



SACS Steering Committee Minutes May 23, 2000

Attending: Bill Bompart, Vera Boyll, Roxann Bustos, Mary Davis, Gordon Eisenman, Mark Fissel, Jim Garvey, Richard Harrison, Carolyn Ingraham, Bob Johnston, Bill Nelson, Laura Nichols, and Ray Whiting

Meeting Location:

The SACS Steering Committee will meet May 30, 2000, at 1:30 p.m., Boykin-Wright.

Meeting Agenda:

Please review the agenda posted to the ASU-SACS list-serv and advise Ms. Nichols of changes.

Minutes:

- 1) The SACS Steering Committee approved the minutes dated May 16, 2000, as read.
- 2) Bob Johnston handed out the abbreviated planning reports from Kathy Hamrick, Special Coordinator for Academic and Master Planning. Some administrative units were not required to submit planning reports at this time. Reports from these units will be submitted at a later date.
- 3) As a follow-up to last week's meeting, Bill Bompart distributed copies of a draft memorandum concerning the abbreviated planning process. The Steering Committee reviewed and approved this memorandum with minor editorial changes.
- 4) Mark Fissel reported that the Information Technology Committee has made great progress toward completing a Technology Master Plan. This plan details the issues concerning the infrastructure of technology at ASU. This plan will need to be dovetailed into the ASU Strategic Plan.
- 5) Team One presented their review for both the Political Science and Military Science units. Questions were raised concerning plans for bringing non-compliant issues into compliance as follows:
 - Each team needs to clarify that this is an all inclusive review of the Steering Committee,
 - Embedded IE components need to be identified,
 - Each team should identify non-compliant issues and specify what the unit needs to do to achieve minimal SACS compliance, and
 - Each unit should also made recommendations for unit improvement.

SACS Steering Committee - May 23, 2000 - Continued

- 6) Questions were raised concerning the requirements for academic units to respond to both Sections 3.1 and 3.2 of the Criteria. Bill Bompart stated that he believes it is prudent to ask academic units to respond to both sections. Academic units should have both academic and administrative goals. Ray Whiting made the motion that we waive the requirement for academic units to respond to both Sections 3.1 and 3.2 on a case by case basis. If an academic unit can identify administrative goals under their response to Section 3.1, the need for responding to Section 3.2 of the Criteria should be waived. This motion was approved by the Steering Committee.

Meeting Adjourned