



January 15, 2013

Dr. Frank G. Pogue
President
Grambling State University
P. O. Drawer 607
Long-Jones Hall
Grambling, LA 71245

*cc Dr. Walton
Ms Daniels
Mr. Sanders*

Dear Dr. Pogue:

The following action regarding your institution was taken at the December 2012 meeting of the Board of Trustees of SACS Commission on Colleges:

The Commission on Colleges reviewed the institution's Third Monitoring Report following action on reaffirmation of accreditation and removed the institution from Warning. No additional report was requested.

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

Sincerely,

Belle S. Wheelan, Ph.D.
President

BSW:cp

cc: Dr. Robin W. Hoffman
Mr. Wayne Parker, Board Chair
Dr. Randy Moffett, President, University of Louisiana System ✓



**SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND SCHOOLS
COMMISSION ON COLLEGES**

1866 Southern Lane • Decatur, Georgia 30033-4097

Telephone 404/679-4500 Fax 404/679-4558

www.sacscoc.org

January 7, 2011

JAN 21 2011

Dr. Frank Pogue
Interim President
Grambling State University
P. O. Drawer 607
Long-Jones Hall
Grambling, LA 71245

Dear Dr. Pogue:

The following action regarding your institution was taken at the December 2010 meeting of the Board of Trustees of SACS Commission on Colleges:

The Commission on Colleges reaffirmed accreditation. The institution is requested to submit a First Monitoring Report due **April 15, 2011**, addressing the visiting Committee's recommendations applicable to the following referenced standards of the *Principles*:

CS 3.2.10 (Administrative Staff Evaluations), Recommendation 2

There is a lack of sufficient evidence of a comprehensive system of evaluation of administrators and timeline to show how the evaluations are used to improve performance.

The institution should provide evidence showing how administrators are evaluated and outlining evidence of improvements resulting from the evaluation system. Evidence should show how the evaluation review is used across the University.

CS 3.3.1.1 (Institutional Effectiveness: Educational Programs)

The institution failed to provide specific information on educational program learning outcomes. Further assessment results and use of those results were not completely reported.

The institution should provide detailed information confirming the assessment of its educational programs and how those results are being used for program enhancement. The institution should provide a representative sample of the academic programs consistent with its mission.



Dr. Frank Pogue
January 7, 2011
Page Two

CS 3.3.1.2 (Institutional Effectiveness: Administrative Support Services)

The institution failed to provide a system of evaluation of the administrative support services units.

The institution should provide evidence of its evaluation of administrative services units and include a representative sample of the use of evaluation of the administrative support units instead of a single example.

CS 3.10.1 (Financial Stability)

The institution relies on spending from its reserve to fund its day to day operations. The institution should provide evidence of financial stability including a specific documented plan showing how it will sustain its day to day operations without reliance on using its reserves.

As part of the report, the institution is required to submit financial audit reports and management letters for the two most recent fiscal years, and include its most recent financial aid audit. The most recent year is defined as the fiscal year ending immediately prior to the due date of this report. In addition, the institution is required to include a statement of financial position of unrestricted net assets, exclusive of plant assets and plant-related debt, which represents the change in unrestricted net assets attributable to operations for the most recent year.

Please submit to your Commission staff member a **one-page** executive summary of your institution's Quality Enhancement Plan. The summary is due **February 15, 2010**, and also should include: (1) the title of your Quality Enhancement Plan, (2) your institution's name, and (3) the name, title, and email address of an individual who can be contacted regarding its development or implementation. This summary will be posted to the Commission's Web site as a resource for other institutions undergoing the reaffirmation process.

Your institution's next reaffirmation will take place in **2020** unless otherwise notified.

All institutions are requested to submit an "Impact Report of the Quality Enhancement Plan on Student Learning" as part of their "Fifth-Year Interim Report" due five years after their reaffirmation review. Institutions will be notified one year in advance by the President of the Commission regarding its specific due date.

Guidelines for the monitoring 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. If there are any questions about the format, contact the Commission staff member assigned to your institution.** When submitting your report, please send **four copies** to your Commission staff member.



Dr. Frank Pogue
January 7, 2011
Page Three

Please note that Federal regulations and Commission policy stipulate that an institution must demonstrate compliance with all requirements and standards of the *Principles of Accreditation* within two years following the Commission's initial action on the institution. At the end of that two-year period, if the institution does not comply with all the standards and requirements of the *Principles*, 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 institution has been placed on Probation within the two-year period, extension of accreditation beyond the two-year period for good cause is dependent on the amount of time the institution has already been on Probation. An institution may be on Probation for not more than two years. If the Commission does not determine good cause or if the institution does not come into compliance within two years while on Probation, the institution must be removed from membership. (See enclosed Commission policy "Sanctions, Denial of Reaffirmation, and Removal from Membership.")

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

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Belle S. Wheelan", is positioned below the word "Sincerely,".

Belle S. Wheelan, Ph.D.
President

BSW:ch

Enclosures

cc: Dr. G. Jack Allen