

Shelia Luke <sluke@sacscoc.org>

Wed 3/4/2015 10:43 AM

To:

Mark Underwood;

To help protect your privacy, some content in this message has been blocked. To re-enable the blocked features, click here.

To always show content from this sender, click here.

You replied on 4/6/2015 4:14 PM.

Action Items

Mark,

Thank you so much for sending the Institutional Summary form and for the additional information that you provided in your email. I will address your initial inquiry below and then I will advise you on what is needed to update our records. Please see my responses in red. Per your initial inquiry:

We are listing in 3.12 our Substantive Changes since the last SWTJC reaffirmation of accreditation. The situation arises from the requirement in the "Institutional Summary For Prepared for Commission Reviews" to list **all** sites for the "50% or more of a program" rule and the "25%-49% of a program" rule. There are really two issues:

1. Our Uvalde, Del Rio, and Eagle Pass campuses have been in operation for decades; Uvalde since 1946, and the other sites since the 1980's. I know the Uvalde campus received initial accreditation in 1964, but I have no record of a "date approved by SACSCOC" for the other sites. What is an appropriate response for that column for those sites in the document?

Uvalde is the main campus (assuming that there are no other sites in Uvalde) and it was accredited in 1964. Since this is the main campus, it should not be listed as an off-campus site. Both the Del Rio and Eagle Pass Campuses are referenced in the 2005 Institutional Summary. Therefore, we will consider these sites approved by virtue of the 2007 reaffirmation. Please reference 1/1/2007 as the approval date of the Eagle Pass and the Del Rio Campuses.

2. SWTJC provides dual credit courses to 21 service-area high schools. I have records indicating that SWTJC notified the Commission about only three of those sites. I have spoken to the previous Accreditation Liaison, who has even looked at personal records he took with him upon his retirement. He and others who have been at SWTJC for a while think that we sent in the High School sites when we were approved for Distance Education some years ago. However, we have no copy of such a record. I would mention that these sites were listed in our Fifth-Year Interim Report in 2011 and were received without comment.

I am in the process of updating the SACSCOC database of off-campus instructional sites for each of our member institutions. Although we do have some high school sites listed in our database for SWTJC, it would be most helpful to me if you would:

1. Provide a complete listing of all high school sites which includes:

●□□□□□□□□ Site Name

●□□□□□□□□ Complete Address

- Established Date
 - Percentage offering at that site (i.e. 25-49%). You can actually just list them in categories based on the schools offering 25-49% and those offering 50% or more.
2. You can email this information to me. Once I receive this information, I will verify it and contact you if any additional information is needed.
 3. I will then send you a final report to verify that we have accurately captured all of SWTJC's off-campus sites in our database.

Almost all of the high school sites fall under the "25%-49% of a program rule," and our relationship with them began prior to our last reaffirmation; nevertheless, apparently the Commission was not notified. So again my question is about the appropriate response for the "date approved by SACSCOC" column in the "Summary" form.

Go ahead and list the high school sites on your summary form as well. Sites offering 25-49% do not require an approval date. Sites offering 50% or more do require an approval date. I was able to find the following information in our records:

- Approval letter (8/3/2010) for the following high schools approved to offer 50% or more:

- Crystal City High School
- San Felipe Del Rio High School

- Letter accepting notification (1/29/2015) to offer 25-49% at the following sites:

- Medina Valley High School
- Medina Valley ISD Higher Learning Center

I hope that my responses are clear and that I addressed your concerns adequately. However, if that is not the case, please do not hesitate to contact me and I will be happy to further clarify. Thanks so much Mark!

Shelia