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Part I. Overview and Introduction to the Institution

Georgia Southwestern State University, a four-year unit of the University System of Georgia, was founded in 1906 as the Third Agricultural and Mechanical School. In 1926, the General Assembly granted a charter authorizing the school to offer two years of college work and to change its name to the Third District Agricultural and Normal College. The new charter resulted in the expansion of the curriculum to include courses in teacher training, and the State Department of Education gave teacher certification to students who completed the program.

In 1932, by legislative enactment, this college and other state-supported institutions of higher learning in Georgia were organized into the University System of Georgia and placed under the jurisdiction of the Board of Regents. As a unit of the University System, the College continued its two-year curriculum and changed its name to Georgia Southwestern College.

In 1964, the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia authorized Georgia Southwestern College to begin its transition to a four-year degree-granting institution. This action resulted in the development of baccalaureate programs, and the first bachelor's degrees were conferred in June 1968. The name of the institution was changed to Georgia Southwestern State University in July of 1996.

The University is located on 250 acres of improved wooded land plus a golf course in the community of Americus, GA, 135 miles south of Atlanta. The campus includes recreational areas, a spring-fed lake, and forty-four buildings.

Georgia Southwestern University offers the following undergraduate degrees: Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Fine Arts, Bachelor of Science, Bachelor of Science in Nursing, Bachelor of Business Administration, and the Bachelor of Science in Education.

A program of graduate studies leading to the Master of Education degree was approved by the Board of Regents and initiated in June 1973; the program has undergone continuous growth and development since that time. The Specialist in Education degree was initiated in the summer of 1982, but has recently been deactivated with the understanding that it could be reactivated in the future. The Master of Science in Administration was added in the winter of 1983. The Master of Science in Computer Science was added in the Spring of 1986, and the Master of Business Administration was added to the curriculum in 2003.

The following table provides data on programs added since the institution's last reaffirmation in 2004.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approval Date</th>
<th>Description of Substantive Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 1, 2004</td>
<td>Bachelor of Science in Nursing Online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 1, 2004</td>
<td>Master of Science in Computer Science Online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15, 2005</td>
<td>Bachelor of Business Administration Online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 15, 2005</td>
<td>Bachelor of Science in Education Online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 7, 2008</td>
<td>Bachelor of Science in Early Childhood Education at Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 7, 2008</td>
<td>Graduate Certificate in Computer Information Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 7, 2008</td>
<td>Dual Degree Programs with Chinese Universities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 13, 2010</td>
<td>Bachelor of Business Administration in Natural Resources Management at Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 13, 2010</td>
<td>Reactivation of Bachelor of Arts in Music with Teacher Certification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 13, 2010</td>
<td>Master of Education in Curriculum and Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 13, 2010</td>
<td>Certificate in CareGiving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 13, 2010</td>
<td>Certificate in Criminal Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 30, 2010</td>
<td>Bachelor of Business Administration in Professional Golf Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 20, 2010</td>
<td>Participation in the University System of Georgia Adult Learning Consortium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 15, 2010</td>
<td>Master of Arts in English/Critical Literacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 22, 2012</td>
<td>Master of Science in Nursing Online in collaboration with Clayton State University and Columbus State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 1, 2012</td>
<td>Master of Arts in English/Critical Literacy 25% online delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2, 2012</td>
<td>Certificate in Information Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2, 2012</td>
<td>Minor in Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2, 2012</td>
<td>Deactivation of Bachelor of Science in History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 8, 2013</td>
<td>Deactivation of Associate of Applied Science Degree Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval Pending</td>
<td>Additional Dual Degree Programs with Chinese Universities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval Pending</td>
<td>Deactivation of Bachelor of Business Administration in Professional Golf Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval Pending</td>
<td>Additional Dual Degree Programs with Chinese Universities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among distinguished GSW alumni are former President of the United States and Nobel Peace Prize recipient Jimmy Carter, former first lady Rosalynn Carter, and former U.S. Attorney General Griffin Bell.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee wishes to thank the officials of the institution for the many and thoughtful expressions of hospitality extended the Committee before and during the visit. The officials of the institution provided the Committee all the requested materials and documentation requested in a prompt and thorough manner. The visit was conducted in the most professional and collegial way.
Part II. Assessment of Compliance

Sections A thru E to be completed by the Off-Site Review Committee and the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee. An asterisk before the standard indicates that it will be reviewed by the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee even if the off-site review determines compliance.

A. Assessment of Compliance with Section 1: The Principle of Integrity

1.1 The institution operates with integrity in all matters. (Integrity)

In the information provided by the institution to both the Off-Site Review Committee and the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee, the institution demonstrated that it operates with integrity in all matters.

B. Assessment of Compliance with Section 2: Core Requirements

2.1 The institution has degree-granting authority from the appropriate government agency or agencies. (Degree-granting Authority)

Article VIII Section IV of the Georgia State Constitution and Title 20 of the Georgia Code vests authority over degrees with the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia. Degree granting authority for Georgia Southwestern State University (Georgia Southwestern or GSW) is derived through its membership in the University System of Georgia as confirmed in Article I, Subsection 6 of the Bylaws of the Board of Regents.

2.2 The institution has a governing board of at least five members that is the legal body with specific authority over the institution. The board is an active policy-making body for the institution and is ultimately responsible for ensuring that the financial resources of the institution are adequate to provide a sound educational program. The board is not controlled by a minority of board members or by organizations or interests separate from it. Both the presiding officer of the board and a majority of other voting members of the board are free of any contractual, employment, or personal or familial financial interest in the institution.

A military institution authorized and operated by the federal government to award degrees has a public board on which both the presiding officer and a majority of the other members are neither civilian employees of the military nor active/retired military. The board has broad and significant influence upon the institution's programs and operations, plays an active role in policy-making, and ensures that the financial resources of the institution are used to provide a sound educational program. The board is not controlled by a minority of board members or by organizations or interests separate from the board except as specified by the authorizing legislation. Both the presiding officer of the board and a majority of other voting board members are free of any contractual, employment, or personal or familial financial interest in the institution. (Governing Board)

Georgia Southwestern, as part of the University System of Georgia, is governed by an eighteen member Board of Regents. As established in Article VIII, Section IV of the Georgia Constitution, members of the Board are appointed by the
Governor and confirmed by the Senate. The Georgia Constitution and Georgia Code grant the Board of Regents authority over distribution of state appropriations, establishing responsibility for adequacy of financial resources. Through its Bylaws, Policy Manual, and committee structure, the Board of Regents is the policy-making body for the institutions in the University System of Georgia, including Georgia Southwestern.

The Georgia Code and Board of Regents Bylaws establish attendance requirements and other operational policies that ensure the Board is not controlled by a minority of its members or outside interests. By its makeup, organization, Bylaws, and required compliance with ethics policies of the University System of Georgia and Georgia Code of Ethics and Conflict of Interest, the presiding officer and a majority of the members of the Board are free of contractual, employment, or personal or familial financial interest in the institution. Samples of board minutes included in the policy documents available to the Off-Site Committee also confirmed specific actions of the board associated with this standard.

2.3 The institution has a chief executive officer whose primary responsibility is to the institution and who is not the presiding officer of the board. (See the Commission policy “Core Requirement 2.3: Documenting an Alternate Approach.”) (Chief Executive Officer)

The chief executive officer of Georgia Southwestern is its President, who does not preside over the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia. The President is appointed by the Board of Regents and has administrative responsibility over the institution as outlined in Board Bylaws and policies.

2.4 The institution has a clearly defined, comprehensive, and published mission statement that is specific to the institution and appropriate for higher education. The Mission Statement addresses teaching and learning and, where applicable, research and public service. (Institutional Mission)

The institution’s mission is clearly defined and comprehensive. The Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia (USG) has deemed it appropriate for higher education and specific to the institution, as it addresses excellence in teaching and learning. It is published electronically on the institution’s website and in both Undergraduate and Graduate Bulletins, which are available in hard copy.

2.5 The institution engages in ongoing, integrated, and institution-wide research-based planning and evaluation processes that (1) incorporate a systematic review of institutional mission, goals, and outcomes; (2) result in continuing improvement in institutional quality; and (3) demonstrate the institution is effectively accomplishing its mission. (Institutional Effectiveness)

Georgia Southwestern appears to engage in ongoing, integrated, and institution-wide planning and evaluation process. The current strategic plan, Moving Forward: Cultivating Growth and Excellence, was developed from the work of committees, task forces, and the university as a whole. The process
appears to be systematic and aligns with the mission of the institution. The process is relatively new, but appears to be in place and is being followed.

2.6 The institution is in operation and has students enrolled in degree programs. (Continuous Operation)

The institution indicated that it has been in operation since 1906. It was chartered to offer two-year college degrees in the 1926, became part of the University System of Georgia in 1932, was authorized to offer four-year degrees in 1964, and was renamed Georgia Southwestern State University in 1996. The institution provided a list of students enrolled by degree program in Fall 2013, with 2,769 students enrolled in undergraduate programs and 142 students enrolled in master's programs.

2.7.1 The institution offers one or more degree programs based on at least 60 semester credit hours or the equivalent at the associate level; at least 120 semester credit hours or the equivalent at the baccalaureate level; or at least 30 semester credit hours or the equivalent at the post-baccalaureate, graduate, or professional level. If an institution uses a unit other than semester credit hours, it provides an explanation for the equivalency. The institution also provides a justification for all degrees that include fewer than the required number of semester credit hours or its equivalent unit. (Program Length)

As documented on its website and in its Undergraduate and Graduate Bulletins, the institution offers 35 majors at the baccalaureate level, all of which require 120-132 semester credit hours, and 8 programs at the master's and specialist level, all of which require 30-38 semester credit hours.

The joint programs with Georgia Institute of Technology (GIT) require 138-150 hours, with at least 86 taken at the institution.

These "semester credit hours" are equivalent to the standard practice for determining one credit hour: 50 clock minutes per semester hour per week.

2.7.2 The institution offers degree programs that embody a coherent course of study that is compatible with its stated mission and is based upon fields of study appropriate to higher education. (Program Content)

Evidence provided by the institution confirmed that degree programs are coherent and support the mission. The Off-Site Review Committee concluded that curriculum sheets for each degree illustrate a logical structure comparable with accepted standards in higher education.

*2.7.3 In each undergraduate degree program, the institution requires the successful completion of a general education component at the collegiate level that (1) is a substantial component of each undergraduate degree, (2) ensures breadth of knowledge, and (3) is based on a coherent rationale. For degree completion in associate programs, the component constitutes a minimum of 15 semester hours or the equivalent; for baccalaureate programs, a minimum of 30 semester hours or the equivalent. These credit hours are to be drawn from and include at least
one course from each of the following areas: humanities/fine arts, social/behavioral sciences, and natural science/mathematics. The courses do not narrowly focus on those skills, techniques, and procedures specific to a particular occupation or profession. If an institution uses a unit other than semester credit hours, it provides an explanation for the equivalency. The institution also provides a justification if it allows for fewer than the required number of semester credit hours or its equivalent unit of general education courses. (General Education)

The institution provided an adequate rationale for the General Education program. This program is both comprehensive in breadth and reflects the institution's mission. Pages 90—97 of the 2013-2014 Undergraduate Bulletin outline the General Education components for the baccalaureate level. The GSW Core Curriculum consists of 60 semester credit hours, 42 of which are General Education.

The credit hours are distributed over (7) areas described as follows: Communication Skills, Quantitative Skills, Institutional Options (Humanities, Fine Arts and Ethics), (Natural Sciences, Math and Technology), Social Sciences and Lower Division Major Requirements.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed documents and conducted interviews in support of the institution’s case for compliance and affirms the finding of the Off-Site Review Committee. GSW’s Vice President for Academic Affairs was interviewed concerning General Education requirements and the portion of GSW’s Undergraduate Bulletin dedicated to General Education was thoroughly reviewed. It is evident that a significant portion, 42 semester-hours, of each undergraduate degree consists of general education classes, which give students a breadth of knowledge in the following areas: Communications Skills; Quantitative Skills; Humanities, Fine Arts and Ethics; Natural Sciences, Mathematics and Technology; and Social Sciences. In addition, there are 18 semester-hours of additional lower division courses, which differ by degree program, which are part of the general education core requirements. So, in fact, roughly half of an undergraduate degree at GSW consists of general education courses. As stated in the Undergraduate Bulletin, the general education core requirements are based on the coherent rationale that upon successful completion of the core, students will be able to write effectively for a variety of audiences, to demonstrate collegiate-level writing development in various contexts; understand information critically, and understand cultural differences; articulate factual and conceptual knowledge concerning literature and one of the fine or performing arts; interpret symbolic representations of data relevant to the physical world and evaluate the relationship between observation and inference in the natural sciences; and articulate factual and conceptual knowledge concerning societal dynamics.

2.7.4 The institution provides instruction for all course work required for at least one degree program at each level at which it awards degrees. If the institution does not provide instruction for all such course work and (1) makes arrangements for some instruction to be provided by other accredited institutions or entities through contracts or consortia or (2) uses some other alternative approach to meeting this requirement, the alternative approach must be approved by the Commission on Colleges. In both cases, the institution demonstrates that it controls all aspects of its educational program. (See the Commission policy “Core
Requirement 2.7.4: Documenting an Alternate Approach.) (Course work for Degrees

Curriculum sheets for each program confirm that Georgia Southwestern offers all coursework for at least one degree at the baccalaureate, masters, and specialist level. Data presented by the institution verifies it controls all aspects of the educational programs.

2.8 The number of full-time faculty members is adequate to support the mission of the institution and to ensure the quality and integrity of each of its academic programs. (Faculty)

The institution defines full-time faculty members as those who work a 40 hour week, including teaching, office hours, service, and scholarship, with a normal teaching load being 12 semester hours per week (or in some cases 12 contact hours). Georgia Southwestern has 107 full-time faculty members, which constitutes over 65 percent of the facult.

The Faculty Handbook and other policies stipulate that the faculty in the departments is responsible for ensuring the quality and integrity of the curriculum.

The institution provides program-by-program data on the number of full-time faculty via a comparison of full-time to part-time faculty for general education courses, major courses and graduate program courses.

These data support the number of full-time faculty is adequate in every program except for the online MSN and webBSIT programs, the data for which imply that all faculty teaching in these programs are "part-time and other faculty." The institution did not provide a clear explanation on how the institution ensures the quality and integrity in these programs.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed the Focused Report and supporting documentation: percent of part-time to full-time faculty for the WebBSIT and MSN programs and the MSN Accreditation Report (2013). The report presented as evidence of compliance in these programs, the number of full-time faculty from participating institutions and those from GSW. Likewise in the WebBSIT Consortium all three GSW faculty are full-time and 12 of the 17 faculty from other participating institutions are full-time.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee also reviewed the MOU for both programs and minutes of meetings of oversight boards or councils, and interviewed faculty. In accordance with the MOU for WebBSIT a Governing Board, comprised of the deans of the institutions, determines the strategic direction of the program and meets once a year to review operations of program and provisions of the MOU. The Operating Board, comprised of representatives from each institution, oversees the day-to-day operation, including setting the course schedule and determining the number of faculty based on course enrollment feedback. The Executive Director administers and assesses the program.

In accordance with the MOU for the MSN the Online Liaison Council, comprised of two representatives from each institution, meets monthly to handle the day-to-day operation. Each institution gathers data and reports these data to the Chief Nursing Officer (CNO), just appointed in June 2013. Each program is responsible
for one-half of the curriculum. Currently, each institution has two full-time faculty dedicated to teaching in the program which currently has a student enrollment of 41 students (16 at GSW and 25 at Columbus). Nursing faculty reported that the program underwent its site-visit for program accreditation and received no deficiencies. They are awaiting the formal report.

In the WebBSIT and in the MSN programs the number of full-time faculty members is adequate to support the mission of the institution and to ensure program quality and integrity.

2.9 The institution, through ownership or formal arrangements or agreements, provides and supports student and faculty access and user privileges to adequate library collections and services and to other learning/information resources consistent with the degrees offered. Collections, resources, and services are sufficient to support all its educational, research, and public service programs. (Learning Resources and Services)

The library supplied evidence of its ownership of library collections and its participation in various statewide library initiatives in Georgia that provides additional access to electronic collections for its students and faculty. The evidence in the compliance document substantiates only the adequacy of its onsite print collections to support its FTE when compared with other peer institutions, but does not reflect adequacy of the total collections including those accessible offsite. Although the library states that it conducts periodic reviews of collections, has interlibrary loan agreements, and refers to results from user surveys, the actual evidence from these assessments to confirm that the collections and services are adequate in meeting the specific needs of the institution’s programs was not provided for the Off-Site Review Committee to review.

The Off-Site Review Committee found that, while the library participates in numerous statewide library initiatives, it established only the adequacy of its onsite print collections, not usage. The Focus Report, however, substantiates the adequacy and usage of its online collections. The Galileo Usage Data provides ample evidence that the students have access to the materials and are, in fact, using them. Furthermore, the ILL Usage Data indicates that students resort to libraries outside of GSW when materials are not present in that collection. Library User Surveys 2011-2013 of both faculty and students indicate that users are generally happy with both the materials found and the service they are receiving, proving its compliance.

*2.10 The institution provides student support programs, services, and activities consistent with its mission that are intended to promote student learning and enhance the development of its students. (Student Support Services)

Georgia Southwestern provides a comprehensive array of student services that are specific and appropriate for the mission of the institution. Services are spread throughout the institution and delivered primarily through five of its units: The Office of Academic Affairs, Enrollment Services, the Office of Student Affairs, the Department of Athletics, and The Office of Information and Instructional Technology. The institution also provides distance learning students with several
means of locating and accessing student services. These include the GSW website -- Academics index, which provides an index page of links to Academic Resources (Academic Resource Center, Disability Services, and the Writing Center, etc.). Information about Student Support Services is widely distributed and accessible to both on campus and distance learning students on institution's web pages, in the Undergraduate and Graduate Bulletins and in the Student Handbook.

The institution provided evidence of a broad range of student support programs, services, and activities, including an academic resource center, a First year Advocate program, and Office of Disability and Testing Services, an English Language Institute, the a Prior Learning Assessment Program, TRIO services, a Writing Center, an Office of Campus Life, Campus Recreation, Career Services, Counseling Services, Health Services, and Residence Life. Additionally, the institution provided information regarding student services that would be appropriate to distance learning students, such as Disability Services, Career Services, and the Writing Center.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed documents and conducted interviews with the Assistant Dean of Students in support of the institution's case for compliance and affirms the findings of the Off-Site Review Committee.

2.11.1 The institution has a sound financial base and demonstrated financial stability to support the mission of the institution and the scope of its programs and services.

The member institution provides the following financial statements: (1) an institutional audit (or Standard Review Report issued in accordance with Statements on Standards for Accounting and Review Services issued by the AICPA for those institutions audited as part of a system-wide or statewide audit) and written institutional management letter for the most recent fiscal year prepared by an independent certified public accountant and/or an appropriate governmental auditing agency employing the appropriate audit (or Standard Review Report) guide; (2) 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; and (3) an annual budget that is preceded by sound planning, is subject to sound fiscal procedures, and is approved by the governing board. (Financial Resources)

Georgia Southwestern provided a financial analysis showing steady growth for total net assets exclusive of plant assets and related debt. Revenues from tuition and fees are increasing while state appropriations are decreasing over the same time periods. The evidence provided to the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee indicated sound budget planning. GSW provided a five-year analysis of net assets, but did not restrict the analysis to unrestricted net assets. The institution needs to provide a multi-year analysis of unrestricted net assets, exclusive of plant and plant related debt. The institution also needs to provide evidence of the budget approval for FY 2014 and the FY 2013 audit.

Georgia Southwestern State University (GSW) did provide a five-year analysis of unrestricted net assets in its Compliance Certification Report, but unfortunately the analysis was mislabeled.
The University System of Georgia's (USG) FY 2014 was approved by the Board of Regents (BoR) in May 2013, but the minutes of that meeting were not approved and posted until after the Compliance Certification Report was submitted. Both the minutes of the May BoR meeting and the appendix that shows the budgets for individual institutions are included.

GSW's Full Audit of its FY 2013 Financial Statement was received October 23, 2013 and included no findings or questioned costs.

2.11.2 The institution has adequate physical resources to support the mission of the institution and the scope of its programs and services. (Physical Resources)

Georgia Southwestern has adequate physical resources to support the mission of the institution. A Campus Master Plan has been approved and updated as of 2011. Plans include additional facilities and renovation of current facilities based on enrollment growth. Deferred maintenance plans and construction plans are reviewed annually for funding during the budget cycle. A detailed survey of each building and its condition is included as part of the facilities inventory.

2.12 The institution has developed an acceptable Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) that includes an institutional process for identifying key issues emerging from institutional assessment and focuses on learning outcomes and/or the environment supporting student learning and accomplishing the mission of the institution. (Quality Enhancement Plan)

The institution developed an acceptable QEP. See Part III for additional information.
C. Assessment of Compliance with Section 3: Comprehensive Standards

3.1.1 The mission statement is current and comprehensive, accurately guides the institution’s operations, is periodically reviewed and updated, is approved by the governing board, and is communicated to the institution’s constituencies. (Mission).

The process to revise the institution’s mission statement began in 2009, after the 2002-2007 strategic planning cycle ended. The effort was institution-wide as surveys were conducted and a task force appointed. The revisions were approved by the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia in August 2010. Now, the mission is aligned with the current (2008-2015) strategic plan. It is published electronically on the institution’s website and in both Undergraduate and Graduate Bulletins, which are available in hard copy.

3.2.1 The governing board of the institution is responsible for the selection and the periodic evaluation of the chief executive officer. (CEO evaluation/selection)

As confirmed by meeting minutes of the Board of Regents, the current President of Georgia Southwestern was appointed by the Board in 2007. Under the policy of the Board, Presidents in the University System of Georgia are subject to annual evaluation by the Chancellor of the System as part of the annual reappointment process. Additionally, in 2010, an external consultant coordinated an evaluation of Georgia Southwestern’s President. The evaluation included participation by a wide range of campus and community stakeholders.

Although the external consultant evaluation was provided no documentation of a completed annual evaluation was provided for review by the Off-Site Review Committee.

Typically, the Georgia Board of Regents (BoR) discusses reappointing presidents of University System of Georgia (USG) institutions annually at their April meeting. However, these discussions usually take place in executive sessions, which are closed to the public and no minutes are taken, as is allowable under Georgia Law. Nonetheless, the minutes do reflect that a discussion of "personnel matters" took place in executive session and in some years, notably 2009 and 2010, the regents voted to reappoint a number of USG presidents immediately after coming out of executive session. Initial discussion of presidential reappointment takes place during the meeting of the Executive and Compensation Committee on the first day of the April meeting and further discussion by the Committee of the Whole takes place on the second day. In addition, the Secretary to the Board has provided GSW with a letter to certify that the president’s evaluation for 2013 took place.

It is evident that the Board of Regents of the University of Georgia System has a clear and comprehensive set of guidelines for the appointment and annual evaluation by the Chancellor; documentation (meeting minutes) was supplied to indicate that the Board of Regents confirms an annual evaluation of the president.
3.2.2 The legal authority and operating control of the institution are clearly defined for the following areas within the institution's governance structure: (Governing board control)

3.2.2.1 the institution's mission

Policy 2.10 of the University System of Georgia Board of Regents requires each System institution to operate under a mission approved by the Board. The current mission of Georgia Southwestern State University was approved by the Board of Regents in August 2010. The policies and actions of the Board clearly define the legal authority and operating control of the institution with regard to its mission.

3.2.2.2 the fiscal stability of the institution

The Constitution and laws of the State of Georgia, as well as policies of the Board of Regents for the University System of Georgia, confirm that legal authority and operating control regarding fiscal stability of Georgia Southwestern State University rests with the Board. As documented in minutes of meetings of the Board, this authority extends to control over allocation of appropriations, establishment of tuition and approval of budgets.

3.2.2.3 institutional policy

The Constitution and laws of the State of Georgia, along with the Bylaws and policies of the Board of Regents for the University System of Georgia clearly define legal and operating authority regarding institutional policy for Georgia Southwestern.

3.2.3 The governing board has a policy addressing conflict of interest for its members. (Board conflict of interest)

The University System of Georgia Human Resources Administrative Practice Manual includes a Policy on Conflict of Interest which applies to members of the Board of Regents. In addition, the Official Code of the State of Georgia includes provisions prohibiting conflicts of interest by members of the Board of Regents.

The institution provided documentation confirming that there had been no instances of penalties against Board members associated with violation of conflict-of-interest provisions, including removal from the Board. However, no information was provided to the Off-Site Review Committee to document education of Board members about the policy or affirmation by Board members of their knowledge of the policy or their compliance with the policy.

The Official Code of the State of Georgia clearly prohibits conflicts of interest by members of the Board of Regents. Documentation provided by the University demonstrates that additional ethics training was provided to the regents by the System’s Chief Audit Officer. The most recent ethics education session for the Georgia Board of Regents (BoR) took place on January 8, 2013. Evidence was also provided that affirming the attendance of each Regent attending.
3.2.4 The governing board is free from undue influence from political, religious, or other external bodies and protects the institution from such influence. *(External influence)*

The Board of Regents for the University System of Georgia is established by provision of the Constitution of the State of Georgia, which also provides for the appointment process for members of the Board. Removal from the Board is only as provided by law for excessive absences from meetings or violation of state ethics or conflict of interest laws. The Board of Regents also has established a policy against political influence. However, in the absence of additional evidence such as statements confirming Board Member’s compliance with the Board’s Conflict of Interest policy, the Off-Site Review Committee was unable to confirm that the board is free of the influence from political, religious, or other external bodies. Additionally, the institution provided no evidence of policies or procedures of the Board or actions taken by the Board to protect the institution from such influence.

The State of Georgia has a code of ethics that applies to the Board of Regents for the University System of Georgia (BoR). In particular, the code requires that regents uphold the constitution and laws of the United States and the State of Georgia, that they make no private promises of any kind binding upon the duties of their office, and that they refrain from doing business with the University System of Georgia which is inconsistent with the conscientious performance of their office. Regents are educated annually in the State Code of Ethics as well as the ethics and other related policies of the University System of Georgia (USG). As evidence of this training, a letter from the USG’s Chief Audit Officer and Associate Vice Chancellor who conducts the training that includes acknowledgement affidavits from the regents was provided. Also provided was a letter from Burns Newsome, the USG’s Vice Chancellor for Legal Affairs and Secretary to the Board, certifying that no regent has ever been dismissed for a conflict of interest or ethics violation. A sample of the annual financial disclosure statements required of all regents was provided as well.

As evidence that the regents protect institutions from political influence, two examples from the press involving other USG institutions since Georgia Southwestern State University (GSW) has not had a case of undue political influence in recent memory are provided. The first example involves Georgia State University, where in 2009 some professors came under criticism from State Legislators, regarding their research. USG spokesmen dismissed the criticism as unfounded and no professors were disciplined or fired as the State Legislators had suggested should be done. The second example involves the use of the logos of the University of Georgia and Georgia Institute of Technology in political campaigns.

3.2.5 The governing board has a policy whereby members can be dismissed only for appropriate reasons and by a fair process. *(Board dismissal)*

Section 45-10-3 of the Georgia Code provides a code of ethics for members of public boards, including the Board of Regents for the University System of Georgia. Section 45-10-4 of the Georgia Code provides a process for dismissal of Board members upon violation of the code of ethics. Board members also may be removed for excessive absences from scheduled meetings of the Board.
Meeting notices and opportunities for Board members to provide reasons for absences allow a fair process for dismissal of Board members for this reason.

The institution confirmed that it is unable to provide examples of implementation because no Regent members have been removed from the Board as a result of the dismissal processes provided for by law and Board policy.

3.2.6 There is a clear and appropriate distinction, in writing and practice, between the policy-making functions of the governing board and the responsibility of the administration and faculty to administer and implement policy. (Board/administration distinction)

As clarified in Board of Regents Policy 3.1, the University System of Georgia Board of Regents establishes broad policies and delegates' responsibility to administer and implement policy to the institution's administration and faculty. A detailed example was provided by the institution documenting policy development and implementation related to revision of General Education requirements.

3.2.7 The institution has a clearly defined and published organizational structure that delineates responsibility for the administration of policies. (Organizational structure)

The administrative organizational chart for Georgia Southwestern, along with the University Statutes which include descriptions of administrative responsibility for key positions, depict a clearly defined organizational structure that delineates responsibility for administration of policies. Both the organization chart and University Statutes are published on the university website.

3.2.8 The institution has qualified administrative and academic officers with the experience and competence to lead the institution. (Qualified administrative/academic officers)

Georgia Southwestern provided evidence of hiring qualified administrative and academic officers capable of fulfilling the duties and responsibilities of running the institution. The Off-Site Review Committee's review of the job descriptions and resumes provided for the institution's senior administrative and academic leadership clearly demonstrated that the institution employs a highly qualified and competent leadership team. Each administrator's job description is reviewed and updated, if necessary, during annual performance evaluations.

The institution provided the position descriptions and the curriculum vitae for all senior leadership. A review of the documents indicates that the academic officers of the institution are well qualified both in terms of their academic credentials and their career experiences related to the roles they now occupy.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed documents and conducted an interview with the Vice President of Academic Affairs in support of the institution's case for compliance and affirms the findings of the Off-Site Review Committee.
3.2.9 The institution publishes policies regarding appointment, employment, and evaluation of all personnel. *(Personnel appointment)*

The institution clearly outlines and publishes its policies regarding the appointment, employment and evaluation of all university personnel. Its personnel policies are found on the institution’s Human Resources website under the section titled, “Personnel Policies.”

3.2.10 The institution periodically evaluates the effectiveness of its administrators. *(Administrative staff evaluations)*

All administrative and academic officers are evaluated on an annual basis by their supervisors, and, at times, by subordinates, per university and system policy. The President and the Vice President for Academic Affairs are both evaluated annually by the faculty and staff. Evaluations are prescribed in University policy, and each evaluation involves an employee self-evaluation, supervisor review and comment, and face-to-face appointment to review the employee’s performance over the past year. The review process provides the supervisor an opportunity to give formative feedback to the employee to improve job performance, and for the supervisor and the employee to agree upon goals for the next year. Examples of performance evaluations for each of the three principal types of administrators at the institution were provided for review by the Off-Site Review Committee.

3.2.11 The institution’s chief executive officer has ultimate responsibility for, and exercises appropriate administrative and fiscal control over, the institution’s intercollegiate athletics program. *(Control of intercollegiate athletics)*

The organizational chart for Georgia Southwestern University depicts an administrative structure whereby The Director of Athletics reports directly to the President. Position descriptions for the President and the Director of Athletics confirm the President’s ultimate responsibility for administrative and fiscal control over the intercollegiate athletics program.

3.2.12 The institution demonstrates that its chief executive officer controls the institution’s fund-raising activities. *(Fund-raising activities)*.

Organizational charts for Georgia Southwestern and position descriptions for the President, Executive Director of the GSW Foundation, and Director of Athletics verify that individuals responsible for fundraising activities report to the President, who by virtue of the reporting relationships exercises ultimate control of the institution’s fundraising activities.

3.2.13 For any entity organized separately from the institution and formed primarily for the purpose of supporting the institution or its programs: (1) the legal authority and operating control of the institution is clearly defined with respect to that entity; (2) the relationship of that entity to the institution and the extent of any liability arising out of that relationship is clearly described in a formal, written manner; and (3) the institution demonstrates that (a) the chief executive officer controls any fund-raising activities of that entity or (b) the fund-raising activities of
that entity are defined in a formal, written manner which assures that those activities further the mission of the institution. **(Institution-related entities)**

The institution has one related entity; the Georgia Southwestern College Foundation. Documentation includes the Articles of Incorporation of the GSW Foundation that clearly states its purpose is to support the mission of the institution. Evidence of the relationship of the Foundation to the institution is clearly documented in the Provider Service Agreement. The President/CEO of the institution is responsible for the fund-raising activities as described in the incorporation documents and the provider service agreement. Job description of the Executive Director of the Foundation clearly defines the reporting relationship to the Foundation and the institution. As evidenced by the institution’s organization chart, the President/CEO has clear responsibility for oversight of the Foundation’s activities.

**3.2.14** The institution’s policies are clear concerning ownership of materials, compensation, copyright issues, and the use of revenue derived from the creation and production of all intellectual property. These policies apply to students, faculty, and staff. **(Intellectual property rights)**

The institution has a clear, coherent policy on intellectual property that includes ownership, resolution of disputes, and use of revenues. The policy is published in the Faculty Handbook and GSWeathervane Student Handbook and is applicable to faculty, staff, and students.

**3.3.1** The institution identifies expected outcomes, assesses the extent to which it achieves these outcomes, and provides evidence of improvement based on analysis of the results in each of the following areas **(Institutional Effectiveness):**

*3.3.1.1 educational programs, to include student learning outcomes*

As with Core Requirement 2.5, institutional effectiveness, the institution does identify its assessment process and related cycle. The institution identifies outcomes, assesses said outcomes, and provides evidence the data is used to make improvements. However, the information provided for review by the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee did not include dual degree programs, WebSIT, and the 1+2+1 programs with the various Chinese universities.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed documents and conducted interviews with the Director of Institutional Effectiveness in support of the institution’s case for compliance.

The institution states that in the cases of the GIT dual degree program and the 1+2+1 program, assessments of students who receive degrees from GSW is embedded in the assessments for the regular academic program. Thus, student learning is assessed as part of the regular delivery of the program content as expressed through the particular academic program’s assessment plan. Since students in these programs are not taught by any modality separate from students of the regular population, there is no reason to believe that they are not assessed for learning attainment. Put another way, it is reasonable to assume that two students who experience the same academic program of study are
assessed in the same way no matter how they might be counted administratively. The substance of their learning and learning assessment for all intents and purposes is the same.

The institution also provided appropriately detailed assessment plans for the WebBSIT program (a relatively new program with no completers) that shows formative assessment activity and instructional changes based on evidence of learning.

3.3.1.2 administrative support services

The sample of plans submitted by administrative support services was representative of the institution. The process used for institutional effectiveness is documented, but there is no consistency in the terminology used from office to office. The units appear to identify outcomes (activities). It is unclear if the information presented is the “evidence” (the institution’s word): It is unclear if the information presented as “evidence” is the measurement or the data resulting from the measure. The report does address changes made based on the data collected.

The Off-Site Review Committee found the institution non-compliant with the standard and cited a general lack of clarity among the reports that includes inconsistent terminology and difficulty discerning what constitutes evidence—whether the “evidence” presented is the measurement or the data resulting from the measurement.

The Institution’s follow-up Focused Report provided to the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee clarifies the concerns voiced by the Off-Site Review Committee. The institution provided reports covering all units classified as administrative support. The institution further clarifies the two parts that comprise each unit’s progress report: the first dealing with the unit’s contribution toward strategic goals; the second dealing with the unit’s progress toward achieving its own goals. It is apparent that in some cases, results from the latter function as evidence for the former. Including the unit-level results as they contribute to strategic goals makes sense and is supported by the evidence the institution provides.

3.3.1.3 academic and student support services

The sample of plans submitted by academic and student support services was representative of the institution. The process used for institutional effectiveness is well-documented. It is clear there is a process in place and it is being followed. The report addressed improvements made based on the data collected. There is inconsistency between units regarding the use of the terms “goal” and “activity.”

3.3.1.4 research within its mission, if appropriate

The institution stated that although research is not identified in its mission statement and there are no established research units or centers, there are some research activities occurring on-campus. In fact, there is limited, funded research within the faculty. The institution did address the student learning outcomes in the graduate degree programs where research is an expected outcome. The
institution did identify outcomes, and provided evident it does assess said outcomes and uses the data to make improvements.

3.3.1.5 community/public service within its mission, if appropriate

Two of the three units identified as providing community/public service provided evidence of identified goals, activities to help achieve said goals, and data collected. Also, there is evidence of the data being used to make improvements. The Center for Business and Economic Development (CBED) did not provide evidence of identified outcomes; therefore, there are no measures identified to assess outcomes. There appears to be no assessment cycle in place for the CBED.

The Off-Site Review Committee found the institution non-compliant due to the absence of any assessment activity for one unit, the Center for Business and Economic Development (CBED). In response via the Focused Report, the institution has reviewed and revised its operational assessment processes to conform to those of the rest of the institution. The Center now has clearly defined outcomes and has gone back through two previous cycles and reviewed activity related to these objectives. It is apparent, from the evidence provided that the unit was, in spirit, conducting appropriate assessment. The updated plans and reviews of previous activities in connection with this new plan show that the institution is properly compliant with the standard.

3.3.2 The institution has developed a Quality Enhancement Plan that (1) demonstrates institutional capability for the initiation, implementation, and completion of the QEP; (2) includes broad-based involvement of institutional constituencies in the development and proposed implementation of the QEP; and (3) identifies goals and a plan to assess their achievement. (Quality Enhancement Plan)

GWS has developed an acceptable QEP that does include (2) broad-based involvement of institutional constituencies in the development and proposed implementation of the QEP. However, the institution did not satisfactorily address components a and c of this standard.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee, therefore, offers the following recommendations relative to the institution’s capability for implementing the QEP:

RECOMMENDATION 1: The Committee recommends that GSW demonstrate the capacity to successfully implement and sustain a robust QEP.

RECOMMENDATION 2: The Committee recommends that GSW ensure that UNIV 1000 instructors are appropriately trained in the use and evaluation of reflective writing.

The Committee also offers the following recommendations relative to identifying appropriate SLO’s for the QEP.

RECOMMENDATION 3: The Committee recommends that GSW develop the desired learning outcomes to make them more precise and easily measurable.
RECOMMENDATION 4: The Committee recommends that, as part of the QEP implementation, GSW take steps to assure that the reflective writing assignments will be reliable and valid instruments to assess desired learning outcomes.

See Part III for additional information.

3.4.1 The institution demonstrates that each educational program for which academic credit is awarded is approved by the faculty and the administration. (Academic program approval)

As illustrated in the MSN example presented in the report, the institution operates its curriculum approval process as defined in its University Statutes document: Each educational program, and the included coursework, for which academic credit is awarded is approved by the faculty and the administration. In particular, the Committee on Academic Affairs acts upon recommendations from the department faculty regarding undergraduate programs and the Committee on Graduate Affairs acts upon recommendations from the department faculty regarding graduate programs. The proposals are then reviewed by the faculty senate, and finally the full faculty. These groups are composed of an appropriate cross-section of the faculty and administration.

3.4.2 The institution's continuing education, outreach, and service programs are consistent with the institution's mission. (Continuing education/service programs)

Evidence presented by the institution confirmed continuing education, outreach, and service programs support the University mission. The Division of Continuing Education, GSW Center for Business and Economic Development, the Rosalyn Carter Institute, and other programs encourage the intellectual, social, and personal growth of the community.

*3.4.3 The institution publishes admissions policies that are consistent with its mission. (Admissions policies)

The institution uses and publishes admission policies that are consistent with its mission as a selective comprehensive state university offering both undergraduate and graduate programs of study. The Georgia Board of Regents has established minimum standards for admission at all System institutions. The institution has established requirements for Freshmen Admission, Transfer Admission, Transient Admission, Audit Admission, International Student Admission, and Admission of Persons 62 or older that meet or exceed the minimum set by the USG. Graduate student admission policies were also provided for each degree program offered at the institution. The institution provided documentation of policies for each admission category for review by the Off-Site Committee.

Admissions policies are consistent with other institutions of higher education. All admissions policies are clearly and widely published in the Undergraduate Student Bulletin and Graduate Student Bulletin, as well as on the institution's website.
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The institution provided evidence of the publication of admissions policies in the Georgia Board of Regents Policy Manual, the USG Academic and Student Affairs Handbook, and on the GSW admissions web site. These policies fit the parameters established by the University System of Georgia for a regional comprehensive state university with graduate programs.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed documents and conducted an interview with the Vice President of Enrollment Management in support of the institution’s case for compliance and affirms the findings of the Off-Site Review Committee.

3.4.4 The institution publishes policies that include criteria for evaluating, awarding, and accepting credit for transfer, experiential learning, credit by examination, advanced placement, and professional certificates that is consistent with its mission and ensures that course work and learning outcomes are at the collegiate level and comparable to the institution’s own degree programs. The institution assumes responsibility for the academic quality of any course work or credit recorded on the institution’s transcript. (See Commission policy “Agreements Involving Joint and Dual Academic Awards: Policy and Procedures.”) (Acceptance of academic credit)

The institution publishes and makes available policies containing criteria for awarding academic credit within its Undergraduate Bulletin for the following areas: Transfer Credit, Transfer Credit from Accredited Technical Colleges, Transfer Credit from Non-Regionally Accredited Institutions, Transfer Credit from International Institutions, Transient Credit, Credit for Study Abroad Programs, Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate, Credit by Examination, Military Credit, and Prior learning. The policies clearly prescribe that faculty have responsibility for awarding all transfer credit.

3.4.5 The institution publishes academic policies that adhere to principles of good educational practice. These policies are disseminated to students, faculty, and other interested parties through publications that accurately represent the programs and services of the institution. (Academic policies)

Georgia Southwestern publishes its academic policies through the Undergraduate Bulletin, Graduate Bulletin, Student Handbook, and Faculty Handbook. These policies are also posted on the Institution’s website. All of these documents are consistent, comprehensive, and adequately describe well-developed policies that have been established and monitored by the faculty. These documents are thoroughly disseminated and available to all segments of the University. In addition, the vetting process for revising or creating policies is robust and clearly articulated.

3.4.6 The institution employs sound and acceptable practices for determining the amount and level of credit awarded for courses, regardless of format or mode of delivery. (Practices for awarding credit)

The institution has well-documented, reasonable policies and procedures for determining the amount and level of credit for both in person and online courses offered by the institution. The documentation provided to the Off-Site
Reaffirmation Committee contains sufficient evidence that the institution implements and enforces its policies for awarding credit.

3.4.7 The institution ensures the quality of educational programs and courses offered through consortia relationships or contractual agreements, ensures ongoing compliance with the Principles and periodically evaluates the consortial relationship and/or agreement against the mission of the institution. (See the Commission policy “Agreements Involving Joint and Dual Academic Awards: Policy and Procedures.”) (Consortia relationships/contractual agreements)

The institution provided documentation of signed agreements and a designation of program responsibilities for each “party” involved. There is evidence of ongoing reviews of agreements demonstrated via minutes from Deans’ and Directors’ Council and Administrative Council.

3.4.8 The institution awards academic credit for course work taken on a noncredit basis only when there is documentation that the noncredit course work is equivalent to a designated credit experience. (Noncredit to credit)

Georgia Southwestern publishes policies to describe the circumstances in which academic credit can be awarded for non-credit experiences. It utilizes a form titled, “Evaluation of Credit from Non-Traditional and Other Sources,” whereby students can apply to have coursework from non-traditional sources evaluated for equivalence with coursework at Georgia Southwestern. However, no evidence was provided to the Off-Site Review Committee confirming that the policies are implemented and enforced.

The Off-Site Review Committee found no evidence that GSW’s polices on awarding academic credit for course work taken on a noncredit basis were implemented or enforced. In GSW’s Focused Report, an example was provided with documentation for each of the three ways in which a student may be awarded academic credit for course work not taken on a credit basis. The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee found issues with two of the three pieces of evidence provided to illustrate that GSW had implemented and enforced its polices for awarding credit for course work taken on a noncredit basis. The example provided concerning Military credit was acceptable. The example provided for experiential learning was lacking a key piece of evidence: a portfolio. A portfolio is required of all students who wish to receive credit through GSW’s Prior Learning Assessment Process. An interview was conducted with GSW's Prior Learning Assessment Director in which the process was described and evidence, including a student portfolio, was produced verifying implementation and enforcement of GSW's Prior Learning Assessment Process. Lastly, the example provided in the Focused Report which was to show implementation and enforcement of GSW’s policy on the “Evaluation of Credit from Non-Traditional and Other Sources” was insufficient as the example concerned transfer of credit from a SACSCOC school (this particular credit should have been awarded through the traditional transfer process). An interview was conducted with the University Registrar who was able to produce a sufficient example where a student was given credit from “Non-Traditional and Other Sources.” The particular example produced concerned credit in a course taken at a school that, at the time the course was taken, was a non-SACSCOC school. The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee finds GSW to be in compliance.
with their handling of assigning credit when a non-credit course is converted to a credit course.

3.4.9 The institution provides appropriate academic support services. *(Academic support services)*

Georgia Southwestern provides a comprehensive and appropriate array of academic support services for both students and faculty that support and enhance student learning and success. Academic Support Services are provided primarily through the Vice President for Academic Affairs, and the Vice President for Enrollment Management. The Division of Student Affairs is also directly supports academic support services through the Office of Career Services. Students may find out what services are available and how to access them in a variety of ways including GSW Weathervane Student Handbook, the Undergraduate and Graduate Bulletins, and the websites of individual units. Incoming freshmen are also introduced to academic support services in UNIV 1000, GSW’s orientation course. Every student is also assigned an Academic Advisor, who knows what academic support services are available. Noteworthy is the approach taken to transition transfer students and inform them about academic support services. Transfer students can access a series of videos describing the campus including how to find an academic advisor and three videos on student services.

The institution also provides distance-learning students with several additional methods of locating and accessing academic services. The Academics index page provides links to Academic Resources including the Academic Resource Center, Disability Services, the University Writing Center, and other relevant resources and offices.

3.4.10 The institution places primary responsibility for the content, quality, and effectiveness of its curriculum with its faculty. *(Responsibility for curriculum)*

The institution places the primary responsibility for the content, quality, and effectiveness of its curriculum with its faculty. Article IV Section 4 of the GSW University Statutes empowers the faculty “Committee on Academic Affairs” (CoAA) to approve curriculum changes and the same statute empowers the faculty “Committee on Graduate Affairs (CoGA). The institution outlines the process of curriculum changes and provides examples of curriculum changes approved during 2012-2013.

3.4.11 For each major in a degree program, the institution assigns responsibility for program coordination, as well as for curriculum development and review, to persons academically qualified in the field. In those degree programs for which the institution does not identify a major, this requirement applies to a curricular area or concentration. *(Academic program coordination)*

The program coordinators for two graduate programs do not appear to have appropriate academic qualifications in the field. The coordinator for the Master of Arts in English/Critical Literacy has a Ph.D. in Curriculum and Instruction, Emphasis on Reading-Writing. The program coordinator for the Master of Business Administration has a Master of Accountancy and is a CPA. The
qualifications of these two coordinators were not apparent in the evidence provided.

The On-Site Reaffirmation committee reviewed the Focused Report and supporting documents, including CVs of coordinators and faculty in the MA in English/Critical Literacy and the Master of Business Administration, and the transcript of the coordinator of the MA in English program. A review of the transcript for the coordinator of the MA in English revealed that she has 40 plus hours in English and several courses in reading—a cognate area. The Focused Report also noted that coordinators of the programs make decisions about and complete assessment in consultation with other graduate faculty. A review of CVs revealed that the faculty members have appropriate credentials. Interviews with members of faculty committees and reviews of committee minutes verified the role of faculty in curriculum development and review.

3.4.12 The institution's use of technology enhances student learning and is appropriate for meeting the objectives of its programs. Students have access to and training in the use of technology. (Technology use)

Although the institution provided evidence that students and faculty have access to and training in the use of technology that is appropriate to support academic programs, the evidence available to the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee was insufficient to determine that the technology provided is used, that its use enhances student learning and is appropriate for meeting the objectives of its programs.

The Off-Site Review Committee could not find evidence that either technology was used, or that it enhanced student learning, or that it met student learning objectives. The Focused Report indicates the plethora of technology available to students via software, labs, wireless access and other numerous online platforms available though Georgia ONmyLine. The Focused Report further provides a map linking enhanced student learning outcomes in the GSU general education program to specific courses. Since many of the courses listed are required courses for all students, usage is implicit and substantiates its compliance claim.

3.5.1 The institution identifies college-level general education competencies and the extent to which students have attained them. (General education competencies)

As mandated by University System of Georgia policy, Georgia Southwestern clearly identifies its general education competencies and ensures that its students are aware of them; the general education curriculum is discussed in detail in the Institution's Undergraduate Bulletin and in the USG Academic and Student Affairs Handbook. Nine areas of competency are identified and assessed, primarily through sets of target courses.

The institution has begun work on these assessments through review of course-embedded artifacts, using standard rubrics. Targets were established and the extent to which students achieve these targets have been documented. This process was recently instituted so not all of the outcomes have been assessed thoroughly at this point. However, the process is in place and is being followed.
3.5.2 At least 25 percent of the credit hours required for the degree are earned through instruction offered by the institution awarding the degree. (See the Commission policy “Agreements Involving Joint and Dual Academic Awards: Policy and Procedures.”) (Institutional credits for a degree).

According to its Undergraduate Bulletin, the institution requires “all undergraduate degree candidates to earn at least twenty-seven (27) of the forty (40) hours of credit immediately preceding graduation in residence.” In addition, transfer students who matriculate in their last year of study must complete their last two semesters in residence, earning at least 30 semester credit hours of the coursework earned for an undergraduate degree.

Since undergraduate majors range in hours from 120-132, these policies alone do not guarantee that all undergraduates take at least 25 percent of the coursework from the institution. The narrative provided indicates that “transfer students in programs that require more than 120 credit hours for completion may be required to take more than 30 credit hours in residence during the last stages of their programs to ensure that they have received at least 25 percent of their instruction from GSW.” There is a similar statement about checking the 25 percent minimum for students completing the WebBSIT consortium program. However, no documentation was provided to the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee demonstrating that this 25 percent minimum is, indeed, enforced.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed documents and conducted interviews with the Registrar in support of the institution’s case for compliance. In both its regular offerings and its distance and transfer programs (1+2+1; GSW-GIT; and, WebBSIT), the institution clearly has policies and programmatic elements that ensure compliance with the standard at the front end. After interview and review of documents provided by the University’s registrar, the degree certification process ensures that the institution maintains compliance with this standard throughout the educational experience.

3.5.3 The institution publishes requirements for its undergraduate programs, including its general education components. These requirements conform to commonly accepted standards and practices for degree programs. (See the Commission policy “The Quality and Integrity of Undergraduate Degrees.”) (Undergraduate program requirements)

The University publishes requirements for its undergraduate programs in the Undergraduate Bulletin and via Curriculum Sheets. The Registration and Academic Information Network provides an online resource for this information. General Education components are described for each program.

3.5.4 At least 25 percent of the course hours in each major at the baccalaureate level are taught by faculty members holding an appropriate terminal degree—usually the earned doctorate or the equivalent of the terminal degree. (Terminal degrees of faculty)

Data presented by the institution confirms at least 25 percent of the course hours in each major at the baccalaureate level are taught by faculty with a terminal degree. Course hours for the fall 2012 programs substantiate the percentages of courses taught by faculty with terminal degree range from 34 percent for the Bachelor of Science in Nursing to 100 percent for several programs.
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3.6.1 The institution's post-baccalaureate professional degree programs, and its master's and doctoral degree programs, are progressively more advanced in academic content than its undergraduate programs. (Post-baccalaureate program rigor)

The institution clearly established that its master's degree programs are clearly more advanced in academic content than the undergraduate programs within the same academic units, providing comparative documentation demonstrating that the graduate degree programs and doctoral specialists programs are progressively more complex and rigorous than the undergraduate programs.

3.6.2 The institution structures its graduate curricula (1) to include knowledge of the literature of the discipline and (2) to ensure ongoing student engagement in research and/or appropriate professional practice and training experiences. (Graduate curriculum)

All Georgia Southwestern graduate programs are structured to include knowledge of the literature of the discipline. Additionally, each program has a research component, a professional practice and training component, or both. Course Outlines and Curriculum Sheets adequately describe these program requirements.

3.6.3 At least one-third of credits toward a graduate or a post-baccalaureate professional degree are earned through instruction offered by the institution awarding the degree. (See the Commission policy “Agreements Involving Joint andDual Academic Awards: Policy and Procedures.”) (Institutional credits for a degree)

For graduate programs offered solely by the institution, students earn at most nine hours of transfer work from another accredited institution. This means that at least two-thirds (and typically more) of the credits for a graduate degree are earned through instruction offered by the institution.

The institution participates in a consortial arrangement with Columbus State to offer the MSN degree online. While the MOU and other documentation do not specify that one-third of the credit must be offered by the institution granting the degree, the MOU does specify that each member is in control of its academic policies. The institution has documented that the schedule of courses over a two-year period, negotiated by the two institutions each time, includes at least one-third of the coursework offered through the institution awarding the degree.

3.6.4 The institution defines and publishes requirements for its graduate and post-graduate professional programs. These requirements conform to commonly accepted standards and practices for degree programs. (Post-baccalaureate program requirements)

Georgia Southwestern defines and publishes requirements for its graduate and post-baccalaureate professional programs on its graduate web pages and within its Graduate Bulletin. Moreover, these requirements are consistent with the appropriate accrediting bodies.
3.7.1 The institution employs competent faculty members qualified to accomplish the mission and goals of the institution. When determining acceptable qualifications of its faculty, an institution gives primary consideration to the highest earned degree in the discipline. The institution also considers competence, effectiveness, and capacity, including, as appropriate, undergraduate and graduate degrees, related work experiences in the field, professional licensure and certifications, honors and awards, continuous documented excellence in teaching, or other demonstrated competencies and achievements that contribute to effective teaching and student learning outcomes. For all cases, the institution is responsible for justifying and documenting the qualifications of its faculty. (See Commission guidelines “Faculty Credentials.”) (Faculty competence)

The Institution has a small group of faculty who do not have a graduate degree in the field, but who are teaching courses. Of these, 12 do not have sufficient documentation of other qualifications that provide evidence of expertise in the field. Please refer to “Request for Justifying and Documenting Qualifications of Faculty.”

The Focused Report does a satisfactory job of addressing the concerns raised in the “Request for Justifying and Documenting Qualifications of Faculty." There were 12 individuals identified by the Off-Site Review Committee as having inadequate academic faculty qualifications and/or insufficient justification of other faculty qualifications. The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee has concluded that four of these individuals are not actually part of the faculty as they teach non-college-credit English as a second language courses in the English Language Institute. Also, evidence was presented in the Focused Report that showed another seven of the 12 identified by the Off-Site Review Committee in fact had terminal degrees or master's degrees in the appropriate discipline or possessed other demonstrated competencies to teach specific classes. Moreover, these seven satisfied the minimum requirements of faculty as detailed on page 166 of the GSW University Statues (Article III section 2). One of the 12 identified is no longer teaching and the courses are now assigned to a qualified faculty member with the terminal degree in the appropriate discipline.

3.7.2 The institution regularly evaluates the effectiveness of each faculty member in accord with published criteria, regardless of contractual or tenured status. (Faculty evaluation)

Evidence presented by the institution confirms it regularly evaluates the effectiveness of faculty. Criteria for evaluation in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service are well-documented in the Faculty Handbook. The institution presented a variety of sample forms demonstrating uniform application of evaluations across the University.

3.7.3 The institution provides evidence of ongoing professional development of faculty as teachers, scholars, and practitioners. (Faculty development)

As indicated in the Faculty Handbook, faculty are required to document participation in professional development for promotion/tenure. The institution provides resources for professional development of its faculty through a number
of programs, most notably “Southwestern Week” sponsored during the week prior to the start of fall semester each year. A variety of professional development activities are offered during that time for faculty. These activities include events such as “training in the use of plagiarism prevention software, for new academic advisors, on building an online course, on the application of the Americans with Disabilities Act in the classroom, for UNIV 1000 instructors, or on the implementation of a new technology like Degree Works.” In addition, there are events throughout the year, and also resources for grants associated with professional development.

3.7.4 The institution ensures adequate procedures for safeguarding and protecting academic freedom. (Academic freedom)

The institution ensures that there are adequate procedures for safeguarding academic freedom and publishes these within its GSW Faculty Handbook and within its General Statutes.

3.7.5 The institution publishes policies on the responsibility and authority of faculty in academic and governance matters. (Faculty role in governance)

Georgia Southwestern faculty participate in academic and governance matters through twelve committees. Prominent are the Committee on Academic Affairs and the Committee on Graduate Affairs, both charged with drafting, reviewing, and approving policy. All committees provide status reports at semiannual General Faculty meetings.

3.8.1 The institution provides facilities and learning/information resources that are appropriate to support its teaching, research, and service mission. (Learning/information resources)

The institution provided evidence of its provision of facilities and learning/information resources and references to its recent renovations to update facilities, in addition to its provision of learning resources onsite and accessible online. The institution did not provide evidence that the facilities and learning/information resources are utilized by students and faculty to meet the needs of the programs and that they are appropriate in supporting the institution’s teaching, research, and service mission.

The Off-Site Review Committee found evidence of the provision of facilities and numerous renovations to update library facilities but no evidence that the resources were used by students and faculty, or that said facilities were used in the context of degree programs. The Focused Report, however, provides adequate evidence that the mission of GSW and the mission of the library are consonant with one another and that said facilities are being utilized by students and faculty. For example, the Focused Report indicates that almost 300 patrons used the James Earl Carter Library daily as evidence of its Gate Count FY 2010-2013. Both ILL Usage and JSTOR Usage, a large noteworthy cross-disciplinary database, confirm GSW's compliance.
3.8.2 The institution ensures that users have access to regular and timely instruction in the use of the library and other learning/information resources. (Instruction of library use)

Georgia Southwestern provided evidence of regular access to instructional opportunities in the use of the library and learning resources that are a combination of face-to-face sessions embedded in courses taught by professors, sessions by appointment with librarians, and instruction delivered online via the website. A one-hour credit class is offered annually teaching the foundations for information literacy, and a library online tutorial is assessable via the library’s homepage. The Library and the Office of Information and Instructional Technology both offer instruction in learning/information resources primarily delivered online that is timely and available to students at a distance.

3.8.3 The institution provides a sufficient number of qualified staff—with appropriate education or experiences in library and/or other learning/information resources—to accomplish the mission of the institution. (Qualified staff)

The Off-Site Review Committee’s review of staff qualifications for the library and learning/information resources units of the institution indicates that the qualifications are appropriate. Although the library unit used a peer analysis to compare its numbers of qualified staff with comparable institutions, the number compared is different than the total staff number reported in the Compliance Certification Report, and the results indicated that the institution is eleventh of thirteen institutions surveyed per FTE students. The evidence did not demonstrate that the institution has a sufficient number of qualified staff in the library and or other learning/information resources areas to accomplish its mission for all of its academic programs.

The Off-Site Review Committee found that while library and learning information staff qualifications were appropriate, it noted a discrepancy between the figures reported and the ranking the institution claimed to hold, and therefore found the institution non-compliant. After reviewing the evidence of the Focused Report, the Explanation of Library Staff per 1000 FTE Calculation, Library Staff Benchmarking Comparison 2010, and Library Staffing USG Comparison 2010, library and information services staffing appears to be adequate and in sufficient numbers to find it in compliance.

3.9.1 The institution publishes a clear and appropriate statement of student rights and responsibilities and disseminates the statement to the campus community. (Student rights)

The institution’s Student Handbook, GSWeathervane is the primary distribution source for information about Student Rights and Responsibilities. Statements about student rights and responsibilities are available in print and in an electronic version on the GSW website. Additional sections in the Handbook regarding Student Rights and Responsibilities include the Student Bill of Rights, Academic Rights and Responsibilities of Students, Student Expression of Opinion, Posting of Information, Financial Responsibility of Students, Student Media, and Responsibilities of Student Editors, Directors, and Contributors to Student Media. The Handbook also describes the institution’s Code of Conduct and the process for handling violations.
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3.9.2 The institution protects the security, confidentiality, and integrity of its student records and maintains security measures to protect and back up data. *(Student records)*.

The University System of Georgia (USG) establishes the core principles for the privacy and security of student records. GSW policies regarding student records must also conform to the USG principles. The institution protects the security, confidentiality, and integrity of student records by employing strict measures to protect and back up data. GSW's security plan includes the use of SSL encryption, redundant servers, sophisticated firewalls, and privacy and security audits.

The Office of the Registrar is the official custodian of student academic records, but individual instructors and academic advisors as well as academic unit administrators also have custody of some student academic records. The institution also contracts with outside providers who store student academic records for various purposes. The institution uses Banner as its Student Information System (SIS), Desire 2 Learn as its Learning Management System (LMS), and PeopleSoft for human resources and financial management. The institution also employs the Degree Works system for advising purposes. The Banner Web Interface is known as the Registration and Academic Information Network (RAIN), and access to this portal is password protected. Individual students have access only to their own records, while faculty and administrators have read-only access to records such as transcripts and rosters for all students. All of data collection systems utilized are supported by institution's Office of Information and Instructional Technology with backup support provided by USG technology services.

3.9.3 The institution provides a sufficient number of qualified staff—with appropriate education or experience in the student affairs area—to accomplish the mission of the institution. *(Qualified staff)*

The institution employs an appropriate level of credentialed staff capable of leading the Division of Student Affairs. A review of staff vitas and job descriptions demonstrate that Student Affairs personnel are capable of providing quality and effective services and programs. Ongoing professional development is encouraged and supported as budget constraints permit. Annual assessments, annual reports, and annual performance appraisals are used to help ensure the quality and effectiveness of the programs and services offered within the Division of Student Affairs.

3.10.1 The institution's recent financial history demonstrates financial stability. *(Financial stability)*

While Georgia Southwestern provided evidence of financial stability, including Key Performance Indicators, no documentation was provided to the Off-Site Review Committee regarding large year-to-year changes in temporary and permanently restricted net assets. Also, no discussion was provided regarding the qualification and experience of individuals charged with management of financial management. Additionally, a current audit was not available for review.
The University provided audits and other data which clearly demonstrate financial stability. While data indicated use of unrestricted reserves, those funds were committed to capital projects reducing the average age of the physical plant.

*3.10.2 The institution audits financial aid programs as required by federal and state regulations. (Financial aid audits)

Georgia Southwestern provided audits for the federal and state financial aid programs as required by federal and state regulations. Audit finding for each year presented were limited and were resolved in a timely manner. Audits are pending for both state and federal programs for FY 2013.

The Georgia Southwestern State University provided clear financial aid data including a FY 2013 audit of its financial statements which presented no findings. This was confirmed by a printed copy of the Management Report for Fiscal Year Ended June, 2013 prepared by the Georgia Department of Audits and Accounts. The report was presented to the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee in an interview with the Vice President for Business and Finance and the Director of Financial Aid.

3.10.3 The institution exercises appropriate control over all its financial resources. (Control of finances)

The institution provided adequate documentation to support appropriate control over its financial resources. Evidence included a Business Procurement Manual, copy of procurement processes, and various reports required by the University of Georgia System.

3.10.4 The institution maintains financial control over externally funded or sponsored research and programs. (Control of sponsored research/external funds)

The institution has policies and procedures in place governing the distribution of funds from external grants and contracts. There is evidence from the details included in the Business Procedures Manual related to the processes for external fund management. Specific examples included disbursement authorizations, travel approvals, and budget management. The last audit provided indicated no audit findings.

3.11.1 The institution exercises appropriate control over all its physical resources. (Control of physical resources)

Georgia Southwestern exercises control over all its physical resources. Regulations and procedures exists that clearly identify responsibility for the control, safeguarding and update of the institution's physical assets. Evidence provided for review by the Off-Site Review Committee included material management procedures and inventories; equipment inventory; building inventories, vehicles inventories, and the assignment of responsibly of the physical resources.
3.11.2 The institution takes reasonable steps to provide a healthy, safe, and secure environment for all members of the campus community. (Institutional environment)

The institution has procedures and processes that provide for a healthy, safe and secure campus environment. Evidence provided for review included the institutional inspection related to fire suppression systems and safety inspections. The institution employs a campus wide emergency notification system called "ConnectED". This notification system provides broadcasts to student, faculty and staff on impending safety events. Additional, the institution provided their Clery information and training manuals.

3.11.3 The institution operates and maintains physical facilities, both on and off campus, that appropriately serve the needs of the institution's educational programs, support services, and other mission-related activities. (Physical facilities)

The institution operates, maintains and has adequate physical resources to serve the need of the institution and support its students, faculty, staff, research needs, housing needs and support of its mission. Documentation included a facilities campus master plan with current facilities needs assessment as well as future needs based on enrollments growth. Evidence also included deferred maintenance plans that documents progress and details future needs as well as a funding plan to address future facility needs.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee toured several classroom buildings, computer labs, the student success center, the student recreation center, and other campus buildings and found evidence that they appear to appropriately serve the educational and support services being provided. Most of the campus facilities have been renovated or expanded in the last ten years, and many have been renovated in the last three years.

3.12.1 The institution notifies the Commission of changes in accordance with the Commission's substantive change policy and, when required, seeks approval prior to the initiation of changes. (See the Commission policy "Substantive Changes for Accredited Institutions.") (Substantive change)

The institution provided its policy to the Off-Site Review Committee with its policy on substantive change, noting that all potential substantive changes must be reviewed by the institutions SACSCOC Liaison. The institution also provided a list of all substantive changes sent to the Commission on Colleges since August 2003, along with the supporting documentation associated with each of these changes.

3.13.1 The institution complies with the policies of the Commission on Colleges. (Policy compliance)

*3.13.1. “Accrediting Decisions of Other Agencies”

Applicable Policy Statement. Any institution seeking or holding accreditation from more than one U.S. Department of Education recognized accrediting body must describe itself in identical terms to each recognized accrediting body with regard to purpose, governance, programs, degrees, diplomas, certificates, personnel, finances, and
constituencies, and must keep each institutional accrediting body apprised of any change in its status with one or another accrediting body.

**Documentation:** The institution should (1) list federally recognized agencies that currently accredit the institution or any of its programs, (2) provide the date of the most recent review by each agency and indicate if negative action was taken by the agency and the reason for such action, (3) provide copies of statements used to describe itself for each of the accrediting bodies, (4) indicate any agency that has terminated accreditation, the date, and the reason for termination, and (5) indicate the date and reason for the institution voluntarily withdrawing accreditation with any of the agencies.

Georgia Southwestern holds accreditation from two U.S. Department of Education-recognized accrediting bodies: the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and the National League for Nursing Accrediting Commission (NLNAC). Neither of these bodies has terminated the institution’s accreditation, nor has the institution voluntarily withdrawn its accreditation from either body. The institution provided evidence related to recent reaffirmation reviews confirming that it describes itself in identical terms to these agencies.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed the Compliance Certification Report and conducted interviews with the Vice President for Academic Affairs in support of the institution’s case for compliance and affirms the findings of the Off-Site Review Committee.

### 3.13.2 “Agreements Involving Joint and Dual Academic Awards: Policy and Procedures”

**Applicable Policy Statement.** Member institutions are responsible for notifying and providing SACSCOC with signed final copies of agreements governing their collaborative academic arrangements (as defined in this policy). These arrangements must address the requirements set forth in the collaborative academic arrangements policy and procedures. For all such arrangements, SACSCOC-accredited institutions assume responsibility for (1) the integrity of the collaborative academic arrangements, (2) the quality of credits recorded on their transcripts, and (3) compliance with accreditation requirements.

**Documentation:** The institution should provide evidence that it has reported to the Commission all collaborative academic arrangements (as defined in this policy) that included signed final copies of the agreements. In addition, the institution should integrate into the Compliance Certification a discussion and determination of compliance with all standards applicable to the provisions of the agreements.

The institution noted a dual-degree arrangement with 34 Chinese universities through collaboration between the China Center for International Educational Exchange and the American Association of State Colleges and Universities. The institution provided three letters of notification to SACS - August 2008, May 2013, and August 2013. Approval was received for the first two, with one pending. The institution stated this was the only dual-degree arrangement at GSW, but the response for CS 2.7.1 describes a dual-degree program with Georgia Institute of Technology (GIT). The institution did not provide sufficient clarification or documentation regarding the GIT program. Without clarification or documentation for the GIT program, compliance could not be determined by the Off-Site Review Committee.
The *Focused Report* response provided by GSW included a copy of the MOU for the agreement between GSW and Georgia Institute of Technology (GIT) for this program which was established in 1997. The MOU clearly designates the agreement to be a Dual Degree Program between the two institutions and spells out the requirements for students interested in participating in the program.

According to the institution’s response, GSW was advised in April 2013 by a member of SACSCOC staff that its program with the Georgia Institute of Technology (GIT) is not a true Dual Degree Program, but rather a misnamed Transfer Agreement; however no documentation was provided to this effect. Even though this is acknowledged by the institution, it continues to refer to the program as a dual-degree program and specifies it as such in its Undergraduate Bulletin.

GSW students who transfer to GIT and complete an engineering degree do not automatically receive a degree from GSW. If a student who completes a GIT degree and started at GSW in this program wants to receive a GSW degree, he or she must apply for graduation at GSW. If after a degree audit the student is judged to have fulfilled the program requirements of the degree he or she seeks from GSW, a degree will be awarded. Of the sixteen students who entered the program at GSW and completed a GIT degree through Fall term 2012, four did not receive degrees from GSW. Of the twelve who received degrees from both institutions, six had to take additional classes to complete their GSW degree.

Examples were provided, with the most recent being 2011.

**Recommendation 5:** As it is still unclear as to the true nature of the arrangement between these two institutions, the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee recommends that the agreement be reevaluated to reflect its true nature and correctly specified in documents of the institution.

*3.13.3 “Complaint Procedures Against the Commission or Its Accredited Institutions”*

**Applicable Policy Statement.** Each institution is required to have in place student complaint policies and procedures that are reasonable, fairly administered, and well-publicized. (See FR 4.5). The Commission also requires, in accord with federal regulations, that each institution maintains a record of complaints received by the institution. This record is made available to the Commission upon request. This record will be reviewed and evaluated by the Commission as part of the institution’s decennial evaluation.

**Documentation:** When addressing this policy statement, the institution should provide information to the Commission describing how the institution maintains its record and also include the following: (1) individuals/offices responsible for the maintenance of the record(s), (2) elements of a complaint review that are included in the record, and (3) where the record(s) is located (centralized or decentralized). The record itself will be reviewed during the on-site evaluation of the institution.

The institution has two procedures for addressing student complaints: one deals with Academic Issues and the other addresses Non-Academic Issues. These policies are outlined and widely publicized in the Student Handbook and the Faculty Handbook. The links to these policies are also located on the institution’s website. Distance Learning Students also have access to these policies on the Distance Learning webpage. Distance Learning students are provided with access to the contact information for department chairs, deans, directors, and
vice presidents on a page linked to GSW's Distance Learning web page. Records of Academic Complaints are maintained in the Office of Academic Affairs and Non-Academic Complaints are maintained in the Office of the Assistant Dean of Students. Examples of complaints and their resolution are provided in FR 4.5

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed documents and interviewed the Vice President for Academic Affairs, Assistant Dean of Students, and the Director of Human Resources and confirms the findings of the Off-Site Review Committee.

3.13.4 "Reaffirmation of Accreditation and Subsequent Reports"

*3.13.4.a. Applicable Policy Statement. An institution includes a review of its distance learning programs in the Compliance Certification.

Documentation: In order to be in compliance with this policy, the institution must have incorporated an assessment of its compliance with standards that apply to its distance and correspondence education programs and courses.

The institution integrated a discussion of issues related to distance learning programs into the appropriate responses to Core Requirements, Comprehensive Standards, and Federal Requirements.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed the Compliance Certification Report and interviewed faculty and the Vice President for Academic Affairs in support of institution's case for compliance and affirms the findings of the Off-Site Review Committee.

3.13.4.b. Applicable Policy Statement. If an institution is part of a system or corporate structure, a description of the system operation (or corporate structure) is submitted as part of the Compliance Certification for the decennial review. The description should be designed to help members of the peer review committees understand the mission, governance, and operating procedures of the system and the individual institution's role within that system.

Documentation: The institution should provide a description of the system operation and structure or the corporate structure if this applies.

The institution provided evidence of the operating structure of the University System of George, of which GSW is a unit. Budgets are approved as separate units and each unit has its own mission statement. The institution provided a mission statement approved by the faculty in April 30, 2010.

3.13.5 "Separate Accreditation for Units of a Member Institution"

*3.13.5.a. Applicable Policy Statement. All branch campuses related to the parent campus through corporate or administrative control (1) include the name of the parent campus and make it clear that its accreditation is dependent on the continued accreditation of the parent campus and (2) are evaluated during reviews for institutions seeking candidacy, initial membership, or reaffirmation of accreditation. All other extended units under the accreditation of the parent campus are also evaluated during such reviews.
Documentation: For institutions with branch campuses: (1) The name of each branch campus must include the name of the parent campus—the SACSCOC accredited entity. The institution should provide evidence of this for each of its branch campuses. (2) The institution should incorporate the review of its branch campuses, as well as other extended units under the parent campus, into its comprehensive self-assessment and its determination of compliance with the standards, and indicate the procedure for doing so.

The On-site Reaffirmation Committee conducted interviews with the Vice President for Academic Affairs and affirmed that this standard is not applicable to GSW.

3.13.5.b. Applicable Policy Statement. If the Commission on Colleges determines that an extended unit is autonomous to the extent that the control over that unit by the parent or its board is significantly impaired, the Commission may direct that the extended unit seek to become a separately accredited institution. A unit which seeks separate accreditation should bear a different name from that of the parent. A unit which is located in a state or country outside the geographic jurisdiction of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools and which the Commission determines should be separately accredited or the institution requests to be separately accredited, applies for separate accreditation from the regional accrediting association that accredits colleges in that state or country.

Implementation: If, during its review of the institution, the Commission determines that an extended unit is sufficiently autonomous to the extent that the parent campus has little or no control, the Commission will use this policy to recommend separate accreditation of the extended unit. No response required by the institution.

The On-site Reaffirmation Committee conducted interviews with the Vice President for Academic Affairs and affirmed that this standard is not applicable to GSW.

3.14.1 A member or candidate institution represents its accredited status accurately and publishes the name, address, and telephone number of the Commission in accordance with Commission requirements and federal policy. (Publication of accreditation status)

The institution publishes information about its accreditation status on its website and in its undergraduate and graduate catalogs, using the prescribed format in all three locations. The institution provided copies of these documents for review by the Off-Site Review Committee.
D. **Assessment of Compliance with Section 4: Federal Requirements**

*4.1* The institution evaluates success with respect to student achievement consistent with its mission. Criteria may include: enrollment data; retention, graduation, course completion, and job placement rates; state licensing examinations, student portfolios; or other means of demonstrating achievement of goals. *(Student achievement)*


Also, no threshold of achievement was identified with the other data (i.e., NCLEX-RN licensure exam scores and GACE II pass rates).

In the institution’s *Focused Report*, GSW provides evidence for each of the selected criteria used to demonstrate compliance. The GSW “Enrollment Goals and Actuals” document provides thresholds for enrollments and actual data. The enrollment goal on this document is consistent with the 2008-2015 Strategic Plan goals for careful enrollment increases.

Similarly, the institution provides documents related to its targets and actions on retention and progression as part of the Complete College Georgia Plan (CCG). The GSW CCG plan for 2012 specifies a targeted rate of retention; this document is followed up with a progress report for 2013.

Finally, the institution demonstrates that for standardized tests, it employs the benchmarks set by the Georgia Professional Standards Commission (GACE exam) and by the Georgia Board of Nursing. Documentation in support of these levels of achievement is evident in the respective programs’ assessment plans.

GSW’s identification and assessment of student achievement goals are consistent with its strategic plan, state priorities, and the institution’s mission as a comprehensive state university focused on teaching and learning.

*4.2* The institution’s curriculum is directly related and appropriate to the mission and goals of the institution and the diplomas, certificates, or degrees awarded. *(Program curriculum)*

The institution’s curriculum is directly related and appropriate to the mission and goals of the institution and the diplomas, certificates, or degrees awarded. To fulfill its mission, the institution offers programs designed to encourage “intellectual, personal, and social growth for students” through a “full range of bachelor degree programs, along with selected master’s and specialist degree programs.” These programs are vetted through a process that specifically includes a clear description of “fit with the institutional mission.”

After review of the mission, website, Graduate and Undergraduate Bulletins, and after an interview with GSW’s Vice President for Academic Affairs, it is evident that GSW’s curriculum is in-line with its mission, goals, and degrees awarded. However, it was of concern to the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee that GSW is no longer accepting students in their lone Educational Specialist program since
GSW's mission includes "a full range of ... programs, along with ... specialist degree programs." Of further concern was the fact that while the Educational Specialist program is listed on the GSW program inventory on the USG website, there is no mention of the Specialist Degree in the Graduate Bulletin which seems inconsistent with the mission. As such, interviews were conducted with the Vice President for Academic Affairs and it was explained that the Educational Specialist program has been deactivated temporarily (as of 2012). A document was produced where USG policy describes temporary program deactivation (which can last up to 2 years) and part of the deactivation process is to remove mention of the program from the school's Bulletin. Since GSW has not completely removed the degree there is no conflict with their mission at this time.

*4.3 The institution makes available to students and the public current academic calendars, grading policies, and refund policies. (Publication of policies)

The institution makes its current academic calendar, grading policies, and refund policies available to students and the public primarily through its website. Information regarding these policies is also available in print versions of the Undergraduate Student and Graduate Bulletins, Faculty Handbook, GSWWeatherVane, and the Student Handbook. The grading and refund policies are detailed and appropriate for the mission of the institution and consistent with similar types of institutions.

The institution provided evidence from its web site regarding the publication of the Academic Calendar, as well as the Admissions Calendar. Evidence of publication of grading policies was demonstrated in the Undergraduate Bulletin and Graduate Bulletin. Public availability of refund policies was shown to be in the Undergraduate Bulletin, the Graduate Bulletin, and the Office of Student Accounts.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed documents and conducted an interview with the Vice President of Enrollment Management in support of the institution's case for compliance and affirms the findings of the Off-Site Review Committee.

*4.4 Program length is appropriate for each of the institution's educational programs. (Program length)

The lengths of the Institution's baccalaureate and master's programs are appropriate and conform to the standards in the disciplines. They meet or exceed minimum requirements of 120 semester credit hours for baccalaureate programs and 30 semester credit hours for master's programs. Baccalaureate programs range from 120 semester credit hours (e.g., Art) to 132 semester credit hours (Music Education); dual-degree programs with GIT range from 138 to 150 hours; master's programs from 30 (MBA) to 38 (MSN).

The specialist program also meets requirements at 30 hours, but this program is currently inactive.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed documents, including the Compliance Certification Report, catalogs, policy manual and handbook, as well as completed degree audit sheets and transcripts, and interviewed faculty and
the Registrar in support of the institution's case for compliance and affirms the findings of the Off-Site Review Committee.

*4.5* The institution has adequate procedures for addressing written student complaints and is responsible for demonstrating that it follows those procedures when resolving student complaints. (See the Commission policy "Complaint Procedures against the Commission or its Accredited Institutions." ) *(Student complaints)*

The institution has two well-publicized procedures for addressing student complaints (one for Academic Issues and one for Non-Academic Issues) as well as a procedure for appealing disciplinary measures resulting from student code of conduct violations. The University System of Georgia (USG) also provides for appeal of some decisions made on the individual campuses. The procedures for handling both academic and non-academic complaints are outlined in the GSW Student Handbook, GSWeathervane, and the GSW Faculty Handbook. All students (undergraduate, graduate, and distance learning) have easy access to these policies. All administrators, advisors, and new employees are also made aware of the policies during faculty and staff training held in August and May.

Academic and Non-Academic Complaints begin with an informal process between the student and the faculty or staff member with whom they disagree and progressively move into more formal processes to the President of the Institution. In specific cases, there is also an appeal to the USG Board of Regents.

An example of an Academic Complaint and an example of a Student Code of Conduct case were presented for review by the Off-Site Review Committee. These examples provided adequate evidence that the complaint processes used at the institution to resolve issues are followed as written in policy.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed documents and conducted interviews with the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the Assistant Dean of Students, and the Director of Human Resources and determined that the institution does have sufficient evidence to provide assurance that the procedures are actually being used in a systematic manner at the institution. There are sufficient procedures for resolving student complaints.

*4.6* Recruitment materials and presentations accurately represent the institution's practices and policies. *(Recruitment materials)*

The recruitment materials provided for Off-Site Review Committee review accurately portray the institution to prospective students and adhere to its mission. The focus of the institution's recruitment materials is the Admissions website; however, the institution also utilizes a variety of social media outlets, billboards, and television and radio advertisements in their recruitment process. The Admissions website is easy to access and contains a wealth of information about the institution. There are links to many other offices and sites for students to explore. The Admissions office also assists with the recruitment of Study Abroad opportunities and the English learning Institute. Many examples of recruitment materials were presented to the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee for review. This review of the recruitment materials and methods provided...
demonstrates that the institution’s message is communicated consistently to students and parents.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed documents and conducted an interview with the Vice President of Enrollment Management in support of the institution’s case for compliance and affirms the findings of the Off-Site Review Committee.

*4.7* The institution is in compliance with its program responsibilities under Title IV of the most recent Higher Education Act as amended. (In reviewing the institution’s compliance with these program responsibilities, the Commission relies on documentation forwarded to it by the U.S. Department of Education.) *(Title IV program responsibilities)*

The institution is approved for Pell, FFEL, FDSL, FS, FWS and FSEOG through 6/30/2015. The last audit, conducted as of FY 2007, showed no audit finding on the federal programs. The institution also included a copy of the current program participation agreement. The next audit is scheduled as of FY 2013, but was not included in the documentation.

GSW provided a printed copy of the *Management Report for Fiscal Year Ended June, 2013* prepared by the Georgia Department of Audits and Accounts which contained no matters or findings. Additionally in an interview with the Vice President for Business and Finance and the Director of Financial Aid, the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee confirmed there were no findings or matters in the 2013 audit.

*4.8* An institution that offers distance or correspondence education documents each of the following: *(Distance and correspondence education)*

4.8.1 demonstrates that the student who registers in a distance or correspondence education course or program is the same student who participates in and completes the course or program and receives the credit by verifying the identity of a student who participates in class or coursework by using, at the option of the institution, methods such as (a) a secure login and pass code, (b) proctored examinations, or (c) new or other technologies and practices that are effective in verifying student identification.

The institution offers distance education coursework, but no correspondence courses. Student identity is verified through login to the GeorgiaVIEW learning management system (LMS), which requires entry of a password. In addition, the School of Business Administration enrolls the majority of online students, and it requires at least one proctored examination (using ProctorU) in each online course.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed GSW’s *Compliance Certification Report* and associated links and interviewed the Chief Information Officer in support of the institution’s case for compliance and affirms the findings of the Off-Site Review Committee.

4.8.2 has a written procedure for protecting the privacy of students enrolled in distance and correspondence education courses or programs.
The institution issues each student and staff member a username and password, which serves as the unique identifier and is required for students and faculty to access the GeorgiaVIEW learning management system and the Registration and Academic Information Network (RAIN). Upon login, students only see their own grades and other feedback, and faculty -- who can see all grades and feedback for students in their courses -- are required to abide by the usual FERPA regulations.

Further, the Computer and Network Usage policy (which users must agree to) clearly specifies the prohibition against sharing of passwords. While not referenced in the documentation for this standard, the student honor code provides specific punishments for cheating, which would cover representing oneself as another student.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed the information provided by the institution and has determined that the institution has sufficient policies for protecting the student information for distance students in accordance to FERPA. The institution employs the Registration and Academic Information Network and the GeorgiaVIEW Learning Management System. Privacy policies also exist for using LiveText and Turnitin.com. The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee affirms the findings of the Off-Site Review Committee.

4.8.3 has a written procedure distributed at the time of registration or enrollment that notifies students of any projected additional student charges associated with verification of student identity.

The institution distributes information about additional costs for students through the RAIN registration system. These costs typically include the cost of proctored examinations, and the most recent notice posted for students during registration indicated that the two hour exam cost is $25.00.

The institution provided evidence from the GSW Registration and Academic Information Network regarding additional charges for Proctored testing fees that indicate that distance students do indeed receive information ahead of time regarding additional student charges.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed documents and conducted an interview with the Vice President of Enrollment Management in support of the institution’s case for compliance and affirms the findings of the Off-Site Review Committee.

*4.9 The institution has policies and procedures for determining the credit hours awarded for courses and programs that conform to commonly accepted practices in higher education and to Commission policy. (See the Commission policy “Credit Hours.”) (Definition of credit hours)

The institution provided evidence of policies and implementation that are commonly accepted to define the semester credit hour. The institution also indicated that the equivalency is required of online courses. It also addresses the amount of contact and preparation time expected in online modes of delivery.
The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed the Credit Hours Policy published in the Faculty Handbook, the Board of Regent's policy on credit hours, course outlines and syllabi for both face-to-face and online courses, and conducted interviews with the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Director of Institutional Effectiveness in support of the institution's case for compliance and affirms the findings of the Off-Site Review Committee.

E. Additional observations regarding strengths and weaknesses of the institution. (optional).

In addition to the excellent job on the part of the institution of preparing for the campus visit, the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee wishes to commend GSW on its strong and cohesive leadership team. The work of these individuals made it very comfortable for the Committee to complete its work. Although recommendations were identified pertaining to the QEP, the institution is commended on the process used to identify the QEP topic. It was very broad-based and reflected the true sense of the process as it is intended in that it was developed basically through faculty input. It was obvious that the ownership of the QEP lies with the faculty and the enthusiasm on their part was certainly evident. Congratulations on a job well-done.
Part III. Assessment of the Quality Enhancement Plan

To be completed by the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee.

A. Brief description of the institution's Quality Enhancement Plan

The Georgia Southwestern State University (GSW) Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP), titled “Windows to the World,” describes a five-year plan to enhance the undergraduate learning environment at GSW focused on the theme of internationalization. The theme has emerged as the result of a multi-year process (described below) that recognizes a priority for a GSW undergraduate education to support a goal to “…better prepare (their) students to engage in the emerging global world.” In addition, it is the intent of the plan, as it is implemented, to develop a stronger global environment at GSW. The plan draws on a rich array of resources in the immediate environment of Americus, Georgia, including enterprises that focus on the global marketplace for coffee and entities that provide humanitarian assistance for housing worldwide.

The QEP, designed as a mechanism both to take GSW to the world and to bring the world to GSW, is described by the campus authors as a “two-way conduit” or a “window,” which is the derivation of the title for the plan. Specifically, the QEP states three Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) to address the desire to better prepare students for the emerging global world and to enhance the global learning environment on campus, as follows:

- SLO1: Increased knowledge about the world.
- SLO2: Increased curiosity about the world.
- SLO3: Increased willingness to engage in the global community.

All three of these SLOs are fully complementary with the University's Mission Statement which describes GSW as a campus that “…encourages intellectual, personal, and social growth” for all members of the campus community. The QEP-defined student learning outcomes are also complementary to components of the GSW General Education learning outcomes, particularly outcomes concerning understanding cultural differences and conceptual knowledge about global societal dynamics. In addition, it is noted that the University System of Georgia USG, of which GSW is a member, values and recognizes a responsibility to prepare “a globally informed and aware citizenry.”

The QEP will be launched with first-year full-time students entering in the Fall of 2014 and will continue thereafter as a component of undergraduate education on the GSW campus. GSW students, as a group, are reportedly limited in their global experience, many having never been outside the state of Georgia. Thus, the goals of the QEP address the challenge to broaden the horizons of these students in multiple dimensions and to enhance the curriculum on the GSW campus.

The QEP as described depends on on-campus and near-campus learning opportunities to develop the stated SLOs. The plan builds on existing programs and learning opportunities currently available to GSW students and is constrained in part by limitations on the fiscal resources that would be necessary for a larger and more ambitious plan.

Among the specific activities described in the QEP is an enhancement of the current UNIV 1000 course (a college orientation course) that is required of all first-year students at GSW. As part of the QEP process, all students enrolled in UNIV 1000 will complete the Global Preparedness...
Inventory (GPI) to establish baseline data relative to students' global preparedness. The planned enhancement of UNIV 1000 in support of the goals of the QEP is a guided visit by students to the Global Village at the local Habitat for Humanity site. Habitat for Humanity is a well-known globally-focused humanitarian organization that is headquartered very near to the GSW campus. By visiting the Global Village, students will be directly exposed to the housing conditions that many of the world's poor confront on a daily basis. It is planned that this visit will "...prepare the students to begin thinking about themselves as part of a larger world." Students will be guided to discuss and reflect deeply on the issues of poverty that they are introduced to at the Global Village. An innovative feature of this part of the QEP is that the students' visit to the Global Village will be in the company of international students enrolled in the GSW English Language Institute (ELI). Subsequent to the visit to the Global Village, the international students will be drawn into conversations with the UNIV 1000 students to help the freshmen students process what they have seen and learned during the visit. Pre- and post-visit questions addressing poverty issues will be used to help assess the impact of the visit to the Global Village on students' global views. A required reflection essay on poverty is an additional part of the learning to be accomplished by UNIV 1000 students. Additionally, students enrolled in UNIV 1000 will also be presented with information about a myriad of international learning and engagement opportunities available to them on the GSW campus to encourage them to begin to think about taking advantage of some of them during the course of their studies. This element of the QEP supports all three SLOs.

In addition to the above, a second element of the QEP, again designed to support all three SLOs, is the introduction of a new "Windows to the World" requirement for graduation. This component of the QEP institutes a requirement for all first-year full-time freshmen entering in the Fall semester of 2014 and subsequently to attend a minimum of six designated "Windows to the World" events (see below for a full description of these events) during the span of their studies at GSW. Following attendance at six of these events, students will be asked to write an essay (Capstone Reflection) reflecting on their learning. These reflective essays will be subjected to the GSW QEP Assessment Rubric instrument (see Table 10 on page 47-48 of the QEP) to gauge learning relative to the SLOs stated in the QEP. Also, following completion of the "Windows to the World" requirement, students will retake the GPI to further assess the effect of this component of the QEP on students' global preparedness. In addition, an internally developed Global Participation Inventory (GPart) will be completed to assess students' interests and participation in eight global activities. [A Freshman version of the GPart is also administered to entering students to assess student interest in participation in global activities.] Comparison of interests and participation in global opportunities, as measured by the GPart, will further document the impact and outcome of the QEP.

The designated "Windows to the World" events will include seminars presented by invited international guests of area business and humanitarian establishments on cultural, economic, political, historical, and other aspects of their home countries. The speakers will both present in seminar format to students and engage in interactive discussions with students. In addition to the seminars organized under this component of the QEP, other events (international festivals, food-tasting, presentations by visiting scholars, performing/visual arts, etc.) will also be tagged as "Windows to the World" events. Such events will be programmed through the newly-created office of Director of International Programs (see below). At least one official "Windows to the World" event/seminar will be scheduled every semester.

The third element of the QEP is the creation of the new on-campus position titled "Director of International Programs" (DIP) mentioned above. The DIP, in fact, will be the lead person at GSW for implementation of the QEP as well as assurance of completion of student learning
outcomes assessment as implementation of the QEP goes forward. In addition to implementation of the QEP, a principal role of this individual is to coordinate and make widely known the array of existing opportunities and resources, both on- and off-campus, for GSW students as well as GSW faculty, to engage in international activities both in Americus and around the world. A detailed listing of such global activities currently available at GSW is found in the QEP on pages 27-29. Examples of existing international programs on campus include: study abroad programs (which will be strengthened as part of the QEP); the English Language Institute; the Association of Third World Studies; the International Studies Consortium of Georgia; the presence of international scholars on campus; a service-learning course (UNIV 4000) offered in partnership with The Fuller Center (local humanitarian organization committed to global housing needs); a wide array of collaborative opportunities in China through GSW’s partnership with the Sino-American Cooperation on Higher Education and Professional Development (CHEPD) program; and, an array of community resources, some of which are referenced above and all of which are described more fully in the QEP (pages 39-40).

The DIP will also provide active and visible campus leadership, including the development of an International Programs Website as well as for a wide assortment of needed administrative functions as GSW furthers its global activities and widens opportunities for engagement with the global community (SLO Three). The DIP will be supported in his/her work by a presidentially-appointed International Programs Advisory Board, thus elevating the status of the QEP to the most senior level of the GSW administrative structure. The DIP will report to the Associate Vice President of Academic Affairs.

Implementation of the QEP will be supported by a budget projected at $406,250 for the first five years.
B. Analysis of the Acceptability of the Quality Enhancement Plan


GSW's QEP, as developed, is consistent both with the institution's mission and specifics of its strategic plan. Moreover, the project supports the University of Georgia System's requirement for all curricula to include "global perspectives." In this regard, the project demonstrates compliance with CR 2.12 in that the project will help the institution accomplish its mission.

GSW has identified three learning outcomes and three program goals for which measurement of student learning and the learning environment is possible. The student learning outcomes, as written, express the desire of the institution to impart on students three cognitive and attitudinal adjustments:

SLO1. Increased knowledge about the world;
SLO2. Increased curiosity about the world;
SLO3. Increased willingness to engage in the global community.

The outcomes, as stated, are actually expressed as inputs: things the program intends to impart to its students, not intellectual skills, knowledge, or abilities that the institution hopes to see students demonstrate upon graduation.

The first outcome of increased knowledge is expressed in general terms with the hope that such knowledge will result in students feeling “empowered to meet the challenges of working and living in a global society” (24). Situating that knowledge in a more concrete context, such as within the academic discipline, would tie assessment of the outcome to stronger, more concrete artifacts of student learning.

The second and third outcomes, likewise, focus on instilling a curiosity and willingness among students to engage in the world, but the onus remains on the program to instill these values, not the students themselves to demonstrate that they have exemplified curiosity or actually engaged with the global community in a concrete way.

The Committee recognizes that, at its heart, this QEP is about making a cultural change and that much of the program and its assessment is an effort to measure the degree of that cultural change over the period of a student's academic life. Such changes do not always manifest in concrete ways; however, to the extent that this program is intended to in some ways brand a student's learning experience at GSW, it would be far more effective for the student to say what he or she is able to do and has done, rather than what he or she felt. As a subset of that point, the use of NSSE data that, in part, raised this issue to the level of institutional commitment ought to be regularly conducted as part of the program's ongoing assessment and for setting institutional benchmarks.

The institution also identifies three goals for the program, which are in many ways operational and intended to facilitate the assurance of the learning outcomes, making it all that more incumbent on the learning outcomes to focus on student achievements. The goals are

1. More students will engage in international opportunities,
2. GSW will enhance its partnerships with community organizations,
3. Information and preparation for all potential international programs will be provided, along with opportunities for students, faculty, and staff to share their travel experiences.
2. **Focus of the Plan.** The institution identifies a significant issue that (1) focuses on learning outcomes and/or the environment supporting student learning and (2) accomplishes the mission of the institution.

The selection of the QEP theme, "Windows to the World," identifies a significant issue of importance to the GSW student body and a major goal of the GSW educational program. As authors of the QEP state, "Today's graduates step out into a globalized world that requires new skill sets in order for them to navigate that world successfully." Among the skill sets needed by graduates for success in the globalized world of the 21st century are the abilities to communicate and negotiate with those different from oneself, and a knowledge of and comfort with differences in religious beliefs, cultural norms and traditions, political views, and governmental institutions. In short, cultural competence is a prerequisite for success even for those individuals who may never leave the local area in which they have grown up and intend to reside. As the QEP authors point out, "You may not work overseas, but you will likely work on a virtual team of international collaborators;...understanding the cultural norms for your collaborators can make you much more successful." Mobility and flexibility is the new norm for the world of work and for successful, responsible, and contributing employment in the work force of the 21st century as well as ease in social interactions in a diverse society. This is the significant learning challenge that the GSW QEP will attempt to confront.

The need for this particular theme is further validated by the fact that a major portion of the GSW student body is drawn from the nearby geographic area – both Sumter County and surrounding areas. Institutional data additionally indicate that 59% of the student body consists of first generation college students. Many of these students reportedly have very limited experience with members of other cultures as a result of these circumstances and have had few reasons or opportunities to interact with people different from themselves. Recent data reported in the QEP, notes that "...freshmen at GSW are less inclined to interact, think about, or discuss topics concerning different cultures than students at other institutions in the University System of Georgia, peer institutions, or at the national level."

Cultural and global competence as goals for the QEP are justified by the need for the skill sets noted above and further underscored by the limited horizons of the GSW student body that are reported by the authors. The goal of the QEP "...is to help our graduates be better equipped to engage in a global world." The QEP outlines plans to enhance learning in the dimensions needed for success in the world of the 21st century and sets goals in addition to the SLOs for so doing. Included in the goals for the overall program outlined in the QEP are: greater engagement of GSW students in international opportunities; enhanced institutional partnerships with relevant community organizations; and, better information dissemination to students to encourage their participation in the multiple international program offerings available to them.

3. **Institutional Capability for the Initiation, Implementation, and Completion of the Plan.** The institution provides evidence that it has sufficient resources to initiate, implement, sustain, and complete the QEP.

Whereas Georgia Southwestern State University may possess the capacity to carry out its QEP, Windows to the World, the Committee has concerns that proposed staffing is inadequate for the full implementation and institutionalization of it. Further, the successful implementation of the program depends almost exclusively on the Director of International Programs. The scope of his or her duties range not only over the execution of this office and its multifarious components, but also the oversight of the QEP, all without any additional staff, office support, financial resources, or administrative mandate. The Committee has concerns about how successful such an individual can be under these constraints given the responsibilities of the job.
RECOMMENDATION 1: The Committee recommends that GSW demonstrate capacity to successfully implement and sustain a robust QEP.

The instructors of UNIV 1000 must be appropriately guided and mentored to assure that the launch of the QEP via the enhancements of that course will be successful. In particular, it will be important that these individuals understand how to work with students to develop a quality reflective learning piece and that students understand the full QEP and expectations that GSW has for them as the learning environment at GSW is transformed.

RECOMMENDATION 2: The Committee recommends that GSW ensure that UNIV 1000 instructors are appropriately trained in the use and evaluation of reflective writing.

4. **Broad-based Involvement of Institutional Constituencies.** The institution demonstrates the involvement of its constituencies in the development and proposed implementation of the Plan.

The QEP was developed following a widely inclusive process that was launched during Southwestern Week 2011 (GSW’s annual August faculty planning and development week that occurs just prior to the arrival of students for the Fall semester of the new academic year) during which ideas for the QEP theme were invited for submission to the QEP Topic Selection Committee. Members of the committee were individuals who either volunteered or were subsequently designated by the SACSCOC Task Force through an iterative process that sought wide representation from the campus community, including students. The SACSCOC Task Force, an instrument of GSW’s Institutional Effectiveness Committee, oversaw the process for selection of the QEP theme. Submission and consideration of prospective topics continued for much of the 2011-2012 Academic Year. By early April 2012, twelve ideas had been formally submitted to the QEP Topic Selection Committee and in mid-April the committee met to consider the submissions. Of the original group of twelve, five emerged from the committee as appropriate for full development. During the summer of 2012, representative teams were formed to prepare detailed proposals for the various QEP topics. These proposal development teams were led by the initial author(s) of the selected themes. The proposals prepared by each writing team were scheduled for presentation during Southwestern Week in August 2012. Four formal proposals ultimately emerged and were presented to the campus community on August 9, 2012 by the authoring teams. All presentations were taped and posted to the QEP website for review by those unable to be present for the live presentations. Feedback from all members of the campus community was solicited by the QEP Chair of the Topic Selection Committee, with special effort to seek input from the Student Government. At meetings in November 2012, the SACSCOC leadership team determined that further information was required to document and support the need for the quality enhancements proposed in the draft QEP ideas submitted by the authoring teams. Such documentation was generated through a literature review as well as campus surveys and further campus discussions. On Monday, November 19, 2012, “Windows to the World” was announced as the theme selected as GSW’s QEP theme.

A QEP Development Team, chaired by the primary authors of the selected proposal, was formed—again through a process that solicited membership from a diverse cross-section of the campus, including faculty, staff, administrators, and students. To promote full communication with campus members during the development of the QEP, the QEP Development Team created a section of “GAView (the USG online learning management tool) which was accessible to all Team members as well as the wider GSW community.
The QEP Development Team met one or two times per month as writing the QEP progressed. Subcommittees on Student Learning Outcomes and on Outcomes Assessment were formed for those critical components of the QEP. The full team met for two workshops in May and July 2013 to refine the SLOs and to initiate the description of strategies for achieving the SLOs.

In addition, the QEP Development Team led efforts to raise awareness on campus of the “Windows to the World” theme for the QEP. To this end, promotional activities included: a contest for development of a logo for the QEP with a cash award; and, “QEP Rallies” to solicit feedback on the emerging document. The rallies provided an opportunity for campus participants to raise questions about the plan’s cost effectiveness, the appeal of the plan to students, ways that the plan could draw on the existing platform of relevant opportunities on campus and in Americus, the leadership responsibility for QEP implementation relative to other faculty duties, and modalities for assessing outcomes. In addition, the emerging QEP was presented widely on campus to a variety of audiences (student government, Staff Senate, General Faculty meetings, etc.) in multiple venues to solicit a continuing flow of ideas and input to the process.

The QEP document was developed and completed in final draft in mid-January 2014. Authorship of the final document was led by the formal members of the QEP Development Team but that group was supplemented by a wide array of interested parties on campus, as noted above, and, in the words of the QEP authors ultimately “The entire University membership is considered to be part of the developers of the QEP.”

5. **Assessment of the Plan.** *The institution identifies goals and a plan to assess the achievement of those goals.*

A detailed timeline for administration of assessments, benchmarking data, and full implementation of assessment is presented for each academic year through the fifth-year impact report. Key assessments that measure the outcomes are administered for incoming FTF and again for students who complete the Windows To The World (WTW) degree requirements. These measures, written artifacts and survey results, should provide some indication of the impact of the program on student learning and perception, which in the case of this project is extremely important. These assessments, do not, however, necessarily showcase what students have learned. The reliance on reflective writing as the tool for assessing student growth poses some concerns that will need to be dealt with early in the program’s process. As reflective writing itself involves a range of cognitive abilities and rhetorical functions that need to be accounted for in the presentation of these writing assignments, research on reflection as a thinking process and as differentiated from the process of reporting a reflection (written or oral) will inform the development of reflective pieces. Students must be provided strategies and opportunities to develop their ability to reflect, either through faculty development, student writing instruction, or academic support (e.g. the writing center), so that the document’s composition facilitates the quality of the learning the student has experienced.

The primary tool for assessing written artifacts is a variation on AAC&U’s value rubric for Intercultural Knowledge. Students will write reflections at both the entry point and the exit point of the requirements and a third party will use the rubric to assess them. Comparisons between baseline and end-point data will be made to show improvement or achievement of the learning outcomes. The implementation of these instruments in the pilot semester has already shown limitations to the administration of the assessment, which the program seeks to remedy. Similarly, this assessment will be piloted again in the spring of 2014 in selected capstone courses to obtain a senior-level baseline and correct any issues with the instrument or its administration.
Two "inventories" will be administered in support of each learning outcome. The Global Perspectives Inventory is a nationally developed survey instrument that measures cognitive, intra-, and interpersonal domains and suggests the level to which students are likely to engage in global curiosity and perspective-taking.

The Global Participation Inventory is an internally produced survey differentiated for freshman and senior application. The thrust of this survey is to ascertain students' interest and actual participation in global activities sponsored by the institution.

In addition to these tools, a survey will be distributed to all attendees of WOTW Seminars to ascertain attendees' level of response relative to the learning outcomes. A prototype will be administered at the first spring 2014 seminar.

An already institutionalized mid-point assessment is in place through GSW's general education program, Area B, where outcomes associated with cultural differences and social dynamics are periodically assessed by faculty as part of general education assessment. These assessments are regularly scheduled for AY '13-14 and '16-17. A comparison of results for these two periods, which fall before and during the QEP, should provide some indication of the impact of the program at its midpoint. Most recent available evidence from this assessment should also be used to establish a benchmark for institutional expectations of student learning attainment.

GSW will monitor progress toward program goals through relatively straight-forward, quantitative means. This data is already tracked as part of GSW's Study Abroad program and other related institutional activities. Participation in related events and programs will be used to determine if the program is meeting its goals. Additionally, QEP governing teams will monitor enrollment, retention, and graduation trends to determine if the program has any impact on the learning environment in that regard.

Assessment of GSW's QEP is relatively straightforward, combining quantitative, qualitative, direct and indirect measures that are administered at appropriate points throughout the curriculum. The clean-up of these instruments throughout the pilot academic year, along with existing measurements in the general education program, should ensure a level of reliability and validity to the assessment system. Finally, NSSE data ought to be incorporated into this plan and used to set at least some level of benchmark for expectations of student growth.

The stated SLOs are input goals rather than learning outcomes and need attention to make them more precise and more easily measurable as student learning outcomes. The important question to be answered is: What exactly do you want GSW graduates to know and be able to do after completion of their requirements mandated by the QEP? Rewording the SLOs to more accurately state what it is you hope to accomplish as SLOs through the implementation of the QEP are necessary.

RECOMMENDATION 3: The Committee recommends that GSW develop the desired student learning outcomes to make them more precise and easily measurable.

Heavy reliance on the use of reflective writing as a tool for direct measurement of the effectiveness of student learning outcomes begs the question: How will students be guided to produce thoughtful, comprehensive, rigorous, and insightful reflective essays? Right from the start, perhaps specifically with the reflective essay following the UNIV 1000 visit to the Global Village, instructors should work closely with students on how to develop a quality reflective piece. The Committee, for example, noted the "startling" results of the piloting effort with reflective writing in Fall 2013.
RECOMMENDATION 4: The Committee recommends that, as part of the QEP implementation, GSW take steps to assure that the reflective writing assignments will be reliable and valid instruments to assess desired learning outcomes.

C. Analysis and Comments for Strengthening the QEP

The Committee has identified notable strengths of the QEP proposed by GSW as follows:

- GSW used a broadly inclusive process in the development of the QEP drawing on the expertise and interests of a large constituency of stakeholders both on campus and in the nearby community.

- The QEP builds on an existing array of programs, drawing them together into a focused and visible presence on the campus that will raise the profile of GSW as a credible global player.

- The QEP has creatively drawn on a unique array of entities in the Americus community that will help deliver significant learning outcomes to GSW students.

- The QEP addresses a clearly identified need to broaden the horizons of the GSW student body through furthering their experience in the global world of the 21st century.

The committee offers these comments, observations, and suggestions for strengthening the QEP:

Given the starting point of the GSW student body (limited global exposure and experience; majority first generation students), it is questionable if the modest interventions proposed in the QEP [reflective essays on poverty following a visit to the Global Village; participation in six "Windows to the World" events; and some additional engagement (available but not required) with global opportunities on and off campus] will result in significant and measurable changes in knowledge, behavior and attitudes relative to the globalized world in which these graduates will be working. This concern is especially of note since so much of the global learning implicit in the QEP for most students at GSW will occur on campus or in the Americus community rather than at international locations, which would be most desirable in aspiring to the stated goals. "Think Globally, Act Locally," or some other slogan, might well serve as a rallying theme for QEP implementation. In that case, more thought might be devoted to how local resources and opportunities (both on-campus and in Americus and the surrounding region) might be further leveraged to enhance the SLO goals of the QEP.

It is important that the official "Windows to the World" events be planned so as to assure the broadest and most diverse possible exposure of students to significant global issues, concerns, challenges, and realities both in contemporary and historical context. These events will require significant pre-planning efforts to assure intellectual rigor and desired outcomes. The Committee suggests that as events are planned for satisfying the new Windows to the World requirement, they be grouped into themes (i.e., global geopolitics; global economy and trade; poverty and hunger; cultural expression and values; historical events in global perspective; global health and disease; geography and the environment, etc.). Students would be required to participate in Windows to the World events across this spectrum of themes (perhaps no more than one event per theme), thus assuring maximum diversity of exposure to significant global issues in the course of satisfying this new requirement.
The Committee suggests that student artifacts (reflective writings, journals, etc.) accumulated through the QEP process be compiled as a student "Portfolio" to assess student learning over time. These portfolios would contribute to overall QEP formative and summative assessment.

There are numerous on-campus resources in the form of international students and visiting scholars whose presence could be leveraged as a learning resource for GSW students as part of the implementation of the QEP. Of note, pro-active use of international students in the UNIV 1000 Global Village visit and engagement of students with visiting international scholars could help further the success of the QEP with minimum cost to GSW. Two cautionary notes: 1) As the expertise of international students and scholars on campus is leveraged for implementation of the QEP, these individuals must be closely and appropriately vetted and prepared to assure that they understand their assigned tasks. 2) Noting that visiting scholars and ELI students are here for other than QEP purposes, GSW should refrain from taxing these individuals with QEP tasks unrelated to the individuals' primary reason for being on campus.

SLO2 (Increased curiosity about the world) will be difficult to assess and perhaps is not sufficiently precise as an SLO. The intent of this SLO is that students will increase their competence and their confidence to engage effectively and responsibly with the world beyond the borders of the campus. That said, an appropriate rewording of the SLO might be considered is: "Increased global competence," a more easily assessed learning outcome.

Noting among the stated student learning outcomes of the General Education (GE) program at GSW (see page 53 of the QEP) in Area B (cultural differences; global perspectives), it appears that there is a significant opportunity for GSW to link the General Education program to the outcomes of the QEP. There seem to be clear opportunities for QEP synergy with the "Global Perspectives Overlay" to GE; the "Global Studies Certificate" option in GE; the study abroad option in the honors program; the program in European Studies; and, elements of the Third World Studies program. Consideration of how this might be accomplished would advance both general education outcomes and the success of the QEP.

The QEP needs a statement about institutional commitment to the continuation of the plan beyond the first five-year horizon. The intent of a QEP is to change the learning environment on the campus permanently. How will this be accomplished at GSW? What is the commitment of the GSW campus to assuring that such is the case? Further, it will be important to have a clear plan in mind to adjust the QEP going forward if early assessment of its outcomes fails to show significant improvement in the target SLOs. Presumably, this responsibility falls to the International Programs Advisory Board working in concert with the Director of International Programs as stated in the QEP. However, thoughtful attention to exactly how such adjustments in the implementation of the QEP will occur if/when needed will be important to overall success of GSW's efforts to internationalize the campus.

A significant effort as part of the implementation of the QEP should be devoted to increased participation in study abroad both by faculty leaders and by students. There are few other ways to provide students with the sorts of experiences and learning opportunities that are fundamental to the successful implementation of the QEP. Perhaps the GSW Foundation can be approached about soliciting and securing funding for scholarships to permit more students to gain from such experiences. Furthermore, consideration of how to overcome other existing barriers to participation in study abroad is important to the success of SLO3.

The Committee notes that it appears that implementation of the QEP will occur without significant faculty engagement. Therefore, the Committee suggests that GWS consider ways in which faculty might be directly engaged in QEP implementation. Faculty commitment to the QEP and the altered learning environment on campus which will result is essential to the success of the QEP. The Committee suggests that GSW consider instituting a reward structure...
for those faculty who distinguish themselves by engagement in implementation and enhancement QEP outcomes, whether in curricular or co-curricular settings.

Given that NSSE data was used to benchmark the current status of GSW students to validate the need of the selected theme, the Committee encourages that such data (or similar data) be gathered as part of the outcomes assessment process.
Part IV. Third-Party Comments

To be completed by the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee.

If an institution receives Third-Party Comments, the institution has an opportunity to respond to those comments and the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviews the response as part of its comprehensive evaluation of the institution.

The Committee should check one of the following:

[X] No Third-Party Comments submitted.

___ Third-Party Comments submitted. (Address the items below.)

1. Describe the nature of the Comments and any allegations of non-compliance that may have been part of the formal Third-Party Comments;

2. Indicate whether the Committee found evidence in support of any allegations of non-compliance.

If found to be out of compliance, the Committee should write a recommendation and include it in Part II under the standard cited with a full narrative that describes why the institution was found to be out of compliance and the documentation that supports that determination. In this space, reference the number of the Core Requirement, Comprehensive Standard, or Federal Requirement and the recommendation number cited in Part II.

If determined to be in compliance, explain in this space the reasons and refer to the documentation in support of this finding.
# APPENDIX A

## Roster of the Off-Site Review Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title and Affiliation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Robert D. Gratz</td>
<td>CHAIR, Special Assistant to the President, Texas State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Gary W. Barnes</td>
<td>Vice President for Business and Finance, West Texas A&amp;M University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Veronica M. Biscoe</td>
<td>Director of University Planning, Assessment and EEO, Northwestern State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. John Crain</td>
<td>President, Southeastern Louisiana University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Janice R. Franklin</td>
<td>Dean, University Library and Learning Resources, Alabama State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Holly P. Hirst</td>
<td>Associate Dean for Research and Graduate Studies and Professor of Mathematics, Appalachian State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Brian L. Johnson</td>
<td>Assistant Provost/Assistant Vice President for Academic Affairs, Austin Peay State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. David P. Shields, Jr.</td>
<td>Vice President for Student Affairs, University of North Alabama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Jerre W. Wilson</td>
<td>Vice President, Academic Affairs, Marine Corps University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACSCOC Representative</td>
<td>Dr. Charles Taylor, Vice President, SACSCOC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Louise Clark</td>
<td>CHAIR, Associate Dean/MBA Director, College of Business, Jacksonville State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Gary W. Barnes</td>
<td>Senior Vice Chancellor for Student Services and Administration, Troy University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Veronica M. Biscoe</td>
<td>Director, Institutional Effectiveness and Academic Support, McNeese State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Mark Y. Herring</td>
<td>Dean of Library Services, Winthrop University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Shirley F. Manigault</td>
<td>Special Assistant to the President / Professor of English, Winston-Salem State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Matthew F. Ragland</td>
<td>Associate Provost of Research &amp; Graduate Studies, Auburn University at Montgomery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. David J. Sammons</td>
<td>Professor Emeritus of Agronomy and former Dean of the International Center, University of Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. John W. Stewart, III</td>
<td>President, University of Montevallo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACSCOC Observer</td>
<td>Dr. Jayne Moschella, Vice President of Academic Affairs, Everglades University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SACSCOC Representative</td>
<td>Dr. Cheryl D. Cardell, Vice President, SACSCOC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*QEP Evaluator*

(Refer to "Directions for Completion of the Report of the Reaffirmation Committee.")
APPENDIX B

Off-Campus Sites or Distance Learning Programs Reviewed
(Refer to "Directions for Completion of the Report of the Reaffirmation Committee.")

Georgia Southwestern State University (GSW) offers one program that operates on the campus of Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College in Tifton, Georgia (ABAC), a Bachelor of Science in Education specializing in Early Childhood Education. Students complete an appropriate Associates degree at ABAC and then enroll in GSW classes to complete the bachelors degree. The BBA program, initially planned at the site has been discontinued.

Students in the BSEd program take all their major requirements on the ABAC campus. Information on the program is available at the following web site links, some of which are the GSW web site and some on the ABAC:

Admissions Information
GSW: http://gsw.edu/Admissions/Who/Transfer/univs/abac

Application for Admission to Teacher Education
GSW: http://gsw.edu/Academics/Schools-and-Departments/School-of-Education/UAdmissions/Admissions-to-Teacher-Education/index

Field Experiences Office for ABAC: http://gsw.edu/Academics/Schools-and-Departments/School-of-Education/About-Our-School/Field-Experience-Office/gswatabac

Classes Taught at ABAC
Spring 2014: https://rain.gsw.edu/sched201402.htm#E
Fall 2013: https://rain.gsw.edu/sched201308.htm#E
Summer 2013: https://rain.gsw.edu/sched201305.htm#E
Spring 2013: https://rain.gsw.edu/sched201302.htm#E
Fall 2012: https://rain.gsw.edu/sched201208.htm#E

Two members of the On-Site Reaffirmation Team visited the site in Tifton, Georgia on Monday, March 10, 2014. The team toured the various classrooms and computer labs being used by GSW students in the program. All are state-of-the-art classrooms and labs. The students have access to the ABAC campus library, which includes a special section for resources for GSW. The campus bookstore maintains a GSW section, as well.

Most of the faculty who teach in this program are full-time GSW faculty, including Lynn Larsen who is the coordinator for the program, but who is based on the ABAC campus. The other full-time faculty are based on the GSW campus and commute to Tifton to teach classes on the ABAC campus. Their courses in Tifton are a part of their regular teaching load. The team met with one full-time faculty member from Americus and with the GSW administrator for the program.
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Faculty who taught in the program during our Faculty Roster Terms of Fall 2012 and Spring 2013 were Ms. Mary Bolton (Clinical Adjunct based in Tifton), Dr. Queen Brown (GSW Associate Professor), Dr. Chu Chu Wu (GSW Assistant Professor), Ms. Jennifer Dickens (GSW Lecturer), Ms. Lynn Larsen (GSW Lecturer and Program Coordinator based in Tifton), Dr. Margaret Lehman (GSW Assistant Professor), Ms. Cheryl Luckie (Clinical Adjunct based in Tifton), and Dr. Sheryl Venable (GSW Associate Professor).

GSW students have full access to student support services at ABAC, and also have tutoring and career services support from the Americus campus. The team met with approximately 20 students in the program. They were very complimentary of their program and deeply appreciative of GSW providing them with this opportunity to complete their bachelor’s degree in education. Some have already met with recruiters from the school system in the surrounding counties regarding future employment.
APPENDIX C

List of Recommendations
Cited in the Report of the Reaffirmation Committee
(Refer to "Directions for Completion of the Report of the Reaffirmation Committee.")

CS 3.3.2 (Quality Enhancement Plan), RECOMMENDATION 1
The Committee recommends that GSW demonstrate capacity to successfully implement and sustain a robust QEP.

CS 3.3.2 (Quality Enhancement Plan), RECOMMENDATION 2
The Committee recommends that GSW ensure that UNIV 1000 instructors are appropriately trained in the use and evaluation of reflective writing.

CS 3.3.2 (Quality Enhancement Plan), RECOMMENDATION 3
The Committee recommends that GSW develop the desired learning outcomes to make them more precise and easily measurable.

CS 3.3.2 (Quality Enhancement Plan), RECOMMENDATION 4
The Committee recommends that, as part of the QEP implementation, GSW take steps to assure that the reflective writing assignments will be reliable and valid instruments to assess desired learning outcomes.

CS 3.13.2 (Agreements Involving Joint and Dual Academic Awards: Policy and Procedures), RECOMMENDATION 5
The Committee recommends that the dual/transfer agreement between GSW and Georgia Institute of Technology be reevaluated to reflect its true nature, and correctly specified in documents of the institution.
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Institution: Georgia Southwestern University

For each of the faculty members listed below, the committee either found the academic qualification of the faculty member to be inadequate and/or the institution did not adequately justify and document the faculty member's other qualifications to teach the identified course(s). For each case, the committee checked the column appropriate to its findings and provided additional comments if needed to clarify the concern.

The institution is requested to submit additional justification and documentation on the qualifications of each of the faculty member listed. When responding, the institution should use the Commission's "Faculty Roster Form: Qualifications of Full-Time and Part-Time Faculty" and its "Instructions for Reporting the Qualifications of Full-Time and Part-Time Faculty," which can be accessed under the Institutional Resources tab of the Commission website: www.sacscoc.org. Read the instructions carefully and pay close attention to the section "Providing Information that Establishes Qualifications." The completed form, or similar document, should be included as part of the institution's formal response to the Commission.

(No issues identified with faculty qualifications)