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A. Standards and Process for Reaffirmation of Accreditation—Excerpts from *Principles of Accreditation: Foundations for Quality Enhancement*

The *Principles of Accreditation: Foundations for Quality Enhancement*, the Accreditation Review Project of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools/Commission on Colleges (SACS/COC), was approved by the membership on December 11, 2001, for implementation effective January 1, 2004. Colleges and universities scheduled for initial accreditation, reaffirmation of accreditation, and substantive change reviews on or after January 1, 2004, are subject to the new standards and the revised review procedures.

The following excerpts from the *Principles* describe the major principles and components of the revised accreditation process and standards.

There are two fundamental principles:

1. **Integrity**: A relationship in which all parties agree to commit themselves to honesty and openness in their dealings with their constituencies and with one another.

2. **Quality Enhancement**: Institutions [are expected] to dedicate themselves to enhancing the quality of their programs and services within the context of their missions, resources, and capacities, and creating an environment in which teaching, research, and learning occurs . . . . The concept of quality enhancement is at the heart of the Commission's philosophy of accreditation. . . . An institution is expected to document quality and effectiveness in all its major aspects.

An institution is required to comply with three sets of standards (See Appendix):

1. **Core Requirements**: Complying with the Core Requirements is essential for gaining and maintaining accreditation with the Commission on Colleges. Compliance with the Core Requirements is necessary but not sufficient to warrant accreditation or reaffirmation of accreditation. An institution responds to each Core Requirement by either confirming compliance or explaining those situations for which there is less than compliance.

2. **Comprehensive Standards**: The Comprehensive Standards set forth requirements in three areas: (a) institutional mission, governance and effectiveness; (b) programs; and (c) resources. Institutions respond to each Comprehensive Standard either by confirming compliance or by explaining those situations that constitute less than compliance.

3. **Federal Mandates**: The Federal Mandates are requirements that must be incorporated into an accreditation agency's standards by order of the U. S. Department of Education in order for the agency to be recognized by the
Department. Accreditation by a DOE recognized agency is a requirement for institutional eligibility for participation in Title IV programs of the 1998 Higher Education Act. Institutions respond to each Federal Mandate either by confirming compliance or by explaining those situations that constitute less than compliance.

The 73 standards are distributed within the three broad categories of Requirements, Standards, and Federal Mandates as follows:

1. **Core Requirements** (12 standards)

2. **Comprehensive Standards** (53 standards)
   - Institutional Mission, Governance, and Effectiveness
     - Mission (1)
     - Governance and Administration (14)
     - Institutional Effectiveness (1)
   - Programs
     - Educational Programs
       - Standards for All Educational Programs (14)
       - Standards Specific to Undergraduate Programs (2)
       - Standards Specific to Graduate Programs (3)
     - Faculty (5)
     - Library and Other Learning Resources (3)
     - Student Affairs and Services (3)
     - Resources (7)

3. **Federal Mandates** (8 standards)

There are two fundamental components to the peer review process:

1. **Internal Review**
   - (a) Expanded Institutional Profile
   - (b) Compliance Certification
   - (c) Quality Enhancement Plan

2. **External Review**
   - (d) Off-site Peer Review
   - (e) On-site Peer Review

Elements of the Peer Review Process

**Expanded Annual Institutional Profiles**

The two annual profiles have been expanded to include currently requested information and to address additional areas such as management and governance, enrollment trends, financial indicators, and program location and delivery.
**Compliance Certification (CC)**

During the eighth year [for UWF, 2002] following an institution’s most recent reaffirmation, the Commission will request that it submit a completed compliance certification by a specified date [for UWF, August 15, 2004]. The certification will represent the institution’s analysis of its compliance with each Core Requirement and Comprehensive Standard.

**Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP)**

The Commission will request submission of the Quality Enhancement Plan at the beginning of the tenth year [for UWF, 2005]. Engaging the wider academic community, the QEP is based upon a comprehensive and thorough analysis of the effectiveness of the learning environment for supporting student achievement and accomplishing the mission of the institution. It is used to outline a course of action for institutional improvement by addressing an issue—or issues—that contributes to institutional quality, with special attention to student learning.

**Off-Site Peer Review**

A small committee of individuals will meet at an off-site location to review the institution’s Compliance Certification and other documentation it provides . . . . The team will function as advisors to the on-site peer review committee by making observations about the information the institution provides and by determining an institution’s compliance with standards.

**On-Site Peer Review**

Following review by the off-site peer review committee, a team of peers will conduct a focused on-site review, the purpose of which will be to verify the institution’s statement of compliance with the Core Requirements and the Comprehensive Standards, evaluate actions proposed and/or taken regarding the institution’s statements of noncompliance, evaluate the acceptability of the Quality Enhancement Plan, and provide consultation regarding issues addressed in the plan. . . . The on-site peer review committee will prepare a written report of its findings—noting areas of noncompliance—and will make a recommendation to the Commission on Colleges regarding the institution’s accreditation status. The actual determination of accredited status is made by the Commission based on the committee’s report and the institution’s response to areas of noncompliance.
B. UWF SACS Reaffirmation of Accreditation Project Organization

The Reaffirmation of Accreditation Project is coordinated through the Office of the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs under direction of the **UWF SACS Leadership Team**. Drafting of the standards-based reports for the Compliance Certification is the responsibility of 12 **Compliance Certification Task Forces** assigned standards paralleling the principal organization of the standards in the *Principles of Accreditation*:

- Governance & Administration
- Planning & Evaluation
- Programs
  - General Education
  - Undergraduate Programs
  - Graduate Programs
  - Continuing Education
  - Enrollment Services
  - Faculty
  - Library/Learning/Information Resources
- Student Support Services
- Resources
- Development

Drafting of the Quality Enhancement Plan is the responsibility of the **Quality Enhancement Plan Task Force**.

Facilitating the work of the task forces and overall management of the Reaffirmation Project is the responsibility of the **UWF SACS Administrative Team**.
C. **Timeline** for Completion of Critical Elements of the Reaffirmation of Accreditation Project

1. **Reaffirmation of Accreditation Project Mileposts**

**Summer 2003**
- Identification of Compliance Certification Task Forces.
- Selection of Quality Enhancement Plan theme.
- Development of Web site and online support system for the reaffirmation of accreditation project.
- Completion of 2002-2003 Strategic Plans and Annual Reports.
- Preparation of Manual for Compliance Certification Task Forces.

**Fall 2003**
- Initial drafts by Compliance Certification Task Forces of reports for each of the Core, Comprehensive, and Federal Mandate standards.
- Identification of Quality Enhancement Plan Task Force including potential consultants.
- Completion of Faculty Databases (qualifications and course syllabi).
- Development of UWF SACS Reference Library.
- Posting of 2003-2004 Strategic Plans.
- Completion of 2002-2003 fiscal year financial audit.
- Development of work plan for Quality Enhancement Plan.
- Attendance at Annual Meeting of SACS/COC.

**Spring 2004**
- Completion by Compliance Certification Task Forces of reports for each of the Core, Comprehensive, and Federal Mandate standards.
- Completion of introduction to Compliance Certification document.
- Completion of online reference library for Compliance Certification document.
- Initial draft of QEP by Quality Enhancement Plan Task Force.

**Summer 2004**
- Completion of electronic version of Compliance Certification document.
- Submission to SACS/COC of Compliance Certification (August 15).
- Continued work on Quality Enhancement Plan.

**Fall 2004**
- Off-site peer review of Compliance Certification.
- Conference call with SACS/COC regarding findings of off-site peer review team.
- Final draft of Quality Enhancement Plan.
- Preparation of Focused Report related to Compliance Certification review.
- Preparation for on-site peer review.
Spring 2005
• Submission to SACS/COC of Quality Enhancement Plan and Focused Report (mid-January).
• On-site peer review (mid-March).
• Receipt of report of on-site peer review team.

Summer 2005
• Preparation and submission of response to on-site peer review team report.

Fall 2005
• Action by SACS/COC at Annual Meeting on reaffirmation of accreditation.

2. **Compliance Certification Component Mileposts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8-5-03</td>
<td>Meeting with Task Force Coordinators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9-9-03</td>
<td>Initial meeting of Task Forces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-15-03</td>
<td>Submission of survey and benchmarking requests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-30-03</td>
<td>Completion of first drafts of standards reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-1-03</td>
<td>Provision of feedback on first drafts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-31-04</td>
<td>Completion of second drafts of standards reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-1-04</td>
<td>Provision of feedback on second drafts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-30-04</td>
<td>Completion of penultimate draft of standards reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-30-04</td>
<td>Completion of SACS-ready standards reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-15-04</td>
<td>Submission of Compliance Certification to SACS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Quality Enhancement Plan Component Mileposts**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7-3-03</td>
<td>Identification of Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) theme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-15-03</td>
<td>Development of QEP Task Force plan of work and collection of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>theme-related data from UWF and external sources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-31-04</td>
<td>Review of internal data, benchmarking studies, and best practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-31-04</td>
<td>Completion of initial draft of QEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-15-04</td>
<td>Receipt of comments on initial draft of QEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-30-04</td>
<td>Completion of second draft of QEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-30-04</td>
<td>Circulation of second draft of QEP to campus stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-1-04</td>
<td>Receipt of comments on second draft of QEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-12-04</td>
<td>Completion of third draft of QEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-3-04</td>
<td>Receipt of comments on third draft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-17-03</td>
<td>Final draft of QEP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-14-05</td>
<td>Submission of QEP to SACS/COC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D. Compliance Certification Task Forces

1. **Assigned Standards**
   [See Appendix for list of standards assigned to each task force.]

2. Task Force Composition

   **Governance & Administration**
   Coordinator:
   Dr. Hal White, Executive Vice President
   Project Administrative Team Facilitator:
   Dr. T. Scott Marzilli

   **Planning & Evaluation**
   Coordinator:
   Dr. Jerry Norris, Associate Vice President
   Project Administrative Team Facilitator:
   Dr. Carl A. Backman

   Programs (Coordination of the General Education, Undergraduate Programs, Graduate Programs, Continuing Education, Enrollment Services, Faculty, and Library/Learning/Information Resources Task Forces)
   Coordinator:
   Dr. Wesley Little, Interim Provost
   Project Administrative Team Facilitator:
   Dr. Carl Backman

   **General Education**
   Coordinator:
   Dr. George Ellenberg, Associate Dean, Arts & Sciences
   Project Administrative Team Facilitator:
   Dr. Rosemary Hays-Thomas

   **Undergraduate Programs**
   Coordinator:
   Dr. Marcia Howard, Associate Dean, Business
   Project Administrative Team Facilitator:
   Dr. Rosemary Hays-Thomas

   **Graduate Programs**
   Coordinator:
   Dr. Klaus Meyer-Arendt, Interim Director, Graduate Studies
   Project Administrative Team Facilitator:
   Dr. Rosemary Hays-Thomas
**Continuing Education**
Coordinator:
Dr. Woodrow Cushing, Director, Continuing Education
Project Administrative Team Facilitator:
Dr. Rosemary Hays-Thomas

**Enrollment Services**
Coordinator:
Dr. Peter Metarko, Associate Vice President
Project Administrative Team Facilitator:
Dr. Carl A. Backman

**Faculty**
Coordinator:
Dr. Patricia Wentz, President, Faculty Senate
Project Administrative Team Facilitator:
Dr. Rosemary Hays-Thomas

**Library/Learning/Information Resources**
Co-Coordinators:
Dr. Grady Morein, Director, University Libraries
Mr. Michael Dieckmann, Associate Vice President
Project Administrative Team Facilitator:
Dr. T. Scott Marzilli

**Student Support Services**
Coordinator:
Dr. Deborah Ford, Vice President, Student Affairs
Project Administrative Team Facilitator:
Dr. T. Scott Marzilli

**Resources**
Coordinator:
Dr. Cornelius Wooten, Vice President, Administrative Affairs
Project Administrative Team Facilitator:
Dr. Carl A. Backman

**Development**
Coordinator:
Dr. Dean Van Galen, Vice President, Development
Project Administrative Team Facilitator:
Dr. Carl A. Backman
E. Responsibilities of Compliance Certification Task Forces, Coordinators, and Facilitators

1. Task Forces

For each principal standard assigned to a task force, the task force is to prepare the Compliance Certification report for the standard. The report is to include the following:

(a) Determination of compliance status as one of the following:
   - Full compliance.
   - Partial compliance.
   - Not in compliance.

(b) Narrative justifying the judgment. The narrative is to include a “compelling argument” and citation of source documents directly supporting the judgment and associated narrative.

(c) Identification of ways in which the University can improve the quality of its programs and services related to the standard even though the standard has been rated as “in compliance.”

(d) Identification of documents cited in the narrative.

(e) Identification of documents not cited in the narrative but which provide additional support for the “compelling argument.”

For each secondary standard assigned to the task force, provide information to the principal task force upon request of the principal task force or on a voluntary basis as circumstances warrant.

Notes on special situations:

(a) For standards for which it is determined that the University will be in partial compliance or not in compliance at the time of submission of the Compliance Certification, the narrative must include a plan for bringing the University into full compliance.

(b) For standards which the task force initially identifies as in partial compliance or not in compliance but for which corrective action can be completed prior to submission of the Certification, the task force should recommend such corrective action.

(c) The standards apply to all locations at which the University offers programs and services and to whatever modes of instructional delivery are used. Compliance with the standards must be documented for each instructional location and for traditional and technology-dependent modes of instruction.

(d) For standards for which it is explicit or implicit that a policy or procedure exists, the policy or procedure must be identified and cited, the mode of publication identified, the distribution identified, and the mechanism for and results of periodic evaluation identified.
There are two standards related to systematic review and evaluation of programs and services: #2-5 systematic review of programs and services and #3.1.3-16 institutional effectiveness. Each task force is asked to provide to the Planning & Evaluation Task Force information related to these two standards. If the institutional effectiveness standard identified above applies to a standard assigned to a particular task force, the task force is to prepare a summary of expected outcomes, outcome assessment, and evidence of improvements based on the analysis of the outcome assessments. If the Systematic Review requirement applies to a standard assigned to a particular task force, the task force is asked to prepare a summary of the review processes used, continuing improvements implemented based on the review, relationship to accomplishing the University mission, and the relationship to University planning and evaluation.

For standards in which language such as “sound and acceptable practice,” “as appropriate,” and so forth, is used, the narrative must include the criteria (and source thereof) that were used to make judgments on the degree of compliance and level of quality.

Several of the standards implicitly or explicitly refer to qualified personnel. If personnel standards apply, identify the nature and location of documentation of qualifications and competence.

Where appropriate and reasonable, judgments of degree of compliance and level of quality are to be supported by analyses of internal survey data, benchmarking studies, and reviews of best practices literature. Particular attention should be given to consistency of responses regarding governance and administration with those of other State University System institutions.

Evaluating the Evidence Supporting Compliance

The SACS/COC Handbook for Reaffirmation of Accreditation states: “Evidence is not simply an amassed body of facts, information, data, or exhibits. Instead, it is a coherent and focused body of information supporting a judgment of compliance. Institutions should ensure that the evidence it presents has the following characteristics: reliable, current, verifiable, coherent, objective, relevant, and representative. Additionally, evidence should: entail interpretation and reflection . . .; represent a combination of trend and “snapshot” data; and draw from multiple indicators.”
2. **Task Force Coordinators**

(a) Organize the work of the task force to ensure timely completion of preliminary and final drafts of the Compliance Certification reports for each assigned standard.

(b) Delegate responsibility within the task force for the collection of information (e.g., UWF procedures, review of best practices literature) and data and for the preparation of draft reports.

(c) Coordinate with the Facilitator on requests for documents not in the SACS Reference Library, surveys and benchmarking studies.

(d) Submit standards-based Compliance Certification reports by published due dates.

(e) Submit program and services quality improvement recommendations by published due dates.

(f) Communicate on a regular basis with the assigned Facilitator (member of Project administrative team) on progress and on situations needing special attention.

3. **Task Force Facilitators**

(a) Communicate and consult on a regular basis with the Coordinators of the task forces to which assigned as Facilitator.

(b) Monitor progress of the task forces on development of reports for standards assigned to the task forces.

(c) Receive and respond to requests for special assistance from Coordinators of assigned task forces.

(d) Report on progress and special needs at weekly meetings of Project administrative team.

(e) Provide assistance to the assigned task forces on use of the Web-based task force work sites.

4. **Task Force Members**


(b) Review all Core Requirements, Comprehensive Standards, and Federal Mandates.

(c) Review all requirements and standards assigned to the task force.

(d) Participate in discussions related to the development of the standards-based Compliance Certification report for standards assigned to the task force.

(e) Assist in the identification of criteria to be used in making judgments as to whether the University is in compliance, in partial compliance, or not in compliance with the standards assigned to the task force.
(f) Assist in identifying information (documents, surveys, benchmarking studies, best practices, and so forth) and personnel to which the task force needs access in order to prepare the standards-based Compliance Certification reports and programs and services quality improvement recommendations.

(g) Assist in the preparation of drafts of the standards-based reports.

(h) Assist in the reviewing of drafts of the standards-based reports for standards assigned to the task force and for related standards assigned to other task forces.

(i) Share with UWF faculty, staff, and students information about the UWF SACS Reaffirmation of Accreditation Project as circumstances warrant.

5. **Project Administrative Team**

(a) Provide to the UWF SACS Leadership Team recommendations on organization and procedures for preparing reports and conducting activities related to reaffirmation of SACS/COC accreditation.

(b) Implement the decisions of the UWF SACS Leadership Team with respect to organization and procedures.

(c) Provide for each Compliance Certification task force member the following:
   - Manual describing the revised SACS/COC reaffirmation of accreditation processes and requirements and the UWF plan for implementing the processes and satisfying the requirements.
   - List of all SACS/COC standards and requirements.
   - List of standards and requirements pertaining to the task force.
   - Instructions on how to use the Web-based task force work sites.
   - Directions for requesting assistance in
     - Conducting surveys.
     - Conducting benchmarking studies.
     - Locating best practices literature.
   - Directions for submitting document names and citation-related information for documents to include in the UWF SACS Reference Library.
   - Directions for communicating between and among the Compliance Certification task forces.
F. UWF SACS Reaffirmation of Accreditation Web Site

To facilitate the work of the task forces and to prepare for the eventual electronic submission of the Compliance Certification to SACS/COC, the UWF SACS Reaffirmation of Accreditation Web Site, accessible at http://nautical.uwf.edu/accreditation/uwfsacs, has been developed as a part of the University of West Florida Accreditation Web Site, http://nautical.uwf.edu/accreditation. Guidelines for using the UWF SACS Reaffirmation of Accreditation Web Site are included in a separate Users Guide.

Features of the Reaffirmation of Accreditation Web Site include the following:

- Identification of all components of the Reaffirmation of Accreditation Project and repository for the Compliance Certification, Quality Enhancement Plan, Institutional Profiles, and other required reports.
- Identification of the Compliance Certification task forces, their responsibilities, and their membership.
- Password-protected work site for each task force including an e-mail system, a document swapping system, and a most current draft upload function.

G. Information Request Protocols

1. Requesting Assistance from Project Administrative Team

   The principal point of contact for requesting assistance from the Project Administrative Team is the Task Force Coordinator.

2. Requesting Documents Not in the UWF SACS Reference Library

   Requests for documents not available through the UWF SACS Online Reference Library should be made through the Task Force Coordinator.

3. Submitting Documents to the UWF SACS Reference Library

   Submission of reference and supporting documents for which the task force has access to an electronic version of the document is to be done using the e-mail function available at the task force’s online work site. The system accommodates attaching electronic files and entering the URL for Internet-accessible documents. The Reference Librarian should always be included as a recipient when conveying documents in this manner. The body of the e-mail should identify the standard(s) with which the document is to be identified.
Submission of documents for which the task force only has access to hard copy is to be done by sending a copy of the document through campus mail to the UWF SACS Reference Librarian/UWF SACS Office/Building 78-Room 121. The document should be accompanied by a transmittal note identifying the standard(s) to which the document pertains and the task force that is sending the document.

4. Requesting Survey Information

All requests for surveys are to be coordinated through the Task Force Coordinator.

5. Requesting Benchmarking Information

All requests for benchmarking information are to be coordinated through the Task Force Coordinator.

6. Interacting with Other Compliance Certification Task Forces

The e-mail function available at each task force’s online work site has a feature facilitating e-mail correspondence between members of the different task forces.

7. Submitting Drafts and Securing Commentary on Standards-Based Reports

Draft reports of the standards-based narratives are posted through the Draft Report upload function available at each Standard’s Worksite page accessible through the task force’s online work site.

8. Submitting Final Drafts of Standards-Based Reports

Final reports of the standards-based narratives are posted through the Draft Report upload function available at each Standard’s Worksite page accessible through the task force’s online work site.
H. Style Manual

1. Word processing program:
   • Microsoft Word

2. Font:
   • Use Arial, plain
   • Use 12 pt
   • Avoid bolding
   • Avoid use of italics except for tertiary headings and titles of documents (other than titles of articles in journals and books).
   • Avoid use of colored fonts

3. Page setup:
   • Portrait (8.5” x 11”)
   • Margins
     - Top, bottom, right: 1 inch
     - Left: 1.5 inches (to accommodate binding of hard copies)
   • Page numbers
     - Bottom, centered, Arabic numerals, dash on each side of numeral as in -6-
   • Headers, footers, page breaks
     - With the exception of page numbers, do not include headers, footers, page breaks, and changes in font size.

4. Headings:
   • Primary—centered, plain font, upper and lower case lettering
   • Secondary—flush left, plain font, upper and lower case lettering
   • Tertiary—paragraph indentation, italics font, upper and lower case lettering, following by period and text

5. Spacing:
   • Single space within a paragraph.
   • Double space between paragraphs.
   • Double space between primary and secondary headings and text.
   • Avoid using page breaks and section breaks unless absolutely necessary.

6. Paragraphs:
   • Indent first line of each paragraph 0.5 inches using the Tab function.

7. Lists:
   • Use numbered lists for ease of reference to an item in the list. Format the numbering with the numeral followed by a period; for example, 1., 2., 3.
8. Tables and Graphics:
   - Use of tables and graphics is encouraged when these representations will reduce the narrative or make the summary easier for the reader. Convert all tables and graphics to Microsoft Word formats and place them appropriately in the narrative text. All tables and graphics must be presented in portrait orientation (8.5” x 11”) not landscape (11” x 8.5”).

9. Capitalization:
   - Use capital letters for the names of specific positions, departments, and colleges:
     - Dean of the College of Business
     - Department of Communication Arts
     - College of Professional Studies
   - Use capital letters for names of programs:
     - Bachelor of Arts in English
   - Use capital letters for task forces and other committees:
     - General Education Task Force
     - Leadership Team
   - Use capital letters for time periods in the University calendar:
     - Fall Semester 2003
     - However, . . . in the fall of 2003
   - Use capital letters and plain font for titles of articles in journals and books.
   - Use capital letters and italic font for titles of books and other monographs.
   - Capitalize initial W on Web when referring to the World Wide Web.

10. Abbreviations:
    - Introduce in text as a parenthetic expression after the first use of the full name; for example, Task Force on Undergraduate Education (TFUE).
    - Common abbreviations need not be defined in the text; for example, BA, BS, EdS, EdD, UWF, and postal system abbreviations for names of states.
    - Leave out the period in common abbreviations.
    - Leave out the apostrophe in plural forms of abbreviations; for example, GPAs not GPA’s.

11. Numbers:
    - Use digits for numbers 10 and above.
    - Use word names for numbers below 10 unless the number occurs in a sentence with numbers 10 and above, in which case use digits for all numbers.
    - Use Arabic rather than Roman numerals.
    - Avoid beginning a sentence with a number; if unavoidable, use the word name for the number.
    - Leave out the apostrophe when referring to a decade; for example, 1990s not 1990’s.
12. Statistical References:
   • Statistical terms should be spelled out; for example, a mean of 100, a standard deviation of 2.5, the 80th percentile.

13. Dates:
   • To indicate a span of years, include the full four digits of the beginning and ending year; for example, 2001-2003.
   • For specific dates, order the date information with month first, day second, and year third; for example, September 1, 2003.

14. Title of Narrative:
   • At the top of each standard’s narrative is to be the standard number (UWF version) flush left and the text of the standard (with hanging indent, if necessary) followed by a line of space and then the date of the draft flush left. For example:

   3.2.1.1-6 The institution employs sound and acceptable practices for determining the amount and level of credit awarded for courses, regardless of format or mode of delivery.

   Draft 9-1-03

15. Voice, Person, and Tense:
   • Active voice
   • Third person
   • Present tense, unless describing an action or event that took place in the past
   • Avoid anthropomorphisms.

16. References to Positions and Persons:
   • In general, names of individuals should not be used in the narratives; use position titles in place of names of individuals.
   • Use capitalization when using the official title for a specific position; for example, “The Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management is responsible for . . . .”
   • Do not use capitalization when referring to positions generically; for example, “The associate vice presidents are responsible for . . . .”

17. Quotations:
   • Short quotations should be included in the running text of the paragraph and set off with double quotation marks.
   • Longer quotations should be inserted as block quotations within the paragraph and indented both right and left an additional 0.5”.
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18. Citations and References
   - Citations within the narrative:
     - Identify by document title and by date of publication set off within parentheses; for example, University of West Florida Catalog (2003)
     - Include within the date parentheses the inclusive page numbers where appropriate; for example, University of West Florida Catalog (2003, pp. 8-15).
   - Reference List
     - At the end of each standards-based narrative will be a list of references for documents cited in the narrative. List the references in the order in which they are cited in the narrative using author, title, and date information.
   - Footnotes
     - Avoid use of footnotes.

19. Other Conventions:
   - Generic references to degrees should be as follows:
     - bachelor's degree
     - master's degree
     - specialist's degree
     - doctoral degree or doctorate
   - Use “chair” rather than “chairperson.”
   - Whenever possible, avoid sex-specific language by making the expression plural and using the appropriate declension of the pronoun “they.” If the singular is unavoidable, use the appropriate declension of “he or she” as the pronoun phrase.
   - When referring to specific courses, use the prefix, number, and course title space as in “SAC 2345 Writing Accreditation Reports.”
I. Reaffirmation of Accreditation Administrative Team and Support Staff

1. Administrative Team

**Dr. Carl A. Backman**
Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs
Director, UWF SACS Reaffirmation of Accreditation Project
UWF SACS Liaison
Bldg 78, Room 122
474-2501; cbackman@uwf.edu

**Dr. Rosemary Hays-Thomas**
Professor, Psychology
Associate Director, UWF SACS Reaffirmation of Accreditation Project
Bldg 78, Room 119
473-7258; rlowe@uwf.edu

**Dr. T. Scott Marzilli**
Assistant Professor, Health, Leisure, and Exercise Science
Assistant Director, UWF SACS Reaffirmation of Accreditation Project
Bldg 78, Room 119
473-7258; tmarzilli@uwf.edu

2. Support Staff

**Glenda Rosasco**
Senior Executive Secretary
Bldg 78, Room 121
474-2501; grosasco@uwf.edu

**Connie Works**
Senior Computer Support Specialist
Bldg 78, Room 117F
474-3080; cworks@uwf.edu

**Vanessa McCall**
Secretary
Bldg 78, Room 117H
473-7893; vmccall@uwf.edu

**“Matt” Li Yi**
Graduate Assistant
Bldg 78, Room 117D
474-2501; ly1@students.uwf.edu
3. ITS Web Developer

Laura Hiltabrand
Coordinator, Computer Applications

J. Virtual and Physical Facilities

Web site: http://nautical.uwf.edu/accreditation

E-mail: uwfsacs@uwf.edu

Online Reference Library: Available at http://nautical.uwf.edu/accreditation

Hardcopy Library: Available in Bldg 78, Room 120

Conference Room/Library: Bldg 78, Room 120

K. Other Resources

1. SACS/COC Principles of Accreditation: Foundations for Quality Enhancement
2. SACS/COC Handbook for Reaffirmation of Accreditation
3. SACS/COC Compliance Certification Template
4. SACS/COC Suggested Documentation and Methods for Reporting Compliance Status
5. SACS/COC Sample Write-ups for Narrative Supporting Determination of Compliance as Indicated on the Compliance Certification
6. SACS/COC Suggestions for Electronic Submission of Materials for Reaffirmation of Accreditation
7. UWF Accreditation Web Site Home Page
8. UWF SACS Reaffirmation of Accreditation Project Web Site Users Guide
9. UWF SACS Reaffirmation of Accreditation Project Home Page
10. UWF SACS Reference Library Home Page
11. UWF SACS Compliance Certification Task Forces Work Sites Home Pages

Appendix

Standards by Task Forces
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