

## Historical Timeline: USF St. Petersburg's Efforts to Earn SACS Accreditation

---

#1

[February 12, 2004](#)

USF St. Petersburg submitted a "Revised Application" and supplemental materials to SACS seeking separate accreditation.

#2

[April 20, 2005](#)

Dr. Karen White received a letter from SACS that acknowledged receipt of USF St. Petersburg's application and supplemental materials. The letter also included the assignment of a SACS contact person to USFSP.

#3

[September 12, 2005](#)

Dr. Karen White received a letter from SACS instructing USFSP to submit accreditation materials by January 1, 2006.

#4

January 2006

USF St. Petersburg submitted accreditation materials as per SACS instructions. The report addressed each of the SACS accreditation standards (totaling some 80 items).

#5

February 7-9, 2006

USFSP hosted the SACS Accreditation Site Team Visit.

#6

[March 7, 2006](#)

Dr. Karen White received a letter from SACS that included the Accreditation Site Team Visit Report and instructions to prepare a response by April 15, 2006. The findings are detailed below.

---

### **A. Assessment of Compliance with Section One**

The committee found no basis for making recommendations on the following

- Institutional Integrity
- Adherence to Commission Policy
- Substantive Change
- Representation of Accredited Status

### **B. Assessment of Compliance with the Core Requirements**

<u>Compliance</u>	<u>Not Applicable</u>
2.1 Compliance	2.12 Not Applicable
2.2 Compliance	
2.3 Compliance	
2.4 Compliance	

**B. Assessment of Compliance with the Core Requirements (Continued)**

<u>Compliance</u>	<u>Not Applicable</u>
2.5	Compliance
2.6	Compliance
2.7.1	Compliance
2.7.2	Compliance
2.7.3	Compliance
2.7.4	Compliance
2.8	Compliance
2.9	Compliance
2.10	Compliance
2.11	Compliance

**C. Assessment of Compliance with the Comprehensive Standards**

<u>Compliance</u>	<u>Non-Compliance</u>
3.2.1	Compliance
3.2.2	Compliance
3.2.2.1	Compliance
3.2.2.2	Compliance
3.2.2.3	Compliance
3.2.2.4	Compliance
3.2.3	Compliance
3.2.4	Compliance
3.2.5	Compliance
3.2.6	Compliance
3.2.8	Compliance
3.2.9	Compliance
3.2.10	Compliance
3.2.11	Compliance
3.2.13	Compliance
3.2.14	Compliance
3.4.2	Compliance
3.4.3	Compliance
3.4.5	Compliance
3.4.6	Compliance
3.4.7	Compliance
3.4.8	Compliance
3.4.9	Compliance
3.4.10	Compliance
3.4.11	Compliance
3.4.12	Compliance
3.4.13	Compliance
3.4.14	Compliance
3.6.1	Compliance
3.6.2	Compliance
3.1.1	Non-Compliance Recommendation 1
3.2.7	Non-Compliance Recommendation 2
3.2.12	Non-Compliance Recommendation 3
3.3.1	Non-Compliance Recommendation 4
3.4.1	Non-Compliance Recommendation 5
3.4.4	Non-Compliance Recommendation 6
3.5.1	Non-Compliance Recommendation 7
3.5.2	Non-Compliance Recommendation 8
3.8.3	Non-Compliance Recommendation 9

**C. Assessment of Compliance with the Comprehensive Standards (Continued)**

<u>Compliance</u>	<u>Non-Compliance</u>
3.6.3 Compliance	
3.7.1 Compliance	
3.7.2 Compliance	
3.7.3 Compliance	
3.7.4 Compliance	
3.7.5 Compliance	
3.8.1 Compliance	
3.8.2 Compliance	
3.9.1 Compliance	
3.9.2 Compliance	
3.9.3.1 Compliance	
3.10.1 Compliance	
3.10.2 Compliance	
3.10.3 Compliance	
3.10.4 Compliance	
3.10.5 Compliance	
3.10.6 Compliance	
3.10.7 Compliance	

---

\* See Appendix 1 for the list of 10 SACS Recommendations

**D. Assessment of Compliance with Federal Requirements**

<u>Compliance</u>	<u>Non-Compliance</u>
4.2 Compliance	4.1 Non-Compliance Recommendation 10
4.3 Compliance	
4.4 Compliance	
4.5 Compliance	
4.6 Compliance	
4.7 Compliance	
4.8 Compliance	

---

#7

USF St. Petersburg submitted “Response to Visiting Committee” on April 15, 2006 that addressed the ten standards that were in non-compliance:

Non-Compliance

**Comprehensive Standards**

CS 3.1.1	Institutional Mission	Recommendation 1
CS 3.2.7	Organizational Structure	Recommendation 2
CS 3.2.12	Fund-Raising Control	Recommendation 3
CS 3.3.1	Institutional Effectiveness	Recommendation 4
CS 3.4.1	Program Approval and Evaluation	Recommendation 5
CS 3.4.4	Transfer Credit	Recommendation 6

#7 (Continued)

Non-Compliance

CS 3.5.1	General Education	Recommendation 7
CS 3.5.2	Awarding of Undergraduate Degrees	Recommendation 8
CS 3.8.3	Library Staff	Recommendation 9
<b>Compliance with Federal Requirements</b>		
FR 4.1	Evaluating Success	Recommendation 10

#8

[July 7, 2006](#)

Dr. Karen White received a letter from SACS indicating that at the June 2006 meeting, the Commission had taken the following action:

The Commission on Colleges awarded ***initial accreditation*** at Level V as a separate entity from the University of South Florida [emphasis added]. The institution will be required to complete a Compliance Certification and a Quality Enhancement Report and to receive a Committee visit in anticipation of reaffirmation of accreditation in 2011.

However, USFSP was also instructed to submit a “Monitoring Report” by April 13, 2007 that addressed five standards that were in non-compliance.

#9

USF St. Petersburg submitted the “First Monitoring Report” to SACS on April 11, 2007 that addressed the following:

Non-Compliance

**Comprehensive Standards**

CS 3.2.7	Organizational Structure	Recommendation 2
CS 3.3.1	Institutional Effectiveness	Recommendation 4
CS 3.4.1	Program Approval and Evaluation	Recommendation 5
CS 3.5.1	General Education	Recommendation 7
<b>Compliance with Federal Requirements</b>		
FR 4.1	Evaluating Success	Recommendation 10

#10

[July 6, 2007](#)

Dr. Karen White received a letter from SACS instructing USFSP to submit a response by September 7, 2007 that addressed four standards that were in non-compliance.

#11

USF St. Petersburg submitted “Second Monitoring Report” to SACS on September 3, 2007 that addressed the following:

Non-Compliance

**Comprehensive Standards**

CS 3.2.7 Organizational Structure Recommendation 2

CS 3.3.1 Institutional Effectiveness Recommendation 4

CS 3.5.1 General Education Recommendation 7

**Compliance with Federal Requirements**

FR 4.1 Evaluating Success Recommendation 10

#12

[January 9, 2008](#)

Dr. Karen White received a letter from SACS instructing USFSP to submit a response by April 11, 2008 that addressed two standards that were in non-compliance. In addition the letter also indicated that:

Please note that with submission of this report, your institution will have submitted monitoring reports for a period of two years, concluding in June 2008. Federal regulations and Commission policy stipulate that if an institution does not demonstrate compliance with all the standards and requirements of the “Principles of Accreditation” within two years following the Commission’s initial action on the institution, representatives from the institution may be required to appear before the Commission, or one of its standing committees, to answer questions as to why the institution should not be removed from membership. If the Commission determines good cause at that time, the Commission may extend the period for coming into compliance for a minimum of six months and a maximum of two years and must place the institution on Probation. If the Commission does not determine good cause, the institution must be removed from membership.

**Please note that institutions at the end of their two-year monitoring period should also include a report supporting the conditions of “good cause” as described in the above referenced document. The institution bears the burden of proof to provide evidence why the Commission should not remove it from membership.**

#13

USF St. Petersburg submitted “Third Monitoring Report” and the “Good Cause Report” to SACS on April 9, 2008. The report addressed the following:

Non-Compliance

**Comprehensive Standards**

CS 3.5.1 General Education Recommendation 7

**Compliance with Federal Requirements**

FR 4.1 Evaluating Success Recommendation 10