Dr. Larry Robinson  
Interim President  
Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University  
400 Lee Hall  
1601 S. Martin Luther King, Jr. Blvd.  
Tallahassee, FL 32307-3100

Dear Dr. Robinson:

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 special report on the following standards from the Principles of Accreditation: Comprehensive Standard 3.4.5 (Academic policies), Comprehensive Standard 3.9.1 (Student rights), Comprehensive Standard 3.10.3 (Control of finances), and Comprehensive Standard 3.11.2 (Institutional environment). The institution's special report resulted from a request from SACSCOC to respond to issues of possible non-compliance stemming from news articles and other means of unsolicited information. The Commission placed the institution on Probation for twelve months for failure to comply with Principle 1.1 (Integrity), Comprehensive Standard 3.2.8 (Qualified administrative/academic officers), Comprehensive Standard 3.10.3 (Control of finances), and Comprehensive Standard 3.11.2 (Institutional environment) of the Principles of Accreditation. A Special Committee was authorized to visit the institution. The institution is requested to submit a First Monitoring Report due four weeks in advance of the Special Committee visit, but no later than September 9, 2013, addressing the following referenced standards of the Principles of Accreditation:

Principle 1.1 (Integrity)
The institution has failed to operate with integrity in relation to providing accurate information on internal audits. For example, the Sniffen & Spellman investigation uncovered 15 "executive summaries" of internal audits or review reports submitted to the university Board of Trustees where the underlying audits or summaries had not been written. It was also claimed that the reports were in adherence to standards of the Institute of Internal Auditors (IIA) when they actually were not.

The institution should provide the 2012 and 2013 fiscal year financial audits and management letters, as well as any operational audits conducted during this period. The institution should also provide an update on the status of the past fabricated internal audits and review reports, as well as internal audits carried out since the discovery of the problems. The institution should provide evidence that the internal auditing function is now operating within the standards of the Institute of Internal Auditors. The report should provide an organization chart of how the internal audit function fits into the broader institutional structure, as well as details on the qualifications of the personnel now working in that office.
**CS 3.2.8 (Qualified administrative/academic officers)**
Several key leadership positions have interim persons serving in those roles, and two new positions that were created to address the problems associated with the hazing incident are unfilled.

The institution should provide information on the qualifications of the administrative and academic officers. This should include all Cabinet-level positions, all interim administrative positions, the new Special Assistant to the President position, the new Department of Music Compliance position, the Chief of Police, and all associate Vice Presidential positions. Interim and unfilled positions should be clearly identified.

**CS 3.10.3 (Control of finances)**
The institution has not presented evidence that it has exercised appropriate control over all its financial resources. In addition to the internal audit concerns already cited, materials provided showed irregularities in the financial control of the band program. While new policies and procedures have been put into place, there is insufficient evidence that the new controls have solved the internal control and internal audit problems.

The institution should demonstrate that it exercises appropriate control over its financial resources. Additionally, it is recommended that the institution provide evidence attesting to the functionality of the internal control environment, as well as the adequacy of internal audits. This should include a discussion of findings, if any, in the 2013 audit management letter.

**CS 3.11.2 (Institutional environment)**
The institution has not presented evidence that it has instituted reasonable steps to provide a healthy, safe, and secure environment for all members of the campus community. The institution should report on the effectiveness of its new anti-hazing policies and how the policies have been communicated and enforced across the campus community. The report should also include the most current Clery Act report.

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 five copies to your Commission staff member.

Because your institution has been placed on Probation, the Commission calls to your attention the enclosed policy “Sanctions, Denial of Reaffirmation, and Removal from Membership.” Federal regulations and Commission policy stipulate that an institution must 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.

In June 2012, the SACSCOC Board of Trustees took action on a Special Committee Report stemming from a complaint, and requested a Monitoring Report due April 15, 2013, regarding Federal Requirement 4.7 (Title IV program responsibilities). Consequently, the two-year period following the Commission’s initial action ends June 2014. At the end of that two-year period in June 2014, if the institution continues on Probation and does not comply with all the standards and requirements in the Principles, representatives
from the institution will be required to appear for a meeting on the record before the Commission, or one of its standing committees, to answer questions as to why the institution should not be removed from membership or to provide evidence of good cause to extend accreditation on Probation for an additional six months. If an institution is not in compliance at the end of two years on Probation, removal from membership is mandatory. The institution bears the burden of proof to provide evidence why the Commission should not remove it from membership.

The Commission may stipulate, at its discretion, that a Special Committee visit an institution. As noted earlier, a Special Committee has been authorized to visit your institution to review evidence of compliance with the specific standards of the Principles of Accreditation cited in this notification letter. The Committee may extend its initial focus if any evidence of additional accreditation-related concerns comes to its attention. Your Commission staff member will contact you to discuss arrangements for this Special Committee.

If you have any questions regarding this letter or the process, please contact your Commission staff member.

Sincerely,

Belle S. Wheelan, Ph.D.
President
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Enclosures

cc: Dr. Michael S. Johnson
    Mr. Solomon L. Badger, III, Board Chair
    Mr. Frank T. Brogan, Chancellor, State University System of Florida