



January 24, 2012

2012 JAN 22 PM 1:28
F-66-1

Dr. Adena Williams Loston
President
Saint Philip's College
1801 Martin Luther King
San Antonio, TX 78203

Dear Dr. Loston:

The Committee on Fifth-Year Interim Reports reviewed the institution's compliance with the 14 select standards of the *Principles of Accreditation* outlined in the Commission's Fifth-Year Interim Report. Based only on those reviewed standards, the institution is requested to submit a Referral Report to the Commission on Colleges due **September 7, 2012**, addressing the following referenced standards of the *Principles*:

CS 3.10.3 (Financial Aid)/FR 4.7 (Title IV Responsibilities)

The institution is a part of the Alamo Community College District. The institution's audited financial statements are consolidated with the District. The 2010 and 2009 audit of the District noted eight findings that were deemed significant deficiencies under the Single Audit Act and OMB Circular A-133. The auditors did not identify clearly which finding belongs to which institution in the District. The institution identified three of the findings in which they are involved. The institution implemented corrective action plans designed to address each of the three findings that they reported as being related to St. Phillip's College. The institution also provided a section of a final audit determination letter from the US Department of Education. The letter outlines what the District needs to do to assure the US Department of Education it has complied with the final audit determination requirements. The District 2011 fiscal year audit was not provided.

Provide evidence from its independent external auditors and/or another independent source that verifies that the three findings from the 2010 audited financial report as reported by the institution are not repeat findings and that the institution has fully implemented the requirements of the final audit determination letter. Also verify through an independent source that the remaining five findings do not apply to St. Phillip's College. Should it be determined that any of the remaining five findings apply to the institution, then St. Phillip's College must provide evidence that it has implemented a corrective action plan and provide from its independent auditors and/or another independent source that verifies that the remaining five findings from the 2010 audited financial report are not repeat findings and that the institution has fully implemented the requirements of the final audit determination, if any.

FR 4.4 (Program Length)

The institution has not demonstrated compliance because it has not addressed length of distance education programs. Provide evidence that the institution has established appropriate program lengths for each of its distance education programs.



Dr. Adena Williams Loston
January 24, 2012
Page Two

QEP Impact Report

The Committee also reviewed the institution's QEP Impact Report. The report was accepted with the following comments:

St. Philip's College's QEP, *Student Demonstration of Critical Thinking Skills*, focused on the development of specific critical thinking skills designed to improve student learning. There was one goal for the project: to improve student demonstration of critical thinking skills. Four objectives and five student learning outcomes supported the goal. Results related to operational aspects of QEP implementation were positive. The reported evidence indicated that the planning, administration, and evaluation of the QEP were successful. Faculty professional development was conducted with almost 300 full and part time faculty participating. Survey results supported that faculty gained greater insight into learning outcomes assessment. The narrative also indicated that implementation of critical thinking activities into the classroom environment increased over the five year project. Further, surveys indicated positive results when faculty implemented effective learning strategies in the classroom.

Results related to student learning indicate that students had significantly improved in their critical thinking skills as demonstrated by student artifacts, which were assessed with faculty-created rubrics. In addition, the standardized Proficiency Profile provided evidence that improvement occurred for students for all designated competencies except writing level two, which was maintained. Additional, indirect measures such as Key Performance Indicators and CCSSE showed positive results during the timeframe of the QEP's implementation. Overall, positive improvements were reported both in student learning outcomes and objectives specific to the operational aspects of the QEP.

Reports requested by the Committee on Fifth-Year Interim Reports will be forwarded to the Committees on Compliance and Reports (C & R), standing committees of SACSCOC Board of Trustees, for action at the meeting immediately following the due date of the Referral Report. The review by C & R will begin a two-year monitoring period within which your institution must document compliance with all the identified standards above.

Guidelines for the Referral Report are enclosed. Because it is essential that institutions follow these guidelines, please make certain that those responsible for preparing the report receive the document. Please send **four copies** to the Commission staff member assigned to your institution.

We appreciate your continued support of the activities of the Commission on Colleges. If you have questions, please contact your institution's Commission staff member.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Belle S. Wheelan".

Belle S. Wheelan, Ph.D.
President

BSW:sr

Enclosures

cc: Dr. Michael S. Johnson



Southern Association of Colleges and Schools
Commission on Colleges
1866 Southern Lane
Decatur, Georgia 30033-4097

REPORTS SUBMITTED FOR COMMITTEE OR COMMISSION REVIEW

- Policy Statement -

Institutions accredited by the Commission on Colleges are requested to submit various reports to an evaluation committee or to the Commission's Board of Trustees for review. Those reports include:

Response Report to the Visiting Committee
Monitoring Report or Referral Report

When submitting a report, an institution should follow the directions below, keeping in mind that the report will be reviewed by a number of readers, most of whom will be unfamiliar with the institution.

Information Pertaining to the Preparation of All Reports

Preparation of a Title Page

For any report requested, an institution should prepare a title page that includes the following:

1. Name of the institution
2. Address of the institution
3. Dates of the committee visit (*not applicable for the Referral Report*)
4. The kind of report submitted
5. Name, title, and contact numbers of person(s) preparing the report

Presentation of Reports

For any report requested, an institution should

1. **For print copies**, copy all documents front and back, double-space the copy, and use no less than an 11 point font. If the report requires binding beyond stapling, do not submit the report in a three-ring binder. Ring binders are bulky and must be removed before mailing to the readers.
2. **For electronic copies**, copy the report and all attachments onto an electronic memory device (e.g., external hard-drive, DVD, CD, or flash/thumb drive). Provide the name of the person who can be contacted if the readers have problems accessing the information. Provide **one print copy** of the response without the attachments.

Each electronic memory device smaller than 4" by 4" should be submitted in a paper or plastic envelope not smaller than 4 x 4 inches and the envelope should be labeled with the name of the institution, the title of the report, and the list of document contents. The electronic memory device should be labeled with the name of the institution and the title of the report.

Each electronic memory device larger than 4" by 4" should be in a paper or plastic envelope and clearly labeled with the name of the institution, the title of the report, and the list of document contents. The electronic memory device should be labeled with the name of the institution and the title of the report.

3. Provide a clear, complete, and concise report. If documentation is required, ensure that it is appropriate to demonstrating fulfillment of the requirement. Specify actions that have been taken and, when possible, document their completion.
4. When possible, excerpt passages from text and incorporate the narrative into the report. Provide definitive evidence, not documents that only address the process (e.g., do not include copies of letters or memos with directives).
5. Specify actions that have been taken and provide documentation that such actions have been completed. Avoid vague responses indicating that the institution plans to address a problem in the future. If any actions remain to be accomplished, the institution should present an action plan, a schedule for accomplishing the plan, and evidence of commitment of resources for accomplishing the plan.
6. When possible and appropriate, provide samples of evidence of compliance rather than all documents pertaining to all activities associated with compliance.
7. Reread the report before submission and eliminate all narrative that is not relevant to the focus of the report. If sending electronic copies, ensure that all devices are virus free and have been reviewed for easy access by reviewers external to your institution.

Information Specific for the Response to the Visiting Committee Report

- Definition:** A Response Report addresses the findings of a visiting committee. It provides updated or additional documentation regarding the institution's compliance with the *Principles of Accreditation*.
- Audience:** The Response Report, along with the Committee Report and other documents, is reviewed by the Commission on Colleges' Board of Trustees and is subject to the review procedures of the Commission's standing committees, including the continuation of a monitoring period, the imposition of a sanction, or a change of accreditation status.
- Report Presentation:** Structure the response so that it addresses committee recommendations in the order that they appear in the report. Tabs should separate each response to a recommendation.
- For each recommendation, provide the number of the Core Requirement, Comprehensive Standard, or Federal Requirement and state the recommendation exactly as it appears in the visiting committee report. Describe the committee's concerns that led to the recommendation by either summarizing the concerns or inserting verbatim the complete narrative in the report pertaining to the recommendation. Provide a response with documentation.
- Due Date:** The Response Report is due on the day indicated in the transmittal letter from Commission staff accompanying the visiting committee report.
- Number of Copies:** See the transmittal letter from Commission staff accompanying the visiting committee report.

Information Specific to the Preparation of a Monitoring Report or a Referral Report

- Definition:** These reports address recommendations and continued concerns of compliance usually identified by the Committee on Compliance and Reports or the Executive Council (or, for a Referral Report, identified by the Committee on Fifth-Year Interim Reports). It usually follows the C & R Committee's review of an institution's response to a visiting committee report.
- Audience:** The Monitoring Report and the Referral Report are reviewed by the Commission on Colleges Board of Trustees and are subject to the review procedures of the Commission's standing committees, including the continuation of a monitoring period, the imposition of a sanction, or a change of accreditation status.
- Report Presentation:** *For a Monitoring Report*, structure the response so that it addresses committee recommendations in the order that they appeared in the report. Tabs should separate each response to a recommendation.
- For each recommendation, (1) restate the number of the Core Requirement, Comprehensive Standard, or Federal Requirement, the number of the recommendation, and the recommendation exactly as it appeared in the visiting committee report; (2) provide a brief history of responses to the recommendation if more than a first response (to include an accurate summary of the original concerns of the visiting committee, a summary of each previous institutional response and an explanation of what had been requested by the Commission); (3) cite verbatim the current request of the Commission that is related to the recommendation (reference notification letter from the President of the Commission); and (4) prepare a response to the recommendation.
- For a Referral Report*, structure the response so that it addresses the concerns described in the letter from the Commission's President in the order that they appeared. Tabs should separate each response to each standard cited.
- For each standard cited, (1) restate the number of the Core Requirement, Comprehensive Standard, or Federal Requirement exactly as it appeared in the letter; (2) cite verbatim the current request of the Commission that is related to the standard cited (reference notification letter from the President of the Commission); and (3) prepare a response to the recommendation.
- Due Date:** The Monitoring Report and the Referral Report are due on the date specified in the Commission President's notification letter. Requests for extensions to the date must be made to the President of the Commission two weeks in advance of the original due date. (*See Commission policy "Deadlines for Submitting Reports."*)
- Number of Copies:** See the letter from the President of the Commission requesting the Report.

Document History

*Edited and Revised for the Principles of Accreditation: December 2003
Updated: January 2007, January 2010, May 2010, January 2012*