| Between September 1 and November 15, 2012 | On-Site Review Conducted |
| Between June 17 and June 21, 2013 | Review by the Commission on Colleges |
| September 15, 2018 | Fifth Year Compliance Report, which must include meaningful results from QEP assessment, due to SACS. |

QEP TIMELINE

The following schedule is based on recommendations for reasonable, complete QEP development from the QEP consultants Dr. Robert Armacost and Dr. Julia Pet-Armacost. Each step of this timeline is specifically designed to address the Core Requirement (CR) and Comprehensive Standard (CS) that discuss the QEP, as discussed in SACS’s (2010) *The Principles of Accreditation: Foundations for Quality Enhancement*:

CR 2.12: The institution has developed an acceptable Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) that includes an instructional process for identifying key issues emerging from institutional assessment and focuses on learning outcomes and/or the environment supporting student learning and accomplishing the mission of the institution.

CS 3.3.2: The institution has developed a Quality Enhancement Plan that (1) demonstrates institutional capability for the initiation, implementation, and completion of the QEP; (2) includes broad-based involvement of institutional constituencies in the development and proposed implementation of the QEP; and (3) identifies goals and a plan to assess their achievement.

SACS elaborates on how to meet this Core Requirement and Comprehensive Standard in their 2010 *Handbook for Institutions Seeking Reaffirmation*.

| | Date | Activity | Rationale for Activity |
|---------------------------------|-------------|---|--|
| QEP Topic Identification | 2009 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Data retreat 2. AEC SWOT 3. SSIC’s examination of data | <p>Activities 1 and 3 address CR 2.12, which requires institutional processes for identifying key issues emerging from institutional assessment.</p> <p>Activities 2 and 3 address SACS CS 3.32, which requires broad-based involvement of institutional constituencies in identifying and developing the QEP topic.</p> |

| | | | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|---|--|
| QEP Topic Identification | May 2010 - July 2010 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Attend SACS Summer Institute 2. Create rubrics for “mini” QEP proposals which will be solicited from August to October 2010. 3. Create rubrics for “developed” QEP proposals that will be solicited in November 2010. Rubrics will evaluate “developed” proposals against all of the SACS expectations for a QEP, with particular attention to how authors document the need for their initiative based on data. 4. Launch communication campaign that describes what a QEP is, why ACC is creating a QEP, and the process that ACC will go through to identify a QEP topic. 5. Launch QEP website July 15, 2010. 6. The QEP becomes a standing agenda item for all SSISC meetings until its submission to SACS on July 1, 2012. | <p>The first activity will help gather information about SACS’s expectations for the QEP and methods for meeting these standards that may be effective at ACC.</p> <p>Activities 2 and 3 (a) builds transparency into the QEP process, (b) focuses AEC and SSIC on SACS’s expectations, (c) helps SSISC understand AEC’s rankings of proposed QEP topics. The rubric for the “developed” proposal will help authors of understand the criteria their proposals will be evaluated against.</p> <p>Activities 4 and 5 help address SCS 3.32, which requires broad-based involvement of institutional constituencies in identifying and developing the QEP topic.</p> |
| | August - October 2010 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Continue communication campaign that describes what a QEP is, why ACC is creating a QEP, and ACC’s QEP topic identification process 2. Dr. Kinslow discusses the QEP at General Assembly, August 20, 2010. 3. Launch communication campaign that asks the ACC community to submit QEP topic ideas centered on the question “If you could change one thing at ACC that would improve students’ learning what would it be?”. 4. Solicit “mini” QEP proposals from the ACC community through an online survey beginning August 20, 2010. 5. Members of the QEP subcommittee of AEC attends meetings of different stakeholders (e.g., ACAC, Faculty Senate, Chamber of Commerce, Student Government) to encourage their participation in the QEP process and to submit ideas through the online survey. 6. ACC data retreat where, through the analysis and discussion of data, key areas of student success and learning that may be appropriate for the QEP may need to focus on additional ideas about the QEP may be uncovered. | <p>All of these activities help address SACS CS 3.32, which requires broad-based involvement of institutional constituencies in identifying and developing the QEP topic.</p> <p>The last activity also helps address SACS CR 2.12, which requires institutional processes for identifying key issues emerging from institutional assessment.</p> |

| | | | |
|--|---------------|---|--|
| | November 2010 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. QEP subcommittee of AEC categorizes and evaluates solicited “mini” QEP proposals using rubric and forwards their evaluations to AEC. 2. At November meeting AEC ranks the top ten “mini” QEP proposals and forwards their rankings and the proposals to SSISC. Priority will be given to proposals that can be justified with data about student learning and success at ACC. 3. Begin communication campaign describing what has been accomplished in the QEP process and next steps. | <p>All of the activities in November 2010 help address SACS CS 3.32, which requires broad-based involvement of institutional constituencies in identifying and developing the QEP topic.</p> <p>The last activity will be particularly important for building transparency into the QEP process.</p> |
|--|---------------|---|--|

| | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|--|---|
| QEP Topic Identification | December 2010 - February 2011 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. First meeting in December SSISC selects 2-4 topics from the QEP “mini” proposals for development into a full QEP proposal. 2. Solicit “developed” QEP proposals that address how to improve student learning in the 2-4 areas identified by SSISC from members of the ACC community. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Developed proposals must meet the SACS expectations for a QEP, particularly the use of data to support the proposed initiative b. Invite individuals who submitted “mini” proposals in selected areas to submit a “developed” proposal. c. Contact areas in ACC that may align with the 2-4 areas identified by SSIC and encourage them to submit a “developed” proposal. d. Support for the writing of “developed” proposals will be available to proposal authors/writing teams (e.g., research, data collection, data analysis). 3. Continue communication campaign describing what has been accomplished in the QEP process and next steps. | <p>Activities 1 and 2 address SACS CR 2.12, which requires institutional processes for identifying key issues emerging from institutional assessment. This CR also requires institutions to select QEP topics based on empirical evidence that focus on student learning outcomes and/or the student learning environment and fit the institution’s mission.</p> <p>Activities 2 and 3 address SACS CS 3.32, which requires broad-based involvement of institutional constituencies in identifying and developing the QEP topic. This is particularly important for building transparency into the QEP process.</p> |
| | March 2011 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Continue communication campaign describing what has been accomplished in the QEP process and next steps. 2. QEP subcommittee of AEC evaluates solicited “developed” QEP proposals using rubric and forwards their evaluations to AEC. Priority will be given to proposals that can be justified with data about student learning and success at ACC. 3. At March meeting AEC ranks the “developed” QEP proposals and forwards their rankings and the proposals to SSISC. Priority will be given to proposals that can be justified with data about student learning and success at ACC. | <p>March’s activities address SACS CS 3.32, which requires broad-based involvement of institutional constituencies identifying and developing the QEP topic. The first activity will build transparency into the QEP process.</p> <p>Activities two and three address CR 2.12, which requires institutions to select QEP topics based on empirical evidence about student learning outcomes and/or the student learning environment and fit the institution’s mission.</p> |
| | April 2011 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. SSISC selects final QEP topic considering all of the SACS requirements, including the use of data about student learning and success at ACC. 2. Announce selected QEP topic to ACC community. 3. Continue communication campaign describing what has been accomplished in the QEP process and next steps. | <p>April’s activities address CS 3.32, which requires broad-based involvement of institutional constituencies in identifying and developing the QEP topic.</p> |

| | | | |
|------------------------------|---------------------------|---|---|
| QEP Topic Development | May 2011 - December 2011 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. SSISC nominates a subcommittee of ACC community members who have knowledge about the QEP topic and ACC to develop a full draft of the QEP. 2. The QEP Topic Development subcommittee writes a draft of the QEP. 3. Continue messages explaining next steps and completed steps | <p>The creation of a subcommittee (Activity 1) will help ACC ensure that the QEP document meets CR 2.12 and CS 3.3.2 and the expectations in the <i>Handbook for Institutions Seeking Reaffirmation</i>.</p> <p>Activity 3 addresses CS 3.32, which requires broad-based involvement of institutional constituencies in identifying, developing, and implementing the QEP.</p> |
| | January 2012 – April 2012 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Solicit comments and suggestions from ACC community members about the stakeholders, institutions, and experts on draft of the QEP. 2. Solicit comments from other institutions that have conducted similar QEPs on the draft QEP. 3. Solicit comments and suggestions from experts on the QEP topic about the QEP draft. 4. Continue messages to the ACC community that explains next and completed steps in the overall QEP process. | <p>Activities 1 and 4 address CS 3.32, which requires broad-based involvement of institutional constituencies in identifying, developing, and implementing the QEP.</p> <p>Activities 1, 2 and 3 will also help ensure that the QEP meets CR 2.12 and CS 3.3.2 and meets the expectations identified in SACS's (2010) <i>Handbook for Institutions Seeking Reaffirmation</i>.</p> |
| | May 2012 - June 2012 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Revise and finalize the Quality Enhancement Plan for submission to SACS. 2. Continue messages to the ACC community that explains the next steps and completed steps in the overall QEP process. | <p>The first activity allows for a final check that ACC's QEP meets all of the requirements of CR 2.12 and CS 3.3.2 and the expectations in the <i>Handbook for Institutions Seeking Reaffirmation</i>.</p> <p>Activity 2 addresses CS 3.32, which requires broad-based involvement of institutional constituencies in identifying, developing, and implementing the QEP.</p> |
| Submission | July 1, 2012 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Submit QEP to SACS On-Site Review committee 2. Continue messages to the ACC community that explains next and completed steps in the overall QEP process. | |