- Policies and regulations related to intercollegiate athletics and the CEO's oversight and relationship to outside entities.

- Memos, minutes, and/or written correspondence that show that either the CEO controls the fund-raising activities of the related entity, or documents that show that the fund-raising activities of the related entity are defined in a formal, written manner assuring that the activities further the mission of the institution.

Reference to SACSCOC Documents, If Applicable

None noted.

Cross-References to Other Related Standards/Requirements, If Applicable

CR 4.1   *(Governing board characteristics)*
Standard 4.2.d   *(Conflict of interest)*
Standard 4.2.f   *(External influence)*
Standard 4.3   *(Multi-level governance)*
Standard 5.2.a   *(CEO control)*
Standard 5.2.b   *(Control of intercollegiate athletics)*
Standard 5.2.c   *(Control of fund-raising activities)*
Standard 13.3   *(Financial responsibility)*
Standard 13.5   *(Control of sponsored research/external funds)*

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)*

Rationale and Notes

In order to ensure that an institution has effective leadership to accomplish its mission, the institution employs academic and administrative officers with the credentials and expertise appropriate to the duties and responsibilities associated with their positions. Administrator qualifications align with position descriptions. There is an expectation that these administrative and academic officers are regularly evaluated to allow feedback on performance.

This standard applies to key decision makers within the institution's governance structure. However, the standard does not apply to the chief executive as the employment and evaluation of the CEO are addressed in Standard 4.2.c *(CEO evaluation/selection)*. The institution should provide a rationale for the group of persons addressed by this standard because titles vary greatly across different institutions. Generally, this standard would address all executive-level officers, as well as directors of major academic units (e.g., academic deans). This standard requires professional

judgment as to the appropriateness of the qualifications of persons in leadership positions. Examples provided should illustrate the regularity of the evaluation process.

> *NOTES*
>
> *There are separate standards regarding policies pertaining to appointment and evaluation of other personnel [(Standard 5.5* (Personnel appointment and evaluation) *and Standard 6.3* (Faculty appointment and evaluation)*]. It would be appropriate to reference the current standard in those other standards if the evidence of evaluation of senior leadership appears only in Standard 5.4* (Qualified administrative/academic officers)*.*
>
> *Specific examples may be appropriate showing regular evaluation of administrative and academic officers, consistent with institutional policy. Examples would usually be redacted for privacy purposes but leave enough detail to demonstrate compliance.*
>
> *SACSCOC considers an evaluation cycle of every three years or less to meet the expectation of "regular" evaluation.*
>
> *The President's evaluation process is addressed in 4.2.a., so it does not been to be referenced again in this standard.*

Questions to Consider

- Is the combination of credentials and experience appropriate for the positions held?
- Do qualifications align with published position descriptions?
- Does the institution follow its own expectations regarding credentials and experience, as reflected in position descriptions?
- For persons in leadership positions who have nontraditional qualifications for their positions, what is the reasoning underlying these appointments?
- Are policies and procedures in place for the regular evaluation of administrators?

Sample Documentation

- Organizational chart to clarify the leadership roles and the names of the persons to be reviewed.
- Position descriptions and details as to appropriate qualifications for each person to be reviewed.
- Résumés, as appropriate. Résumés should be current.

Reference to SACSCOC Documents, If Applicable

None noted.

Cross-References to Other Related Standards/Requirements, If Applicable

Standard 5.5   *(Personnel appointment and evaluation)*
Standard 6.3   *(Faculty appointment and evaluation)*

5.5 **The institution publishes and implements policies regarding the appointment, employment, and regular evaluation of non-faculty personnel.** *(Personnel appointment and evaluation)*

Rationale and Notes

This standard indicates that institutions will publish policies describing conditions of appointment, employment, and evaluation that are periodically assessed and widely disseminated to demonstrate that the institution employs non-faculty personnel with sufficient qualifications to maintain its operations and to support the achievement of goals consistent with its educational mission. There is an expectation that an institution consistently follows its own policies.

> *NOTES*
>
> *This standard does not apply to all full-time and part-time faculty [see Standard 6.3* (Faculty appointment and evaluation)*]. The standard also does not apply to the institution's CEO [see Standard 4.2.c* (CEO evaluation/selection)*], nor does it apply to administrative and academic officers [see Standard 5.4* (Qualified administrative/academic officers)*].*
>
> *This standard is also generally not applied to student workers, graduate assistants, and similar positions. Definitions of appointment and employment are in the Glossary (Appendix B).*

Questions to Consider

- Have personnel policies at the institution been approved through appropriate channels?
- Are the policies published and made accessible to persons affected by the policies?
- Can the institution demonstrate that it consistently follows its own policies and procedures regarding employment and evaluation of non-faulty personnel?
- Is the institution's documentation concerning the appointment, employment, and evaluation practices of non-faculty personnel consistent with its published policies and procedures?
- Are policies and procedures kept current through periodic review?

Sample Documentation

- Documents containing employment policies and procedures (e.g., employee handbooks).
- Evidence the policies are appropriately disseminated to those affected by them.