

**EXCERPT FROM THE PRELIMINARY REPORT
OF THE REAFFIRMATION COMMITTEE**

Statement Regarding the Report

The Board of Trustees of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC) is responsible for making the final determination on reaffirmation of accreditation based on the findings contained in this committee report, the institution's response to issues contained in the report, other assessments relevant to the review, and application of the Commission's policies and procedures. Final interpretation of the Principles of Accreditation and final action on the accreditation status of the institution rest with SACSCOC Board of Trustees.

Name of the Institution: **University of South Carolina - Columbia**

Date of the Review: **November 3-4, 2020**

SACSCOC Staff Member: **Dr. Linda Thomas-Glover**

Chair of the Committee: **Dr. Timothy S. Brophy**
Director, Institutional Assessment
and Professor, Music Education
University of Florida
Gainesville, FL 32606

5.4 Qualified Administrative/Academic Officers

- 5.4 The institution employs and regularly evaluates administrative and academic officers with appropriate experience and qualifications to lead the institution.
(*Qualified administrative/academic officers*) [Off-Site/On-Site Review]

Compliance

The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee found support for the institution's case for compliance.

For administrative and academic positions, the institution provided a copy of the administrator's resume, a position description, and completed evaluations. Position descriptions for these administrative positions included responsibilities and qualifications, along with other types of expectations for preferred knowledge, skills, and abilities. The credentials of the administrators in the position aligned with the documented qualifications. Institutional policy ACAF 1.01 details the policies and procedures for recruitment, appointment, and annual review of academic administrators.

The institution provided comprehensive examples of annual evaluations for most administrative positions, demonstrating an adherence to regular review. The primary reason for not providing a performance evaluation example was that the person had served less than a year. The institution provided the curriculum vitae, position description, and example evaluations of the chancellor with oversight of the four regional campuses of the institution. The documentation demonstrated that its administrative and academic officers have appropriate experience and qualifications and are evaluated regularly.