

- Minutes of governing board meetings and executive committee meetings.
- Documents used in ethics training and for conflict of interest disclosures of board members.
- Evidence on how board members receive orientation to their duties.

## Reference to SACSCOC Documents, If Applicable

SACSCOC Policies: [Integrity and Institutional Obligations to SACSCOC](#)  
[Governing, Coordinating, and Other State Agencies: Representation on Evaluation Committees](#)

SACSCOC Position Statement:

[The Impact of Budget Reductions on Higher Education](#)

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

- Standard 4.2.a (*Mission review*)
- Standard 4.2.b (*Board/administration distinction*)
- Standard 4.2.c (*CEO evaluation/selection*)
- Standard 4.2.d (*Conflict of interest*)
- Standard 4.2.e (*Board dismissal*)
- Standard 4.2.f (*External influence*)
- Standard 4.2.g (*Board self-evaluation*)
- Standard 4.3 (*Multi-level governance*)
- CR 13.1 (*Financial resources*)

### **4.2.a** The governing board ensures the regular review of the institution's mission. *(Mission review)*

#### Rationale and Notes

The institution's governing board formally approves and periodically reviews the institution's mission statement. The board, in its review, reaffirms the mission statement and whether changes are made, thereby maintaining a cognizance of the previously agreed-upon scope of institutional activities and ensuring that institutional policies, procedures, and activities remain compatible with and included in the mission statement.

#### Questions to Consider

- Is review of the mission statement a regular expectation of the governing board?
- What is the process for mission review and approval of changes?
- What event or events trigger a review of the mission of the institution?

## Sample Documentation

- Governing board minutes documenting review.
- A schedule of periodic review consistent with the minutes.

## Reference to SACSCOC Documents, If Applicable

None noted.

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

CR 2.1            (*Institutional mission*)

- 4.2.b** The governing board ensures a clear and appropriate distinction between the policy-making function of the board and the responsibility of the administration and faculty to administer and implement policy.  
(*Board/administrative distinction*)

## Rationale and Notes

Effective governance includes clearly defining the roles and responsibilities of the governing board, administration, and faculty and ensuring that each of these groups adheres to their appropriate roles and responsibilities. While it is important that the overall mission and overarching policies of the institution are approved by the board, the administration and implementation of the general direction set by the board are carried out by the administration and faculty in order to prevent the board from undercutting the authority of the president and other members of the administration and faculty, thereby creating an unhealthy and unworkable governance structure. To ensure a clear understanding of separate roles and responsibilities, the distinctions should be delineated in writing and disseminated to all appropriate constituents.

## Questions to Consider

- Does the organizational structure of the institution reflect a distinction in lines of authority?
- Do board materials (bylaws, manuals, etc.) reflect the distinction in roles and responsibilities? Do administrative materials also reflect this distinction?
- Are there clear examples in practice of the distinction between the board setting direction and the administration and faculty implementing policies?
- If this board/administrative distinction has been blurred, what steps were taken to address concerns?