

**RACEA Executive Committee
Conference Call
Minutes from Friday, July 10, 2015**

Attendees: Cathi Jenks, Bryan Davis, Jill Lane, Michael Black, Angeles Eames, Alan Aycock, Barbara Brown

Absentees: Juliana Lancaster

Agenda

1. Approval of Minutes from March 13, 2015
 - a. Minutes approved.
2. Annual Meeting Debriefing
 - a. Feedback Bryan received is that we should stay with what we have been doing in terms of content. We do not want to spend a lot of money to bring in speakers. Bryan asked the executive committee members for additional input about the meeting. Alan thought that we were in a good position that we are able to get people from SACSCOC to speak at the meetings. Bryan agreed that this seems sufficient and useful for people and that there was no need to conduct a survey of attendees at this point since he was able to speak to everyone. He suggested that we might devote more time to planning the spring meeting at the fall meeting and give people something to think about prior to fall meeting.
3. Treasurer's Report
 - a. Michael Black reported on the agency account balance. He informed the group that due to the cost of holding the meeting at UGA, we cannot afford to do the meeting at UGA for more than another 1.5 - 2 years. We had to pay an additional \$1200 over what was collected for registration fees this past year. There were a lot of service fees involved (e.g., \$100 per day for laptop, \$250 to set up website for registration, etc.).
 - b. Two (2) years ago we had \$3700 in account. Currently have \$2068.18.
 - c. Bryan commented that while we do take in more than needed in fall and have an infusion, we would need to consider raising the registration fee for the meeting. Michael noted that if we raise the fee \$50 it would cover the cost. We need to think about this for next year. Either move venue or raise registration fee. Other idea – not provide as many meals.
4. CPR Committee Update

- a. Marci Middleton inquiring into passwords for CPR archives. Barbara had not heard anything related to this. Marci indicated there was a transition going on and she would be taking over CPR. Barbara and Marci are sharing a supervisor now.
- b. Bryan reported that he asked Marci about the audit that is going on to which she replied that she was looking forward to answering our questions. Juliana not on call, but she has more information about this.

5. Program Review Task Force Update

- a. Angeles stated that she and Juliana discussed that they had been waiting for the system to come up with some direction. They are reluctant to provide direction in order not to be at odds with the task force's proposal.
- b. Angeles and Juliana met and were trying to keep people apprised of what was going on. At this point they are on hiatus because there hasn't been any activity.
- c. Angeles reported on the task force meeting (Please see Academic Program Review Task Force Meeting notes in Appendix A).
 - i. Task force convened in May. Reviewed the charge. Reviewed two documents – academic program forecast form and prospectus form. Angeles stated that she doesn't know if the forms were distributed anywhere else (VPAA's, etc.).
 - ii. The majority of the suggested changes were to the Academic Program Forecast document
 - 1. Lots of discussion regarding low producing programs list. If program is on this list, will it be cut? Provosts were asking these questions. Good 30-minute discussion about this.
 - 2. People have been thinking that as long as you provide a rationale and an improvement plan that it should be okay. However, it seemed that in a few years this may not be the case if the program continues to remain on the low producing list. The expectation of the BOR is that it should be improving. Bryan offered that this seems like the BOR expanding into operational decisions instead of policy decisions.
 - 3. Angeles – perhaps the BOR could take a look and categorize the rationales based on institutional mission, service to the Core, etc. Nothing definitive set.
 - iii. Bryan commented that if you are a SACSCOC liaison it is important that your Provost/VPAA is sharing the Academic Program Forecast when it is submitted each year so that you can be aware of proposed program actions that may be substantive changes requiring notification or approval.
 - iv. There were minor changes suggested to New Program Prospectus (see notes attached)

- v. Jill sent the link to the distribution list.
 - vi. There was a CPR Focus Group mentioned in the notes from Angeles that will be chaired by Kelli Brown, the Provost at Georgia College and State University. Juliana Lancaster, Donta Truss, and Angeles Eames are the RACEA members on the group.
 - d. **Action Item** – Barbara will look into Marci’s request for CPR archives via email. Marci didn’t know about the audit that was done back in 2013 of CPRs – spot-checking the program review websites that were supposed to be maintained. Barbara – there is no longer any mandate to maintain these. Angeles remembered reading an audit report – sampled the sites and found that people were doing what they were supposed to be doing.
 - e. **Action Item** – Angeles to go through her records to see if she can find the document (letter with findings). It was conducted by a 3rd party. Angeles to send to Bryan.
 - f. Still in BOR policy manual and in 2.3.6 –that there is an expectation of CPR. Barbara - Without guidance puts institutions at a disadvantage because they know what is expected by SACSCOC but not the BOR. Bryan – the auditor would be the person to ask about the findings and letter. Alan – everyone provided links and then sampling was conducted.
6. AA and AS Task Force Update
- a. Tabled due to connectivity issues.
7. Dates for Fall Meeting & Preliminary Discussion of Agenda
- a. October 23rd or 30th look good. Bryan asked for recommendations. Two preferred 23rd – Michael and Angeles. Will discuss agenda in August.
 - b. **Action Item** - Bryan will get started on technicalities of setting up the meeting. Need to discuss registration fee at August meeting. Likely stick with Macon.
8. SACSCOC Update re: Consortial Agreements
- a. Tabled due to connectivity issues.
9. Next Meeting: August 14 @ 9:00 AM
- a. August 14th works for everyone.
 - b. **Agenda item:** Discuss more of what we know about the program review program review process.
 - c. **Action Item:** Bryan will talk with Juliana to see if anyone else is having issues with their conference bridge system to seek out alternatives for the next call.
 - d. **Action Item:** Barbara will look into setting up WebEx as an alternate means for the next call.

APPENDIX A

Academic Program Review Task Force Meeting May 4, 2015

At this meeting, those gathered reviewed two documents: The Academic Program Forecast (APF) and the New Program Prospectus (NPP). The first document was organized by “process segment.” USG Support Staff had distilled what they perceived as current challenges from prior meetings of the task force and made suggestions on the opportunities for improvement that were based on suggestions made by the representatives on the Task Force throughout the preceding months as well as their own suggestions.

Please refer to the two scans of the documents that were distributed at the meeting.

Academic Program Forecast Discussion:

The opportunities for improvement (in col.B) of the APF were discussed and the group seemed to approve of most the suggested changes and clarified several. Clarifications included:

On p.1 , the first block in col.B, the phrase “through a systematic campus process,” was clarified to include appropriate faculty and curriculum processes.

On p.1, third block in col. B deadline dates were added: September 1 Forecasts will be due. The date for when institutions will have an opportunity to revise and reprioritize the APFs based on feedback prior to submitting for Budget Review was not decided. However, it was suggested that these timelines be announced in advance and put on the BOR website.

On p.1, the fifth block col.B, the first bullet point is amended to include the phrase “If the prospectuses for programs to be included in the forecast are out of order, these will need to be justified.” The second bullet point beginning “Institutions will be asked to hold...” was omitted.

However, consideration of some programs may be bumped in order because the BPSRC will consider reviews from a system-wide perspective with high need and/or collaborative programs receiving first priority review and approval.

On p. 2, fourth block, col. B, Marci Middleton and Mark Lytle will work on this, some common data sources may include the Department of Labor’s Occupational Outlook, the Department of Commerce, Marci’s “List,” employer needs surveys.

On p.2, sixth block, discussion centered on what to pay the reviewers. A \$300.00 honorarium was suggested.

On p. 3, first block, staff discussed that there was a lot of back in forth on the budgets so in the future they will develop a Budget Template to present to the Chief Business Officers as part of the NPP

On p.3 last block, in the low producing programs report BA and BS in the same field will be aggregated and Masters and Doctoral programs in the same field will also be aggregated.

On p.4 first block. There was a spirited discussion on raising expectations for producing degrees. Some felt that the current benchmarks were low, others believed that the current benchmarks did not account for size and types of institutions, or institutional mission. After much discussion, BOR staff agreed to keep the current benchmarks in place and not make changes for now. The point was also made by BOR staff that justifications for low producing programs might fly for a while but after three years . . .positions on the topic may change.

On p.4 second block: The staff recognized that more needed to be done in comprehensive program reviews and that this past year, those issues had not really been addressed. Therefore a new Academic Program Review Subcommittee was proposed that would develop recommendations and report back. The idea is that they would develop a doable template for CPR, solicit feedback and come up with minimum criteria for what the BOR needs.

As a Postscript, the subcommittee was appointed this week. See note from Marci Middleton below.

It is projected that the work of the Comprehensive Program Review Focus Group will be completed with enough time for system-wide implementation by July 1, 2016. We welcome your knowledge, experience, and leadership perspectives on institutional and programmatic assessments for continuous improvement. We plan on having an initial, very informal gathering immediately following the forthcoming joint RACSA/RACAA meeting that will conclude on Tuesday, July 21 (at approximately noon) at The Ritz Carlton Lodge – Lake Oconee Trail located in Greensboro, Georgia.

Below are the specifics of our charge as a subcommittee of the New Program Review Task Force that has been meeting this academic year (also provided as an attachment):

Comprehensive Program Review Focus Group

Subcommittee of the New Program Review Task Force

Academic Year 2015 – 2016

Timeline for completion and implementation of outcomes: July 1, 2016

The committee will be empaneled to complete the following:

- 1) Determine system-wide indicators of quality, productivity, and viability that need to be collected from university system institutions based on institutional comprehensive program review assessments;
- 2) Develop elements for a template by which university system institutions and the system office are looking at foundation level metrics, both qualitative and quantitative, for system office review and feedback to institutions concerning their internal comprehensive program review assessments; and,
- 3) Within the framework of comprehensive program review and using the resultant template, determine the elements that need to be reported to the Board of Regents.

The work of the Comprehensive Program Review Focus Group will be informed and guided by University System of Georgia institutions and current ongoing activities involving program and institutional assessments. During the course of this initiative, it is anticipated that best practices and examples will be highlighted according to sector, discipline, and major as well as examples of other higher education system efforts to provide reports of state level academic program accountability. The work of the Comprehensive Program Review Focus Group will be closely aligned to Board Policy 3.6.3 concerning Comprehensive Academic Program Review and SACS Principles of Accreditation (Foundation for Quality Enhancement).

The following individuals comprise membership of the Comprehensive Program Review Focus Group:

USG Institutional Lead:

Dr. Kelli Brown, Georgia College & State University, Provost and Vice President, Academic Affairs

System Office Liaison:

Dr. Marci Middleton, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Programs

Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs Representatives:

Dr. Micheal Crafton, University of West Georgia, Provost and Vice President, Academic Affairs

Dr. Marti Venn, Middle Georgia State University, Provost and Vice President, Academic Affairs

Dr. Timothy Goodman, East Georgia State College, Vice President, Academic Affairs

Institutional Research and Effectiveness Representatives:

Dr. Juliana Lancaster, Georgia Gwinnett College, Executive Director, Office of Plans, Policies, and Analysis

Dr. B. Donta Truss, Fort Valley State University, Associate Vice President, Institutional Research, Planning, and Effectiveness

Dr. Michael Galchinsky, Georgia State University, Director, Academic Program Review

Dr. Angeles Eames, Armstrong State University, Director of Assessment

Schedule of Meetings to date (face-to-face):

July 21, 2015 Joint RACSA/RACAA Meeting (informal gathering confirmed and immediately following the close of business), The Ritz Carlton at Lake Oconee, Greensboro, GA

September 15, 2015 Board of Regents Meeting – Atlanta, GA (potential)

October 2015 RACAA Meeting in Macon at Middle Georgia State University (Tentatively, October 7 at this time) (potential)

A majority of the Comprehensive Program Review Focus Group meetings will be conducted using technological resources available (e.g., teleconference, WebEx, etc.). An initial, informal gathering will be held at the forthcoming summer 2015 joint meeting of the RACSA/RACAA administrative committee on July 21, 2015 immediately following the close of business (noon approximately) at The Ritz Carlton Lodge, Lake Oconee Trail in Greensboro, Georgia.

Continuing . . .

p.4, third block, while people agreed with what is to be done some felt that they did not have complete records since they were new to their positions and asked whether older records could be obtained from BOR. Staff agreed to provide these.

Finally, on the last page of the APF document there was much discussion about what the significance of APR is. The thought being that the results of APR should be used to inform USG decision making and be aligned with budgeting processes. Those present want to know what actions the Board has taken as a result of Comprehensive Program Reviews? The last block notes that USG culture leans more

toward getting new programs on the books. Some believe that more attention should be paid to academic program reviews to identify existing programs that are doing well in assessment and using their results for improvements and that perhaps there should be some state level recognition, award, or grants to reward such programs.

New Program Prospectus Discussion

Only minor changes were suggested: add a signature line for the VPAA; add a new block to #13 for additional equipment or significant resources. The point was made in # 9 that if the total number of credit hours for a new program is “outside the norm,” then the prospectus would NOT be considered.

Next Steps:

The staff will make suggested changes and take the documents to the meeting of the Academic Vice Presidents scheduled for next week to solicit their comments and input before finalizing the report.