

Meeting Minutes: Committee on Academic Affairs

July 18, 2000

Callaway Gardens

Pine Mountain, Georgia

MINUTES

The Administrative Committee held its summer meeting on July 18, 2000 at Callaway Gardens Resort. Vice Chairperson Bettie Rose Horne presided over the second session of the meeting. The first session of the meeting was convened by incoming Senior Vice Chancellor Dan Papp. Interim Senior Vice Chancellor Beheruz Sethna provided a follow-up report on topics of concern and System initiatives that have occurred during the past academic year.

SESSION I

I. Convene

Senior Vice Chancellor Dan Papp called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. by introducing Interim Senior Vice Chancellor Beheruz Sethna. Interim Senior Vice Chancellor Beheruz Sethna discussed the outcomes of several topics and projects (some which are ongoing) that had been undertaken during the past academic year.

a. Technology-Master Planning

Dr. Sethna explained the Technology Master Plan and its' genesis, budget impacts, and subsequent recommendations made on the basis of a study completed by Arthur Andersen Consulting.

1. Genesis

The need for Master Planning for Information and Instructional Technology was first identified by the Board Chair, the Board, and the Chancellor. They expressed the opinion that, given the importance of technology to the University System of Georgia, the time had come to build on the excellent work to date, and create a Master Plan for technology.

2. Budget Impacts

Because of serious budget constraints, the scope of the project had to be scaled down to be consistent with available resources.

3. Recommendations

The consultants made twenty-five recommendations concerning the System's short-and-long term technology plans. These recommendations were categorized into the following five areas: (1) Peachnet and Peachnet Connectivity, (2) University System Recommendations (includes a BOR Information Technology Committee and modifications to the state funding formula), (3) OIIT Recommendations, (4) System-wide Data Collection and Methodology, and (5) Campus Level Technology Master Planning. The following is a brief explanation of each area:

a. **Peachnet and Peachnet Connectivity**

Based on an internal survey, Peachnet and Peachnet Connectivity was the first priority of the campuses. Concerns were raised concerning the increased capacity and connectivity of Peachnet, servers, and network tools. The 7.7 million in funds requested by the President's Committee to address this technological medium does not fix all of the problems. The upgrades and network solutions associated with Peachnet will encompass a two-to-three year cycle. Upon review and sign-off by the President's Committee, this request will be sent to the Chancellor and the Board in either September or October. If the request is approved by the Board, it must then be submitted to the legislature.

b. **University System Recommendations**

Similar to the Board's Committee on Education, Research, and Extension, a new committee will be ratified by the Board. Given the significance of technology, the new committee will be called the Committee on Instructional and Information Technology. The consultants also suggested that the state funding formula be modified to include a technology component.

c. **OIIT Recommendations and Strategic Locations**

The consultants suggested that the Office of Information and Instructional Technology strategically locate its activities such that partnerships with campuses can evolve and support infrastructural needs for information technology personnel.

d. **System-wide Data Collection and Methodology**

The consultant's review further validated our concerns surrounding our system-wide data collection, methodology, and definitions. The System office is in the process of revising certain data collection processes and reporting mechanisms. It was also found that the lack of data standardization exacerbates the problems associated with data collection for the System and between institutions within the System.

e. **Campus Level Technology Master Planning**

The consultants further recommended, consistent with the parameters that had been delineated before the project started, that Technology Master Planning occur at both the System and campus levels since each campus has its own unique needs. To reduce the cost of this phase, the Central Office is considering the possibility of engaging one consultant for the master planning at the campus level. This would still entail 34 individual master plans, one for each campus with its own unique needs. A request of \$2 - \$5 million will be sent to the Board for this purpose.

II. **Benchmarking Project**

The report on the benchmarking project consisted of three scopes: (1) the benchmarking study, (2) management review of four USG institutions and the Central Office and on select institutional business practices, and (3) data needs and planning.

1. **Benchmarking Study**

Institutional administrators have received data in an executive summary format that represents the

findings of the consultants. This data is categorized into fiscal and quality dimensions according to the following table:

Quality Dimension	Fiscal Dimension
Student Retention	Student Graduation
Student SAT Scores	Gifts

Thirty-one separate indicators were developed and studied. Due to the many subcategories studied, there were several thousand data points reported. To focus on the main issues, and provide the Board with some help in sifting through the data, it was suggested that the System look at the data in terms of ranges and standard deviations. The Board will study these issues over the next year, and be sensitized to the mission of each institution.

2. Management Review of the Central Office and Select Institutional Business Practices

The consultant's review consisted of an in-depth review of management practices in key areas such as business services and institutional planning in the Central Office. In addition to operations at the Central Office, business practices were observed at Macon State College, the University of Georgia, Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College, and Kennesaw State University. Approximately 100 interviews were completed and seventeen functional business areas were explored. After investigating campus operational procedures and practices, the consultants completed a more in-depth study of the following processes: (1) purchasing, (2) budgeting, (3) facilities and design configurations, (4) warehousing, (5) materials regulation, (6) business services, and (7) custodial services. The final draft of the report has been approved by the steering committee and the drafts have been shared with the campuses. The consultant's management review concluded that a savings of \$6 - \$7 million could be extracted from these processes.

3. Data Similarity and Transferability (Data Warehousing and Accountability)

For accountability purposes, the consultants found that it was important for our data systems to be internally and externally consistent. This scope had not been started at the time of the meeting at which this report was presented.

III. System eCore™ Implementation

Drs. Kris Biesinger and Joan Lord explained that eCore™ will happen! Georgia Globe has registered its first students. It was explained that three groups have formed to discuss and solve issues associated with eCore™. These groups are (1) Students Services (B. Fullerton, T. Lam, D. Chubb), (2) Course Development (K. Biesinger, S. Karlan), and (3) the eCore™ Subcommittee. The eCore™ Subcommittee was charged to develop student learning outcomes, to develop course curricula, to develop/review admissions criteria, to review course quality, to review course design, and to review the role of home the institution.

It is anticipated that in the upcoming weeks, the following actions will occur:

- Governance processes will take place at home institutions.

- Admissions items are to come to the ACAA body
- eCore™ curriculum is to be passed by the General Education Council
- Review non-traditional student support and how to process and ease entry into regular courses.

Dr. Biesinger further explained that course development would focus on student learning outcomes, legal quality, and technical criteria. A group of 26-faculty members divided into six teams develop courses. The System will use products such as WebCT, WebCT Banner, and Pipeline to create pages for multiple connections, and a variety of browsing platforms. This allows symbolic presentations to remain the same in appearance regardless of the apparatus used. As a result activities on-line are similar to those conducted in person. Data can now be downloaded and calculated.

IV. SACS Substantive Change for Distance Education

The Central Office received acknowledgement that the USG has been approved to apply for SACS substantive change review by Ms. Donna Wilkinson. The review date is scheduled for October 2001. Three other systems have already been reviewed under this process (e.g., Florida, North Carolina and Virginia).

A handout was distributed that provided details concerning a system-wide prospectus and the documents required for a substantive change visit. (Strategies for Georgia Handout). Dr. Biesinger indicated that the following actions would take place within the following weeks:

1. Identify institutions participating in the study. For the official visit, only those institutions that meet the criteria will be eligible to participate.
2. Dr. Biesinger indicated that an e-mail would be sent as a trigger to all institutions in an effort to be aware of which institutions would participate in the SACS Substantive Change.

V. Governor's Education Reform Study Commission

Dr. Jan Kettlewell reported on the progress of the Governor's Education Reform Study Commission. The focus of the discussions thus far have dealt with accountability and seamlessness among DTAE, Colleges and Universities, and the K-12 system. Last year the focus was on K-12. This year the focus will be on higher education and benchmarking. An issue paper under development will be the centerpiece of this effort from Thursday, July 20 through October. The four strands of work to be completed this year are the following:

1. Roles and Responsibilities
 - a. K-12 Assurances of Quality
 - b. Mission Comparisons and Overlaps Between DTAE and USG
2. Education Personnel
 - a. Retaining Quality Teachers
 - b. Preparing and Developing Quality Teachers
 - c. Leadership Development

VI. Closing Remarks (Dan Papp)

Senior Vice Chancellor Dan Papp discussed the need to focus on prioritized issues and invited the Chief Academic Officers to submit suggestions on future strategic directions or current problem areas. Dr. Papp also outlined the following critical areas that will be focused upon in the upcoming academic year:

Area I: Assessment

1. Qualitative Assessment
2. Quantitative Assessment
3. Benchmarking
 - a. External, Internal Data
 - b. Indicators
4. Data Standardization & Definition Standardization
 - a. Examples: FTE, Student, Program
5. Management Review
6. Institutional Research at the Institutional Level

Area II: Technology Master Planning

Area III: Access v. Excellence

1. Admissions Guidelines (potential impacts on the USG System)
2. Recruitment, Retention and Graduation
3. Seamlessness (K-12, DTAE, USG)

Area IV: Responsiveness

1. Student Learning
 - eCore, WebMBA, GLOBE, other DL - How do students learn in the 21st century?
 - Responsiveness to employers and furthering economic development

Area V: Hi-visibility Academic Programs

- Information Technology, Define
- Hi-technology, Define
- Natural Science and Mathematics
- Teacher Preparation
- Education

Area VI: Quality of Learning

- Classroom Issues
- Out of class availability of faculty

- Learning environment on-campus and beyond campus

The CAOs were encouraged to send a note to Dr. Papp concerning other high priority focus issues for the year in problem areas or areas requiring strategic direction.

Adjournment for a Brief Recess

SESSION II

VII. Welcome and Introductions; Approval of March 28, 2000 Minutes

VIII. Report of the Office of the Senior Vice Chancellor

a. Faculty Information System Update - J. Wolfe

Dr. John Wolfe reported that a Classification of Policies related to the Faculty Information System (FIS) was distributed at a recent FIS workshop held at Clayton College & State University. Concerns were expressed about the fact that campuses were prohibited from entering faculty information into the FIS system between Board meetings. The group noted that campuses could only enter data three times per week. Dr. John Wolfe and Mr. Randall Thursby explained that the system has several errors that are noncompliant. They explained that these errors would be remediated when the coding language of the system is redirected into distinct categories. The interim or new Senior Vice Chancellor for External and Human Resources will address issues concerning faculty sick leave with the departure of incumbent of Mr. Mike Vollmer.

Action: The Chief Academic Officers were asked to send issues that require further discussion to Dr. John Wolfe and Mr. Randall Thursby. The following issues will be deliberated and reported on at the next meeting:

- entering part-time and full-time faculty information;
- getting business officers involved;
- developing a stable schedule; and,
- inputting information for Fall 2000 faculty

Dr. Horne suggested that the following individuals comprise the Faculty Information System Committee to further investigate the above-mentioned issues: Georgia Tech - Michael Thomas, Georgia Perimeter College - Jean Clerc, Clayton College & State U. - Elliott McElroy, and, Georgia College & State University - Anne Gormly.

b. Comprehensive Program Review

Dr. Robert Haney discussed the revised document concerning Comprehensive Program Academic Review and trigger indicators. The members of the Committee who developed the revisions include Dr. Lloyd Benjamin, Dr. Joseph Silver, Dr. Brad Rice, Dr. Josephine Davis, and Dr. Robert Haney. The

policy section of the proposal was pulled out as a separate document. The document now has the following provisions:

- Establishes requirements and conduct of periodic review similar to institutional effectiveness and strategic planning activities;
- Defines Central Office role;
- Describes use of Program Review for improving programs;
- Defines actual reporting functions;
- Defines trigger mechanisms;
- Describes normal vs. triggered review;
- Describes how institutions may select a visiting committee for the discipline to be reviewed;
- Indicates that trigger mechanisms do not necessarily spell doom;
- Indicates the need for simple indicators for accountability measures; and,
- Presents budgets from a workload position in this review.

Dr. Papp indicated that institutional reporting was required for assessment and evaluation. The system should be kept simple in order to meet external requirements and that four to five indicators will be established for each program. A motion was called to adopt the Comprehensive Program Review policy and guidelines. The motion was approved unanimously.

IX. Committee Reports

a. Council on General Education

Dr. Joan Lord reported on the activities associated with the Council on General Education. President James Burran will be the new Chair of the Council on General Education. Since the March ACAA meeting, three recommendations were presented to the Council. These recommendations were the following:

1. **The Academic Committee on Health Professions** has recommended that biology be added to the acceptable science courses in Area D.II.b. The new requirement for allied health majors would be a "two-semester laboratory sequence in either biology, chemistry, or physics." The Council on General Education recommends approval with the stipulation that the only biology courses that may be used to fulfill this requirement are Introductory Biology (designed for non-science majors) and Principles of Biology (designed for science majors). **The motion was approved.**
2. **The Academic Committee on Math** has recommended that mathematics education majors be required to take pre-calculus in Area A. Pre-calculus is currently an Area A requirement for math and science majors, but institutions have the option of requiring pre-calculus in Area A for math education majors. The Council on General Education endorses this recommendation to become effective for all students entering in Summer 2001. **The motion was approved.**
3. **eCore Subcommittee** - The following recommendation was made by the Academic Committee on Learning Support. It was forwarded to the eCore™ Subcommittee because a major intent of

the recommendation was to allow access to eCore™ for qualified, non-traditional out-of-state students. At the Academic Advisory Committee meeting in early April, the Learning Support directors passed a recommendation to add the following statement to the end of the last paragraph of Section 3.01.03 non-traditional freshmen:

As an alternative, an institution may allow non-traditional students who have within the past five years posted SAT scores of at least 500 in both verbal and mathematics to exempt the CPE/COMPASS placement test.

The motion was approved.

b. eCore Development

Drs. Joan Lord and Kris Biesinger appealed to the Chief Academic Officers to assist in the call for faculty nominations for eCore™ course development. The following areas require faculty leadership: Human Course Interaction, Arts, Sciences, Philosophy, Technology, and World History. The Chief Academic Officers were asked to send their nominations to Dr. Biesinger within one week. The expeditious turnaround is requested in order for Dr. Biesinger and team to evaluate the recommendations and notify the campuses in order for faculty release time to be administered.

c. Regents Administrative Committee on Institutional Effectiveness

Dr. Robert Haney announced that a workshop would be held for all institutions that have an upcoming SACS reaffirmation review. Administrators were encouraged to attend the workshop for assistance with institutional effectiveness plans and institutional self-studies.

d. Report of the Nominating Committee

Dr. Horne informed everyone that the Nominating Committee consisted of the following individuals: Dr. John Black (Gainesville College), Dr. Anne Gormly (Georgia College & State University, and Dr. Joseph Silver (Savannah State University). Dr. Horne asked that Dr. John Black provide the report of the Nominating Committee. Dr. Black, Chair of the Nominating Committee, informed everyone that Dr. Josephine Davis, Vice President for Academic Affairs at Fort Valley State University, was the Chair-Elect nominee for academic year 2000-2001.

e. Election of 2000 - 2001 Chair-Elect

Dr. John Black, Chair of the Nominating Committee called for a motion. The assembled group unanimously elected Dr. Josephine Davis as ACAA Chair-Elect for the 2000-2001 academic year.

f. Comments of 2000 - 20001 Chair

1. Governor's Reform Commission and the Mini-Core

Dr. Horne invited Senior Associate Dorothy Zinsmeister to report on the outcomes and challenges of the Governor's Reform Commission relative to seamlessness issues and establishment of a mini-core. Dr. Zinsmeister reported that the transferability of math and

English courses between DTAE and USG institutions would be reviewed by the Academic Advisory Committees for further recommendation.

2. Listserv Discussion and Consulting Policies

Dr. Horne invited Dr. John Black, Vice President for Academic Affairs at Dalton State College to report on the listserv discussion on consulting policies. Dr. Black has summarized the information received to date from all respondents. Chief Academic Officers were encouraged to contact Dr. Black for further details.

g. Open Discussion: Summer Scheduling of Regents' Testing (M. Stoy)

Dr. Horne invited Dr. Michael Stoy, Vice President for Academic Affairs at Gainesville College, to pose questions and concerns regarding the summer administration of the Regents' Test. Dr. Stoy indicated that it is difficult to target a summer school group to take the Regents' Test during such a short term. Dr. Stoy further explained that we are taking "at risk" students and putting them at greater risk. Dr. Stoy recommended that the issue of repeat Regents' Test administration be passed to the Learning Support Committee. The motion was approved with a recommendation that the Learning Support Committee coordinate this agenda item with the University System Registrars and report on this issue at the next Chief Academic Officers' meeting.

Tangential to this discussion was a request for an update on the electronic administration of the Regents' Test. Dr. Biesinger reported that a budget proposal had been developed to provide a technological solution for the delivery of the Regents' Test.

h. General Announcements

Dr. Robert Haney (RACIE, Ga. Southern), announced that the next RACIE Sponsored workshop on preparing for SACS reaffirmation will be held September 17 (Macon State Campus) - 18 (Macon Conference Center) in Macon. This meeting occurs every 2 - 3 years for those institutions that will have an upcoming SACS reaffirmation visit.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:15 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,
Marci M. Middleton, MBA, MS
Director, Academic Program Coordination
USG

© **Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia**

270 Washington Street, S.W., Atlanta, GA 30334

U.S.A.

University System of Georgia Comprehensive Program Review Guidelines

Introduction

The goal of academic program review in the University System of Georgia is the improvement of programs based on information gathered and analyzed during a cyclical review process. In conducting program review, institutional faculty and administrators assess progress over time, analyze costs and benefits of programs, and make strategic decisions about program modification. The procedures outlined below offer guidelines for rigorous and meaningful review in a context of institutional freedom to design individual review processes, to employ elements of the academic audit model now in use in many institutions, and to select internal and external benchmarks. The procedures also outline how the Central Office will annually monitor performance indicators, the results of which might trigger an earlier review than scheduled. The procedures acknowledge the difficulty of conducting reviews for a large and diverse array of programs across the University System but at the same time establish guidelines which are within the reach of all institutions.

Guidelines for Academic Program Review

The purpose of these guidelines is to establish a system for periodic review of academic programs within University System of Georgia institutions. It is understood that academic program review is one component of an overall institutional effectiveness plan; other components include strategic planning, assessment of student learning outcomes, and assessment of outcomes in administrative areas. It is recommended that these guidelines be reviewed periodically to determine their effectiveness in guiding program review within the University System.

Definitions

Program Review - systematic examination of an academic program by faculty and administrators to assess the relative value of the program in terms of viability, productivity, and quality. The focus of the review should be on the program, not on the department or academic unit. The analysis of department viability, while an important institutional activity, is independent from program review.

Normal Review Cycle - the period of time in which all academic programs of an institution are reviewed.

Viability - the use of such considerations as available resources, student interest, career opportunities, and contributions to the goals and mission of the institution, University System, and state to determine whether a program should be continued as is or modified (expanded, curtailed, consolidated, or eliminated). Viability considerations are independent of quality measures; i.e., a high quality program could lack viability, or a program in need of considerable improvement could have high viability.

Productivity - the number and contributions of graduates of an academic program and/or the number of students served through service courses in the context of the resources committed to its operation. (Additional measures of productivity might include counts of students who meet

their educational goals through the program's offerings, including minors, certificates, or job enhancement, if such goals are part of the program's mission.)

Quality - measures of excellence. Quality indicators may include, but are not limited to, attainment of student learning outcomes, a comparison of program elements relative to internal and external benchmarks, resources, accreditation criteria, relevant external indicators of program success (e.g., license and certification results, placement in graduate schools, job placement, and awards and honors received by the program), and other standards.

Triggered Review - an off-cycle review initiated by evaluation of indicators monitored annually.

Normal Program Review Process

Nothing in the following guidelines precludes independent reviews of specific academic programs by the University System or any of its institutions.

INSTITUTIONAL PROCESS

- A. Each institution will submit an initial report (one-time submission, updated as needed) to the University System Central Office. The report will list the date of the last program review, if a review has been conducted, and the accrediting body for the program, if applicable. If the program must be reviewed by an outside entity for accreditation, the review cycle and other descriptive information should be provided.

The initial report will summarize the academic program review plan and process adopted by the institution, outlining the procedures and methods to be used. An initial list of the programs to be reviewed during the institution's full program review cycle will be provided.

- B. The program under review will conduct a self-study focusing on relevant data such as program admissions, student credit hours, number and percentage of graduates, cost/student credit hour, and resources committed to the program. The self-study should include defined expectations and a measurement of these expectations relative to internal standards and external benchmarks.
- C. Appropriate input and evaluative elements of an academic program review include: **Mission** - program mission, relation to institution mission, relation to University System mission, needs of students, and demand for graduates **Teaching and Learning, Research and Scholarship, and Service** - evaluation of these program functions should include, but may not be limited to, the following kinds of elements: **Students** - percent and number of majors and graduates, percent and number of graduates passing professional and qualifying examinations, diversity, selectivity, skills at entry, service course enrollments, program applications compared to program capacity, credit-hour generation, and student learning, satisfaction and evidence of success in meeting student needs and learning outcomes. **Faculty and Staff** - numbers (part- and full-time), costs, student-faculty ratio, average class size, faculty productivity, maintenance of an adequate faculty cohort for program success, diversity, credentials, and professional development. **Facilities** - space (adequacy and condition), cost,

technology labs, equipment, library, and other indicators of adequacy of campus infrastructure to support the program.

Curriculum - coherence, currency, relevance to program learning outcomes and student needs, course sequencing or frequency of course offerings, and enrollment patterns.

Other Learning and Service Activities - advising, tutoring, internships, service-learning, practica, study abroad, and career planning and placement. **Research and Scholarship** - faculty and student involvement, productivity, reputation, level of financial support, mentoring and development opportunities for new faculty. **Service** - projects completed and outcomes (program, division/school/college, institution, community and/or region levels) and contributions to mission.

- D. The program review process must provide for an analysis of the self-study and of the program by a study group of external faculty and outside evaluators, if appropriate and possible. If internal reviewers are used, every attempt must be made to ensure that the review is as objective as possible. As appropriate, academic programs which are professionally accredited may use the self-study and external review processes of reaffirmation to satisfy the academic program review requirements, provided these guidelines are followed.
- E. The program review process must provide for input into and analysis of the review by the faculty governance and administrative bodies.
- F. The program review process must include a commitment by faculty of the program and appropriate administrators to act upon the findings and recommendations of the review. Each campus will regularly report on unit progress in implementing review recommendations.
- G. As appropriate, performance indicators such as the following should be addressed in all program reviews.

Dedicated Resources (Human, physical, fiscal)

Faculty Qualifications. The program meets all regional accreditation requirements for faculty qualifications. It is suggested that the program meet discipline-based accreditation requirements, whether or not special accreditation is sought.

Faculty/student ratio. The program reports the faculty/student ratio and demonstrates that it is adequate and efficient for its mission. (Suggested: The faculty/student ratio meets the standard recommended by accrediting organizations.)

Instructional technology. The program demonstrates that instructional technology is current and is adequate for the institution's mission.

Facilities and non-instructional technical support. The program demonstrates that its physical facilities and non-instructional technical support are current and adequate for the program's mission.

Learning resources for faculty and students. The program demonstrates that the library and other information resources are current and adequate for the mission and that they meet the

requirements of the relevant accreditation body.¹

Budget Resources. There is evidence that the program has financial resources necessary to support its teaching, research, and outreach efforts as appropriate to program and institutional mission.

Program, Learning, and Service Outcomes

Faculty/graduate ratio. The program's faculty/graduate ratio is computed and judged to be appropriate to the program's mission.

Success of graduates. The program's graduates find appropriate employment or meet post-graduation educational goals in light of market trends and the needs of the state.

Scholarly contribution. The program's scholarly productivity is appropriate to the mission of the program and the institution.

Community service and outreach. The program's activity in community service and outreach is appropriate to the mission of the program and institution.

Retention rates. The program demonstrates that retention rates are appropriate for the program and the student population.

Student learning outcomes. Graduates of the program demonstrate that the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and behaviors of general education have been maintained and advanced. Graduates of the program exhibit mastery of their discipline.

Processes

Curriculum review. The program demonstrates that periodic review of the curriculum (focusing on coherence, level, and comparison with similar programs) is carried out, based on assessment of learning outcomes and other types of feedback, such as practice in the field.

Design of learning experiences. Learning experiences are designed to reinforce the general attributes of a college graduate through recognized good practices such as the following:

High expectations of students

Coherence in learning

Synthesizing experiences

Integrating education and experience

Active learning

Ongoing practice of learned skills

Prompt feedback to students

Collaborative learning

Significant time on task

Respect for diverse talents and ways of learning

Attrition rates. The program monitors attrition rates in light of similar rates for comparator

¹ Or other national/regional organization standards/guidelines as appropriate if specialized accreditation is not available or appropriate for the program.

institutions, with particular attention to sub-populations of the student body. The program demonstrates that it has a process in place to monitor and promote student progress.

- H.** Each program review plan must adhere to these Guidelines. In addition, institutional program review plans must meet the requirements of the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Criteria, Section 3.1 (in part):

The institution must develop guidelines and procedures to evaluate educational effectiveness, including the quality of student learning and of research and service. This evaluation must encompass educational goals at all academic levels and research and service functions of the institution. The evaluation of academic programs should involve gathering and analyzing both quantitative and qualitative data that demonstrate student achievement.

Measures to evaluate academic programs and general education may include the following: evaluation of instructional delivery; adequacy of facilities and equipment; standardized tests; analysis of theses, portfolios, and recitals; completion rates; results of admissions tests for students applying to graduate or licensing examinations; evaluations by employers; follow-up studies of alumni; and performance of student transfers at receiving institutions. The institution must evaluate its success with respect to student achievement in relation to purpose, including as appropriate, consideration of course completion, state licensing examinations, and job placement rates.

- I.** Each institution will submit an annual report on program reviews as outlined in Section “E” of the program review policy.

CENTRAL OFFICE PROCESS

The Central Office will review and approve the program review schedule for the current year and the report on programs reviewed the previous year. The Central Office will report to the Board of Regents as appropriate.

Triggered Program Review Process

CENTRAL OFFICE PROCESS

- A.** The Central Office will monitor annually a small number of indicators or “triggers” listed below in order to identify programs which may require additional study. The monitoring process is intended to begin a conversation between the Central Office and the campus about the health of the program(s) in question. Data already reported by the institutions to the System will be used to monitor the indicators.² Indicators will be reviewed periodically and revised as necessary. While institutions are responsible for cyclical review of doctoral programs, there are no triggers for doctoral program review at this time.

² In addition to the indicators listed in this section, loss of special purpose accreditation or placement on probationary status will trigger an immediate review.

1. Graduate Programs

- a. Graduate enrollment in the major (average over the past three years) is less than 10.
- b. Graduate degrees awarded in the major (average over the past three years) is less than five.

2. Bachelor's Programs

- a. Pass rates on licensure examinations is more than 10 percent below the state or regional average, if applicable.
- b. Enrollment in the major (average over the past three years) is less than 15.
- c. Degrees awarded in the major (average over the past three years) is less than 10.

3. Associate Transfer Programs

- a. Fewer than half of students who have earned 30 hours are still enrolled, have transferred to another System institution, or have transferred to a career program.
- b. Transfers have a 2.0 grade point average or above at the receiving institution.

4. Career Programs: Certificates and Associates³

- a. Enrollment in the program (average over the past three years) is less than 10.
- b. Degrees or certificates awarded (average over the past three years) is fewer than five.
- c. Pass rates on licensure examinations is more than 10 percent below the state or regional average, if applicable.

B. When performance falls below the indicators described above, the Central Office will begin a dialogue with the institution as outlined below:

1. The Central Office will ask the Chief Academic Officer of the home institution about the state of the programs in question.
2. Based on the institution's response, the Central Office and the Chief Academic Officer may agree to add that program to the current or next year's schedule of programs it will review, thus altering the institution's overall plan for the review cycle.
3. If a full review of such a targeted program is conducted, a separate report on the results of that program review will be submitted to the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

C. The annual review of key indicators by the Central Office may also reveal questions about program effectiveness in one or more discipline areas across institutions and programs. When general questions about programs in a particular discipline arise, the following will occur:

1. A general review of the programs in that specific discipline at all USG institutions may be requested.

³These triggers apply to certificates of at least one year and career associate programs. They do not apply to programs offered in cooperation with DTAE colleges or to DTAE programs at Bainbridge College, Clayton College & State University, Coastal Georgia Community College, or Dalton State College.

2. A separate report from each institution on the results of the targeted program review may be requested by the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.
- D.** In the event that either Section “B” or “C” has been invoked, the institution’s schedule of programs to be reviewed that year will include the programs specified by the Central Office in addition to those scheduled by the institution.

INSTITUTIONAL PROCESS

When contacted about programs which fall below the indicators monitored by the Central Office, the institution will analyze the relevant data and provide reasons for the indicated results. Most questions will be resolved at this level; examples include programs which do not require course offerings beyond those already in place for high-demand programs with strong performance, unique programs, programs for which there is a statewide or regional need, and programs central to the mission of the institution. When the institution finds cause to examine the program further, the Chief Academic Officer and the Central Office will agree to add the program to the current or following year’s cycle of program reviews.