



**East Georgia State College**  
**Focused Report**  
**October 6-8, 2020**  
**Print Version**

**This print version of East Georgia State College's (EGSC) Focused Report includes the SACSCOC Principles of Accreditation and EGSC's narrative response for each principle EGSC was found non-compliant by the Off-Site Committee. All source documents may be accessed through hyperlinks on the USB drive accompanying each copy of this Focused Report.**

### Table of Contents

<b>Principle #</b>	<b>Descriptor</b>	<b>Page #</b>
<a href="#"><u>6.2.a</u></a>	Faculty Qualifications	3
<a href="#"><u>6.2.b</u></a>	Program Faculty	35
<a href="#"><u>6.3</u></a>	Faculty Appointment and Evaluation	48
<a href="#"><u>7.3</u></a>	Administrative Effectiveness	51
<a href="#"><u>8.1</u></a>	Student Achievement	61
<a href="#"><u>8.2.b</u></a>	Student Outcomes: General Education	70
<a href="#"><u>10.7</u></a>	Policies for Awarding Credit	84
<a href="#"><u>12.2</u></a>	Student Support Services Staff	88
<a href="#"><u>12.4</u></a>	Student Complaints	97

**6.2.a Faculty Qualifications**

For each of its educational programs, the institution:

- a. justifies and documents the qualifications of its faculty members.

**Judgment**

Compliant    Partial Compliance    Non-Compliant    Not Applicable

**Narrative**

**EGSC Compliance Certification**

Link to Compliance Certification 6.2.a

**Off-site Committee Comments**

Although the institution provided documentation (transcripts and certificates) that establishes faculty qualifications for teaching in specific programs or courses, the Off-Site Committee was unable to determine that all faculty possessed required credentials for teaching specific courses within a given program. In some cases, relevant credentials were not provided, while in others detailed explanations and/or justifications could possibly render faculty qualified to teach specific courses. Exemplary of the need for greater clarity in credentialing guidelines is the Critical and Academic Thinking for Success course. The institution’s processes and procedures for certifying faculty, inclusive of review and updates of faculty credentials, at least twice annually, seem not to give enough attention to a thorough review of transcripts and other relevant information prior to the assignment of courses. The institution may wish to consider revisiting and perhaps revising the credentialing processes to ensure that faculty at least meet minimum requirements for teaching specific courses and to ensure consistent implementation and application of its stated credentialing processes and procedures.

**Request for Justifying and Documenting Qualifications of Faculty**

**Institution:** East Georgia State College

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 SACSCOC’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](http://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 SACSCOC.

1	2	3	4	5
Name of Faculty Member	Course(s) in Question	Inadequate Academic Qualifications	Insufficient Justification of Other Qualifications	Comments (if needed)
Altamirano, David	Critical and Academic Thinking for Success		x	No credentialing guidelines provided for the course. The syllabus for the course is a form syllabus.
Cheek, Howard	Critical and Academic Thinking for Success		x	No credentialing guidelines provided for the course. The syllabus for the course is a form syllabus.
Howell, Jeffrey	Critical and Academic Thinking for Success		x	No credentialing guidelines provided for the course. The syllabus for the course is a form syllabus.
Nordan, Robert	Critical and Academic Thinking for Success		x	No credentialing guidelines provided for the course. The syllabus for the course is a form syllabus.
Strickland, David	Critical and Academic Thinking for Success		x	No credentialing guidelines provided for the course. The syllabus for the course is a form syllabus.
Vess, Deborah	Critical and Academic Thinking for Success		x	No credentialing guidelines provided for the course. The syllabus for the course is a form syllabus.
Strickland, Julie	Composition I, Composition II, Support for English Composition		x	Degree in English education, transcript suggests a focus on P-12 English

	ENG 0999			Education, only a couple of ENGL prefix courses
McPhail, Haley	Support for English Composition ENG 0999		x	Only 3 ENGL credits, masters is in teaching
Hundley, Frederick	MUSC 1100 Music Appreciation	x		No transcript provided for the graduate work in music, only the PhD in computer tech
Todd, Jessica	Elementary French I	x		No documentation of master's level credits in French, CV says French degree in progress in 2020
Chevalier, David	Introduction to Biology I Introduction to Biology Lab I Introduction to Biology II Introduction to Biology Lab II	Unable to determine – no transcripts or information on relevant course work.		There is just a note about why there are no transcripts for Ph.D. in Botany and there is no information on M.S. in Plant Biology. Not clear whether or not graduate work included 18 hours in Biology
Lee, Jason C	Introduction to Biology I Introduction to Biology I Lab	Does not have 18 hours of graduate credit in Biology. Other course in Integrated Science is probably fine because does have over 18 hours in all science total.	Need Justification	Master's is in Science Education
Marsh, Robert	College Algebra Pre-Calculus Elementary Statistics Calculus I Calculus II	Ph.D. is in Curriculum and Instruction. Master and does not include quantitative courses. M.S. in Nuclear Engineering and	Need Justification	

		MBA in Information Systems have some quantitative courses but does not appear to have 18 graduate credit hours in Math.		
Payne, Marvalisa	Quantitative Skills and Reasoning Calculus I	No graduate transcripts		
Tolentino, Timothy	Principles of Chemistry	Only see 6 graduate hours of Chemistry from Bioengineering Ph.D. and M.S.	Need Justification	
Yocco, Lisa	College Algebra Pre-Calculus Survey of Calculus	M.S. in Mathematics Teacher Education does not include 18 graduate hours of Math (Math Modeling Support, College Algebra Support and Quantitative Skills and Reasoning are probably OK.)	Need Justification	
Bayens, Edward	Introduction to Sociology  Intro to Psychology	Doesn't appear to have 18 Grad. Hours in Sociology; Grad. Counseling courses might work with justification	Need Justification	MA in Student Personnel Higher Ed, Ph. D Higher Ed
Braddy, Larry	Intro to Psychology; Human Growth and Development	Doesn't have 18 graduate credits for either of these courses; might be able to provide strong justification for psychology	Needs justifications,	M.Ed Rehab. Counseling
Brady, James A.	Public Speaking	Can't Assess		MA Transcript not available (Bradley's

				transcript appears) Doctorate in Ed Leadership
Bragg, Susan	Intro to Sociology and Social Problems	Doesn't have 18 graduate credits in Sociology, Can possibly justify Social Problems	Needs Justification	M.S.W. Social Work
Brown, Dewayne	Intro to Sociology	Doesn't have 18 graduate credits in Sociology	Needs Justification	M.S. Human Relations and Clinical Psychology
Byrd, Roger	American National Government	Although degrees are in related field, doesn't have sufficient graduate credits for closely related courses	Justification	M.A. & PhD in Leadership and Public Administration
Cheek, Howard L.	U.S. History to 1865	Not enough graduate credits in U.S. History or closely related courses	Needs Justification	Masters of Public Affairs, PhD in Political Philosophy
Giebfried, John	U.S. History	No Courses in U.S History for Master's Degrees	Need Justification	PhD Transcript, which is not posted might resolve the issue.
Hassan, Ronald	Principles of Emergency Service, Building Construction for Fire Protection	No relevant graduate work and/or certifications provided		Only Bachelor's Degree transcript.

Bayens, Edward	Introduction to Sociology  Intro to Psychology	Doesn't appear to have 18 Grad. Hours in Sociology; Grad. Counseling courses might work with justification	Need Justification	MA in Student Personnel Higher Ed, Ph. D Higher Ed
Braddy, Larry	Intro to Psychology; Human Growth and Development	Doesn't have 18 graduate credits for either of these courses; might be able to provide strong	Needs justifications,	M.Ed Rehab. Counseling

		justification for psychology		
Brady	Public Speaking	Can't Assess		MA Transcript not available (Bradley's transcript appears) Doctorate in Ed Leadership
Braggs, Susan	Intro to Sociology and Social Problems	Doesn't have 18 graduate credits in Sociology, Can possibly justify Social Problems	Needs Justification	M.S.W. Social Work
Brown, Dewayne	Intro to Sociology	Doesn't have 18 graduate credits in Sociology	Needs Justification	M.S. Human Relations and Clinical Psychology
Byrd, Roger	American National Government	Although degrees are in related field, doesn't have sufficient graduate credits for closely related courses	Justification	M.A. & PhD in Leadership and Public Administration
Cheeks, Howard L.	U.S. History to 1865	Not enough graduate credits in U.S. History or closely related courses	Needs Justification	Masters of Public Affairs, PhD in Political Philosophy
Giebfried, John	U.S. History	No Courses in U.S History for Master's Degrees	Need Justification	PhD Transcript, which is not posted might resolve the issue.
Hassan, Ronald	Principles of Emergency Service, Building Construction for Fire Protection	No relevant graduate work and/or certifications provided		Only Bachelor's Degree transcript.

***[NOTE: The last nine faculty listed above in this table appear to be duplicates of the preceding nine faculty in the Committee's original list which were probably duplicated by accident when assembling the Committee's report.]***

**Institution Response**

East Georgia State College (EGSC) provided faculty rosters for all faculty teaching courses in fall 2019 and Spring 2019. The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee (Committee) reviewed these rosters in detail and found that most faculty were qualified to teach their assigned courses based on their academic credentials and/or other qualifications, such as scholarly contributions and professional experience. However, the Committee noted that a number of the rosters did not provide sufficient justifications and/or qualifications for some specific teaching assignments as noted in the listing



above. The specific questions raised by the Committee concerning the qualifications of each of these 24 faculty members are addressed below.

EGSC officials admit that we were not as diligent as we should have been in constructing the original Faculty Rosters submitted with the Compliance Certification report. Most importantly, and as the Off-Site Committee findings confirmed, we frequently failed to provide supplemental justifications involving vital related professional experience and academic accomplishments when such evidence was needed to justify teaching assignments. Too often when education degrees were present and faculty were teaching courses in the "content fields," we failed to include in the Faculty Rosters the 18 graduate semester hours completed in courses in those content fields or closely related to them. Specific and accurate details of graduate degree completion were sometimes missing and typographical errors were present. Weaknesses in some of the previously submitted Faculty Rosters reflected a lack of sufficient attention to detail in constructing the faculty rosters to demonstrate compliance with standard 6.2.a.

EGSC officials concur with many of the findings of the Off-Site Committee and have taken corrective action as will be outlined below. Additional credentials and justifications have been added to many of the revised Faculty Rosters for the 24 identified faculty to demonstrate compliance. However, in a few instances, the institution could not sufficiently justify certain 2019 teaching assignments, and official actions have been taken to assure that those individuals are not assigned to teach those courses again going forward. Such actions are also noted in the revised Faculty Rosters below. The presentation of Faculty Roster corrections and revisions begin for those who taught the CATS 1101 first-year-experience (FYE) course. Following faculty who taught CATS 1101 are all other cited faculty with questionable justifications.

The Off-Site Committee also suggested that EGSC review and revise the institution's credentialing processes to ensure that faculty meet at least minimum requirements consistently for teaching each specific course assignment in compliance with SACSCOC Guidelines. EGSC is committed to continually improving and ensuring ongoing implementation of needed changes in the faculty credentialing and teaching assignment scheduling process. Accordingly, the Faculty Senate and the Cabinet of EGSC have formally adopted and the Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs and the President have approved a new EGSC Faculty Credentials Policy. Based on the reaffirmation experience to date with standard 6.2.a, the following improved procedure are now implemented at EGSC:

**Weakness #1:** Academic administrators need raised awareness and regular reminders of the SACSCOC Faculty Credentials Guidelines and how they are interpreted for ongoing compliance with the institutional accreditation standard on Faculty Qualifications (6.2.a), **Procedural Change Implemented:** When the call goes out each fall and spring to begin the schedule building process for the upcoming semester, a packet of information entitled *EGSC Expectations for Teaching Qualifications* (presented in Sources below in the *EGSC Expectations for Teaching Qualifications Folder*) will be distributed for use by those schedule builders containing: a) a copy of the current SACSCOC Guidelines on Faculty Credentials; b) a copy of the Commission's Resource Manual's Rationale for compliance with Standard 6.2.a on Faculty Qualifications; and c) most importantly, a listing of specific potential noncompliance practices at EGSC that should be avoided when making teaching assignments. As indicated that document for that packet, the current listing of potential noncompliance practices includes: a) teaching assignments outside EGSC's Faculty Qualifications Profile and Authorized Course Assignment Parameters; b) teaching assignments in discipline areas where faculty with degrees in education (e.g., MEd and EdD) may not have sufficient graduate semester hours in the teaching discipline or other offsetting credentials; c) teaching assignments in a discipline area different from the discipline area of the degree held which cannot be adequately justified; d) teaching assignments in a discipline/specialty area that might be somewhat related to the faculty member's discipline/specialty area but are commonly considered substantively different

(e.g., sociology and social work, political science and public administration, speech and mass communication, management and marketing, elementary education and educational administration, painting and sculpture, voice performance and piano performance, etc.) and cannot be adequately justified; and e) teaching assignments where the instructor's academic credentials are deficient and cannot be offset by other qualifications because those other experiences and accomplishments are not documented with evidence that is extensive, substantive, and compelling. This packet is being sent to class schedule builders for Spring Semester 2021;

**Weakness #2:** There is a lack of updated, verified, and standardized basic information available on the qualifications of each teaching faculty member which should be referenced and used regularly to guide and appropriately delimit decisions on teaching assignments in order to ensure compliance with SACSCOC accreditation standard 6.2.a. **Procedural Change Implemented:** The Office of the Academic Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs now manages a new record-keeping procedure in which a form entitled, "Faculty Qualifications Profile and Authorized Course Assignment Parameters" (hereafter referenced as Profile) is constructed and on file for each full-time and part-time teaching faculty member. The construction of the Profile ensures that all reported earned degrees are identified by specific type (e.g., PhD, EdD, DBA, MA, MBA, MPA, etc.), degree program name, and awarding institution as verified by official transcripts received and on file from the awarding institution. All graduate and undergraduate degrees are listed in the Profile. Based on an analysis of the graduate transcripts and degree programs completed, course assignment parameters are identified for the EGSC discipline listings and levels of instruction in which the faculty member is judged to be qualified to teach according to SACSCOC standards and guidelines. If specific restrictions on course teaching assignments exist for an individual within their discipline or in others, they are identified in the Profile. Faculty who are expected to teach courses under other discipline listings and levels of instruction have those expectations also identified in the Profile along with the appropriate 18+ graduate semester hours of completed coursework (identified by course number, title and credits in that teaching discipline) and/or citations of substantive and detailed evidence of other related professional experience, scholarship, certifications and accomplishments justifying their qualifications to teach such courses. Web access to these Profiles will be available to schedule builders to facilitate their access and use on a 24/7 basis. Each faculty member is sent and expected to review and suggest updates and corrections to his/her profile early in the fall semester each year. See EGSC Faculty Qualifications Profile and Authorized Course Assignment Parameters and a completed profile for Samuel Holcomb, a new part-time faculty member hired for Fall Semester 2020.

**Weakness #3:** Internal audits of compliance with SACSCOC accreditation standard 6.2.a can be helpful for ensuring compliance with SACSCOC standard 6.2.a but are too infrequent when they happen only every ten years with reaffirmation. **Procedural Change Underway:** EGSC's Reaffirmation reviews in 2020-21 serve as comprehensive internal and external audits of compliance with Standard 6.2.a. Every two years thereafter beginning in 2022-23, internal audits are scheduled to be conducted by the SACSCOC Accreditation Liaison on a 10% sample of all instructors of record to assess the extent to which continuing compliance with Standard 6.2.a is being achieved. Individual faculty who were found to be unqualified for certain teaching assignments in the previous audit will be included in each 2-year follow-up audit to ensure the continuance of corrective action taken previously. Results from the audit will be shared with all academic administrators, some of whom may need to take corrective action. Results will also be used to update the listing of specific potential noncompliance practices at EGSC that should be avoided when making teaching assignments as presented in the packet of information regularly distributed entitled, *EGSC Expectations for Teaching Qualifications*.

The new faculty credentials policy and procedures were introduced to the EGSC faculty during the fall faculty meetings on August 4, 2020.

**QUALIFICATIONS OF FACULTY FOR TEACHING CATS 1101, CRITICAL AND ACADEMIC THINKING FOR SUCCESS, FOR ONE SEMESTER HOUR OF CREDIT IN EGSC’S FIRST-YEAR EXPERIENCE (FYE) PROGRAM**

The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee correctly cited EGSC for not providing any justification for the qualifications of six faculty members who taught CATS 1101 in 2019 (i.e., Altamirano, Cheek, Howell, Nordan, Strickland, and Vess). That First-year Experience (FYE) course follows national best practices as reflected in the work of Dr. John Gardner and the National Resource Center for First-Year Experience and Students in Transition at the University of South Carolina [6]. This course is aimed at supporting student success in the first year of collegiate study at EGSC, regardless of a student’s chosen discipline area of interest in a collegiate major. This one-credit freshman level course is one of EGSC’s First-Year Experience (FYE) initiatives which are designed to facilitate successful student transitions to college life and the rigors of post-secondary education, regardless of intended major. The catalog course description [7] for this course in 2019 reads as follows:

**CATS 1101 Critical & Academic Thinking for Success 1-1-1:** This CATS 1101 course is the freshman seminar course at East Georgia State College. The course serves as a guide and support for students as they transition into college and develop their identity as student scholars. Methods of instruction include both discussion of key topics in class (thinking) and completion of assignments outside of class (doing). The required readings and class presentations guide students in their growth as scholars who pose problems, discover solutions, resolve controversies, evaluate knowledge, and use effective communication skills. The course includes a badging (passport/portfolio) activity that enables students to self-regulate and take responsibility for their learning and production of knowledge. Lab activities linked to the course provide students with a venue for the practice of critical thinking, student engagement, and effective communication. The course connects the new student to the resources and people on campus that can help the student be successful.

We should have provided a standard justification in column 4 of the Faculty Rosters for these six instructors in 2019 and regret not doing so. Following commonly accepted practices of FYE courses, EGSC’s credentialing guidelines for serving as an instructor of record in this course call for the instructor to possess at least a master’s degree, have experience teaching college students, have familiarity with EGSC’s academic and student support services, and have completed a professional development experience organized by FYE leadership at EGSC designed to facilitate instructional effectiveness in the advancement of the student success content of this course. All six of the EGSC faculty who taught CATS 1101 in 2019 met those expected academic qualifications, and justifications to that effect are now cited in their Faculty Rosters as follows:

1	2	3	4
NAME (F, P)	COURSES TAUGHT	ACADEMIC DEGREES & COURSEWORK	OTHER QUALIFICATIONS & COMMENTS
Altamirano, David (F)	CATS 1101: Critical & Academic Thinking for Success (1) (UN)  SOCI 1101: Introduction to Sociology (3) (UT)	Master's: Sociology /Social Work (Georgia Southern University, 2004)  Master's: M.A. Sociology (Georgia Southern University)	CATS 1101 is a one-credit First Year Experience course intended to follow commonly accepted national practices to help first-year students make a successful transition to college life and the rigors of a college education, in this instance at EGSC. Following commonly accepted practices of FYE courses, EGSC’s credentialing guidelines for serving as an

	<p>SOCI 2293: Intro to Marriage and Family (3) (UT)</p>	<p>Bachelor's: Sociology / Social Work (Georgia Southern University, 1996)</p> <p>Bachelor's: B.S. (Georgia Southern University)</p>	<p>instructor of record in this course call for at least a master’s degree, experience teaching college students, familiarity with EGSC’s academic and student support services, and completion of a professional development experience organized by FYE leadership at EGSC designed to facilitate instructional effectiveness in the advancement of the student success content of this course. This instructor meets all of those qualifications and has been a successful instructor of this course. He has taught at the college level for 12 years and has been involved with FYE at EGSC since 2016.</p>
<p>Cheek, Howard L. (F)</p>	<p>CATS 1101: Critical &amp; Academic Thinking for Success (1) (UN)</p> <p>COSP 1101: Correll Scholars Program Seminar (1) (UT)</p> <p>COSP 1102: Correll Scholars Program Seminar on State and Regional Issues (1) (UT)</p> <p>COSP 2101: Correll Scholars Program Seminar on National and International Issues (1) (UT)</p> <p>COSP 2102: Correll Schlrs Prgm Practicum (1) (UT)</p> <p>HIST 2111: U.S. History to 1865 (3) (UT)</p> <p>POLS 1101: American Government (3) (UT)</p> <p>POLS 2301:</p>	<p>Doctorate: Ph.D. Politics (The Catholic University of America, 1998)</p> <p>Master's: M.Div. (Duke University, 1994)</p> <p>Master's: Master of Public Affairs (Western Carolina University, 1988)</p>	<p>CATS 1101 is a one-credit First Year Experience course intended to follow commonly accepted national practices to help first-year students make a successful transition to college life and the rigors of a college education, in this instance at EGSC. Following commonly accepted practices of FYE courses, EGSC’s credentialing guidelines for serving as an instructor of record in this course call for at least a master’s degree, experience teaching college students, familiarity with EGSC’s academic and student support services, and completion of a professional development experience organized by FYE leadership at EGSC designed to facilitate instructional effectiveness in the advancement of the student success content of this course. Dr. Cheek is Professor of Political Science, the former Dean of the School of Humanities and Social Sciences, and the Director of the Correll Scholars Program at EGSC. He holds a PhD and has authored more than ten refereed scholarly books, dozens of scholarly articles in academic publications, and is a regular commentator on American politics and religion. He has a rich history of teaching and filling high level administrative posts at colleges and universities for decades. This instructor meets all those qualifications and has been a successful instructor of this course.</p>

	Comparative Politics (3) (UT)		
Howell, Jeffrey(F)	CATS 1101: Critical & Academic Thinking for Success (1) (UN) HIST 2111: Survey of U.S. History I (3) (UT) HIST 2112: Survey of U.S. History II (3) (UT) HIST 1121: Survey of World History I (3) (UT) HIST 1122: Survey of World History II (3) (UT) HIST 2200: Black History (3) (UT)	<b>Ph.D. in History, Mississippi State University, Starkville, 2013</b> <b>M.A. in History, Mississippi State University, Starkville, 2005</b> <b>M.A. in Divinity, Mid America Baptist Theological Seminary, Memphis, TN, 1993</b> <b>B.A. in History, University of Mississippi, Oxford, 1987</b>	CATS 1101 is a one-credit First Year Experience course intended to follow commonly accepted national practices to help first-year students make a successful transition to college life and the rigors of a college education, in this instance at EGSC. Following commonly accepted practices of FYE courses, EGSC's credentialing guidelines for serving as an instructor of record in this course call for at least a master's degree, experience teaching college students, familiarity with EGSC's academic and student support services, and completion of a professional development experience organized by FYE leadership at EGSC designed to facilitate instructional effectiveness in the advancement of the student success content of this course. Dr. Howell holds a PhD in History and is an Associate Professor at EGSC. He has published numerous refereed books and other publications in his discipline, and was awarded a Governor's Teaching Fellowship by the University of Georgia. He has taught college level history for more than a decade and is a frequent instructor of CATS 1101. This instructor meets all of those qualifications and has been a successful instructor of this course.
Nordan, Robert (F)	CATS 1101: Critical & Academic Thinking for Success (1) (UN) MUSC 1100: Music Appreciation (3) (UT)	Ed.D, in progress Higher Education Leadership and Management Walden University School of Education A.B.D. (November, 2017), Projected graduation: July 2020 M..A, 1982, Church Music, Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary B.M, 1978, Music Education, Valdosta State College	CATS 1101 is a one-credit First Year Experience course intended to follow commonly accepted national practices to help first-year students make a successful transition to college life and the rigors of a college education, in this instance at EGSC. Following commonly accepted practices of FYE courses, EGSC's credentialing guidelines for serving as an instructor of record in this course call for at least a master's degree, experience teaching college students, familiarity with EGSC's academic and student support services, and completion of a professional development experience organized by FYE leadership at EGSC designed to facilitate instructional effectiveness in the advancement of the student success content of this course. Mr. Nordan has

			served as the Assistant Director for FYE at EGSC Augusta and has successfully taught the CATS 1101 course since 2016. Beginning June 2020, he will assume the position of Director of First-Year Experience Program for EGSC. This instructor meets all of those qualifications and has been a successful instructor of this course.
Strickland, David (F)	CATS 1101: Critical & Academic Thinking for Success (1) (UN) SOCI 1101: Introduction to Sociology (3) (UT) SOCI 1160: Social Problems (3) (UT) SOCI 2293: Introduction to Marriage and Family (3) (UT)	M.S. in First-Year Studies, Kennesaw State University, 2018  Completed Coursework toward Doctoral Degree in Higher Education Administration, Georgia Southern University, 1998-2000,  M.A. in Sociology, Georgia Southern University, 1994  Graduate Studies in Education, Georgia Southern University, 1991-1992  Graduate Studies in Education, Fairleigh Dickinson University, 1990-1991  Graduate Studies in Education, Kent State University, 1987-1988  B.A., Southeastern University, Lakeland FL 1980	CATS 1101 is a one-credit First Year Experience course intended to follow commonly accepted national practices to help first-year students make a successful transition to college life and the rigors of a college education, in this instance at EGSC. Following commonly accepted practices of FYE courses, EGSC's credentialing guidelines for serving as an instructor of record in this course call for at least a master's degree, experience teaching college students, familiarity with EGSC's academic and student support services, and completion of a professional development experience organized by FYE leadership at EGSC designed to facilitate instructional effectiveness in the advancement of the student success content of this course. Professor Strickland has been the Director of the First-Year Experience (FYE) program for East Georgia State College for the past eight years. He is a tenured full professor with 25 years of teaching experience at the college level. He is recognized nationally as an authority on first-year programs and seminars and college success. His books on college success are used at about 100 universities, colleges, and community colleges in the United States, and he has been sought after as a program design and faculty training consultant for first-year programs. This instructor meets all of those qualifications and has been a successful instructor of this course.
Vess, Deborah (F)	CATS 1101: Critical & Academic Thinking for Success (1) (UN) ART 1100: Introduction to Art (3) (UT)	Ph.D. in European History University of North Texas, 1991  M.A. in Philosophy, University of Pittsburgh, 1980	CATS 1101 is a one-credit First Year Experience course intended to follow commonly accepted national practices to help first-year students make a successful transition to college life and the rigors of a college education, in this instance at EGSC. Following commonly accepted

	<p>HIST 2111: Survey of U.S. History I (3) (UT)                  HIST 2112: Survey of U.S. History II (3) (UT)                  HIST 1121: Survey of World History I (3) (UT)                  HIST 1122: Survey of World History II (3) (UT)                  MUSC 1100: Introduction to Music (3) (UT)</p>	<p>B.MUS. Pennsylvania State University, University Park, 1980.                   B.A. in Philosophy, Indiana University, Bloomington, 1979</p>	<p>practices of FYE courses, EGSC’s credentialing guidelines for serving as an instructor of record in this course call for at least a master’s degree, experience teaching college students, familiarity with EGSC’s academic and student support services, and completion of a professional development experience organized by FYE leadership at EGSC designed to facilitate instructional effectiveness in the advancement of the student success content of this course. Dr. Vess holds a PhD in European history and a Master’s degree in philosophy. She has a rich history of teaching and filling high level administrative posts, including Vice President of Academic Affairs, at several colleges and universities. She has a track record as a highly skilled educator with advanced knowledge of topics such as growth mindset, social belonging, retention, and persistence, which are very important for instructors of CATS 1101. She taught eight sections of CATS 1101 during Fall 2019 at EGSC Statesboro. This instructor meets all those qualifications and has been a successful instructor of this course.</p>
--	--	---	--

**Mr. David Altamirano:** Professor Altamirano has an M.A. in Sociology and has taught at the college level since 2008. He has been working with the CATS program in various capacities since serving on the First Class, First Year Experience Committee in 2016.

**Professor Strickland** has been the Director of the First-Year Experience (FYE) program for East Georgia State College for the past eight years. He is a tenured full professor with 25 years of teaching experience at the college level. He is recognized nationally as an authority on first-year programs and seminars and college success. His books on college success are used at about 100 universities, colleges, and community colleges in the United States, and he has been sought after as a program design and faculty training consultant for first-year programs.

**Mr. Nordan** has served as the Assistant Director for FYE at EGSC Augusta and has successfully taught the CATS 101 course since 2016. Beginning June 2020, he will assume the position of Director of First-Year Experience Program for EGSC.

**Dr. Cheek** is Professor of Political Science, the former Dean of the School of Humanities and Social Sciences, and the Director of the Correll Scholars Program at EGSC. He holds a PhD and has authored more than ten refereed scholarly books, dozens of scholarly articles in academic publications, and is a regular commentator on American politics and religion. He has a rich history of teaching and filling high level administrative posts at colleges and universities for decades.

**Dr. Howell** holds a PhD in History and is an Associate Professor at EGSC. He has published numerous refereed books and other publications in his discipline, and was awarded a Governor’s Teaching Fellowship by the University of Georgia. He has taught college level history for more than a decade and is a frequent instructor of CATS 1101.

**Dr. Vess** holds a PhD in European history and a Master’s degree in philosophy. She has a rich history of teaching and filling high level administrative posts, including Vice President of Academic Affairs, at several colleges and universities. She has a track record as a highly skilled educator with advanced knowledge of topics such as growth mindset, social belonging, retention, and persistence, which are very important for instructors of CATS 1101. She taught eight sections of CATS 1101 during Fall 2019 at EGSC Statesboro.

**OTHER QUESTIONED FACULTY ROSTERS**

**Mrs. Julie Strickland:** We regret that EGSC erred in not reporting previously key information in our Compliance Certification’s Faculty Roster for this valued faculty colleague. As an English Educator, her academic preparation, experience, and expertise are strong in the area of teaching English composition for first-year students. An in-depth analysis of her graduate transcript reveals that she has completed much more than a couple of related ENGL courses. When all of the graduate content courses in English, writing, and literature are taken into account as noted in her revised Faculty Roster below, she has 34 semester hours (including quarter hour equivalents) of academic coursework related to the composition courses she taught at EGSC in 2019. Twelve of those hours were earned post-master’s. Her faculty credentials exceed the minimums stated in the Commission’s Guidelines, and she is very well-qualified for the freshman composition courses she taught. Her corrected Faculty Roster reflects those strengths as follows: \_

1 NAME (F, P)	2 COURSES TAUGHT	3 ACADEMIC DEGREES & COURSEWORK	4 OTHER QUALIFICATIONS & COMMENTS
Strickland, Julie (F)	ENGL 0999: Support for English Composition I (1) (D) ENGL 1101: Composition I (3) (UT) ENGL 1102: Composition II (3) (UT)	Master's: M.Ed. (Georgia Southern University) English Education  Grad Sem Hrs in English & Writing: ENGL 7637 20 <sup>th</sup> C American Lit (3) ENGL 7635 19 <sup>th</sup> C American Lit (3) ENGL 5135G MG/HS Literature (3) WRIT 5130G Mod Engl Grammar (3) MSED 5333G Lit & Writing (3) WRIT 7260 GSU Writing Project (6) WRIT 7260 GSW Writing Project (6)	Mrs. Strickland’s related professional experience includes 6 years as a high school English teacher which is especially relevant to teaching the learning support/developmental ENGL 0999 course. She also has 12 years of experience teaching at the college level, primarily in remedial writing and freshman composition courses at Georgia Southern University, Ogeechee Technical College, and EGSC. Acceptance into her four summer writing project institute experiences were competitive and included a fellowship from the National Writing Center. Twelve of her Writing Project graduate semester hours were earned post-master’s, reflecting her strong commitment to continuing professional development as a composition instructor.



		Total Sem Hrs=27 SED 799 ASC Writing Project (5) SED 799 ASC Writing Project (5) Total Qtr Hrs=10  Bachelor's: B.A. (Oglethorpe University)English	
--	--	---	--

**Ms. Haley McPhail:** Ms. McPhail has a bachelor’s degree in English and three years of experience teaching English at the secondary school level, so she can reasonably be considered qualified to teach the ENGL 0999 learning support course.

1 NAME (F, P)	2 COURSES TAUGHT	3 ACADEMIC DEGREES & COURSEWORK	4 OTHER QUALIFICATIONS & COMMENTS
McPhail, Haley (P)	ENGL 0999: Support for English Composition I (1) (D)	Master's: M.A.Teaching (includes 3 credits Eng) (University of NC/Chapel Hill, 2002)  Bachelor's: B.A. English (Tennessee Tech University, 1999)	We regret that EGSC’s original Faculty Roster for this instructor did not include any supplemental justification to explain why she was qualified to teach ENGL 0999 with so little graduate work completed in English. First of all, we erred in not properly classifying ENGL 0999 as a D, developmental course, on her Roster. It was classified as an Undergraduate Nontransferable course instead which was incorrect. Developmental courses are typically not considered to be college-level and their completion is expected to make up for a lack of sufficient college-level preparation at the secondary education level. Accordingly, The EGSC catalog’s course listing for ENGL 0999 indicates that it is offered only for institutional credit. It is intended to be a remedial or developmental course in English composition (referred to as “learning support” in contemporary terms) and cannot be used to satisfy undergraduate degree completion requirements at EGSC. The Commission’s current Faculty Credentials Guidelines are silent relative to the expected qualifications of faculty who teach developmental courses. Under the Commission’s former <i>Criteria for Accreditation</i> which was replaced by the current <i>Principles of Accreditation</i> , faculty qualifications for remedial education were stated as follows: “Faculty members who

			<p>teach in remedial programs must hold a baccalaureate degree in a discipline related to their teaching assignment and have...teaching experience in a discipline related to their assignment....” Ms. McPhail has a bachelor’s degree in English and three years of experience teaching English at the secondary school level, so she can reasonably be considered qualified to teach the ENGL 0999 learning support course. Her corrected Faculty Roster is presented below. However, the issue is now moot. EGSC began linking ENGL 0999 courses to ENGL 1101 courses so that under-prepared students would be supported by the faculty member teaching the college-level course. The college was aware that Ms. McPhail was not qualified to teach ENGL 1101 with a master’s degree in education and so few graduate hours in English courses. As a result, she was thanked for her service and was not employed to teach for EGSC again.</p>
--	--	--	--

**Mr. Frederick Hundley:** Mr. Hundley holds a master’s degree in music education.

1	2	3	4
NAME (F, P)	COURSES TAUGHT	ACADEMIC DEGREES & COURSEWORK	OTHER QUALIFICATIONS & COMMENTS
Hundley, Frederick (P)	MUSC 1100: Music Appreciation (3) (UT)	D.S., Computer Technology in Education, Nova Southeastern University, 2002 M.Ed., Music Education, Georgia Southern University, 1993, B.M., School Music, Georgia Southern University, 1991,	Mr. Hundley’s qualifications for teaching music appreciation rest largely on his graduate coursework in Music as part of his master’s degrees in music education. We regret that the institution did not follow the Commission’s guidance and list his graduate semester credits in Music in the third column of his Faculty Roster previously submitted as part of the Compliance Certification. We had also failed to include as supporting documents his master’s degree transcripts which would have confirmed quickly that he has earned far more than the minimum of 18 semester hours of graduate credit in Music courses. He is well qualified to teach a general education course in music appreciation as the following corrected Faculty Roster for him attests and as is supported by his master’s degree transcript.

**Ms. Jessica Todd:** The Off-Site Committee found her to be compliant for teaching English and Spanish courses with her two M.A. degrees in those fields, but questioned her qualifications for teaching the elementary course in French. We regret that EGSC did not document her graduate semester hours completed in French at the University of Georgia where she intends to complete a M.A. degree in French by the end of 2020. Her UGA transcript at the end of Spring Semester 2020 indicates that she has completed 20+ graduate hours in French. Her vita contains an extensive list of essays, research papers and presentations written in the French language, attesting to her competence to teach an introductory course in French. She is well qualified to teach that course as her corrected Faculty Roster below attests.

1	2	3	4
NAME (F, P)	COURSES TAUGHT	ACADEMIC DEGREES & COURSEWORK	OTHER QUALIFICATIONS & COMMENTS
Todd, Jessica (F)	ENGL 1101: Composition I (3) (UT)  ENGL 1102: Composition II (3) (UT)  FREN 1001: Elementary French I (3) (UT)  SPAN 1001: Elementary Spanish I (3) (UT)	Online Teaching Certification, University of Georgia, Athens, GA <i>In progress.</i>  M.A. French, University of Georgia, Athens, GA , <i>In progress.</i>  M.A. Spanish, Georgia Southern University, Statesboro, GA., 2010  M.A. English, Georgia Southern University, Statesboro, GA , 2004  B.A. English, Georgia Southern University, Statesboro, GA, 2002	Ms. Todd has a master's degree and sufficient graduate semester hours earned in French to teach FREN 1001. Her vita contains an extensive list of essays, research papers and presentations written in the French language, which also attests to her competence to teach an introductory course in French.

**Dr. David Chevalier:** Dr. Chevalier earned all three of his degrees in Plant Biology and Botany in France and Switzerland.

1	2	3	4
NAME (F, P)	COURSES TAUGHT	ACADEMIC DEGREES & COURSEWORK	OTHER QUALIFICATIONS & COMMENTS
Chevalier, David (F)	BIOL 1103: Introduction to Biology I (UT) BIOL 1103L: Introductory Biology I Lab (1)	Doctorate: Ph.D. in Botany (University of Zurich (Switzerland), 2002)	Dr. Chevalier earned all three of his degrees in Plant Biology and Botany in France and Switzerland. Botany is a recognized specialty area and branch of the teaching discipline of Biology. Consequently, he held a Post-doctoral Fellow in the Biological Sciences Division of the

	(UT) BIOL 1104: Introduction to Biology II (U) BIOL 3200: Genetics (4) (UT) BIOL 3400: Cell Biology (U) BIOL 3460: Plant Biology (4) (UT) BIOL 1104L: Introductory Biology II Lab (1) (UT)	Master's: M.S. Plant Biology (University of Montpellier (France), 1997)  Bachelor's: B.S. Plant Biology and Physiology (University of Tours (France), 1996)	University of Missouri for four years. For the past twelve years he has successfully taught a wide range of lower division, upper division, and graduate Biology courses at Mississippi State University and EGSC. His vitae documents that he has published numerous research papers in biological journals and has been a successful grant writer for NSF funding. The Off-Site Committee did not question his qualifications for teaching three different upper division courses in Biology, for which the lower division introductory lab courses in Biology are prerequisites. The absence of transcripts from respected European universities which do not produce such documents should not be a determining factor of his qualifications to teach introductory Biology courses given his extensive academic and professional accomplishments in the field of Biology.
--	---	---	---

**Mr. Jason Lee:** Mr. Lee’s academic credentials include more than the minimum number of graduate semester hours in the related science fields of Biology, Chemistry, Physics and Physical Science.

1	2	3	4
NAME (F, P)	COURSES TAUGHT	ACADEMIC DEGREES & COURSEWORK	OTHER QUALIFICATIONS & COMMENTS
Lee, Jason C (F)	BIOL 1103: Introduction to Biology I (3) (UT) BIOL 1103L: Introductory Biology I Lab (1) (UT) ISCI 1101: Integrated Science (4) (UT)	Master's: M.Ed. in Broadfield Science Education (Armstrong Atlantic State University, 2002)  Graduate Sem Hrs in the Sciences Montana State University BIOL 6000 Spec. Topics in Biology (2) PHYS 7020 Physics for Sec. Sci. Tchrs (3) SCED 7990 Spec. Topics in Sci Ed (3) Armstrong Atlantic State University SCED 7990 Spec. Topic: Chem for Tchrs (3) PHSC 7640 Phys. Sci. for Sec. Tchrs (4)	Mr. Lee is qualified to teach the Integrated Science courses having earned over 18 credits in various science fields including Biology, Chemistry, Physics, and Physical Science. The content of ISCI 1101 is described in the catalog as a multi-disciplinary course for non-science majors. Students are introduced to fundamental principles of astronomy, biology, chemistry, geology, and physics. The course will focus on the scientific method and critical thinking and will include written laboratory exercises. Mr. Lee’s academic credentials include more than the minimum number of graduate semester hours in the related science fields of Biology, Chemistry, Physics and Physical Science. He taught in these broadfield sciences for 12 years as a secondary school science teacher and has been a successful integrated science instructor at EGSC for 10 years. By virtue of this extensive professional experience and sufficient academic preparation, he is qualified to teach ISCI 1101 He also has significant credentials in Biology.

	<p>PHSC 7641 Phys. Sci. II for Sec. Tchrs (4) Total SCH in the Sciences =19</p> <p>Bachelor's: Biology (Armstrong Atlantic State University, 1995)</p>	<p>His credential and experience are summarized in Lee Jason C Biology Education Teaching and Training Experience.</p> <p>Jason Lee taught as a part-time faculty member at the time of the College's previous decennial review and is listed on the EGSC Faculty from Prior Review Form 2020.</p>
--	--	--

**Dr. Robert Marsh:** Dr. Marsh has considerable credentials as detailed below that qualify him to teach Math.

1	2	3	4
NAME (F, P)	COURSES TAUGHT	ACADEMIC DEGREES & COURSEWORK	OTHER QUALIFICATIONS & COMMENTS
<p>Marsh, Robert (F)</p>	<p>MATH 0999: College Algebra Support (1) (D) MATH 1111: College Algebra (3) (UT) MATH 1113: Pre-Calculus (3) (UT) MATH 1401: Elementary Statistics (3) (UT) MATH 1540: Calculus I (4) (UT) MATH 2012: Calculus II (4) (UT)</p>	<p>Doctorate: Ed.D. in Curriculum Studies (Georgia Southern University, 2010)</p> <p>Master's: MBA in Business (Georgia Southern University, 2001)</p> <p>Master's: M.S. in Nuclear Engineering (Georgia Institute Technology, 1990)</p> <p>Graduate Courses/Sem Hrs In/related to MATH</p> <p><i>9 graduate semester hours in mathematics. Transcripts from Georgia Institute of Technology show 13 graduate hours in mathematics or mathematics-related courses. The courses are Math 4583 – Vector Analysis; NE 6125 – Calculations on Digital Computers II; Math 4320 – Complex Analysis; and NE 6105 – Analysis of Experimental Data.</i></p>	<p>The rationale for accepting credentials of Dr. Marsh as a mathematics instructor in the 2010 SACSCOC decennial review and presented anew here include 3 years of full-time teaching experience at Georgia Southern University. Courses taught include college algebra and calculus. That rationale remains the case today. In addition, he has another decade of successful teaching experience in his mathematics course assignments.</p> <p>Dr. Marsh taught as a full-time faculty member at the time of the College's previous decennial review and is listed on the EGSC Faculty from Prior Review Form 2020.</p>

		<p><i>In addition, the transcript from Georgia Southern University shows 15 graduate hours in mathematics or mathematics-related courses. The courses are Mgnt 6330 – Quantitative Methods in Business; Finc 7231 – Financial Problems; Mgnt 7331 – Problem Solving with Quantitative Methods; Esed 8539 – Computer Technology in Math/Science Education; and Math 7236 – Advanced Ordinary Differential Equations.</i></p> <p>19 graduate semester hours in major Total Sem Hrs = 28</p> <p>Bachelor's: B.S. Nuclear Engineering (Georgia Institute of Technology, 1988)</p> <p>Bachelor's: B.B.A Information Systems (Georgia Southern University, 2002)</p> <p>Associate's: A.A. General Studies (East Georgia State College)</p>	
--	--	--	--

**Ms. Marvalisa Payne:**

Professor Payne has a M.S. in Mathematics as reported on the Faculty Roster, considered sufficient to justify teaching undergraduate and developmental courses in MATH.

1	2	3	4
NAME (F, P)	COURSES TAUGHT	ACADEMIC DEGREES & COURSEWORK	OTHER QUALIFICATIONS & COMMENTS
Payne, Marvalisa (P)	MATH 0997: Quantitative Skills and Reasoning Support (1) (D) MATH 1001: Quantitative Skills and Reasoning (3) (UT)	Master's: M.S. Mathematics (University of Tennessee)  Bachelor's: B.A. Mathematics (Oberlin College)  Bachelor's: B.S.	Normally, when a M.S. in Mathematics is reported on the Faculty Roster, it is considered sufficient to justify teaching undergraduate and developmental courses in MATH. The Resource Manual for 6.2.a states that, "Transcripts for faculty should be available during on-site reviews (as requested by

	<p>MATH 1101: Quantitative Skills and Reasoning (3) (UT)                  MATH 1540: Calculus I (4) (UT)</p>	<p>Mathematics (Augusta State University)</p>	<p>reviewers) but are not required to be part of the documentation provided as part of the Compliance Certification....” Nevertheless, EGSC attempted to provide transcript access to the Off-Site Committee if needed in its review of compliance. Unfortunately, an error was made by EGSC in this regard, and the transcript which was linked to her master’s degree was for her bachelor’s degree from Augusta State University instead of her master’s from University of Tennessee. The latter is now provided here, and it validates that she was awarded a M.S. in Mathematics in 2005 and has completed 36 graduate semester hours of coursework in mathematics. She is qualified for her teaching assignments in 2019 at EGSC, and the substance of her previously submitted Faculty Roster is unchanged.</p>
--	--	---	---

**Dr. Timothy Tolentino:**

Dr. Tolentino’s Bioengineering graduate degrees from Georgia Institute of Technology were cited as deficient in chemistry coursework to teach introductory general education courses in chemistry by the Off-Campus Committee. EGSC officials concur with that assessment. Dr. Tolentino was an “as needed” part-time faculty member who is no longer employed by East Georgia College to teach such courses. The corrected Faculty Roster for him is as follows:

1	2	3	4
NAME (F, P)	COURSES TAUGHT	ACADEMIC DEGREES & COURSEWORK	OTHER QUALIFICATIONS & COMMENTS
<p>Tolentino, Timothy (P)</p>	<p>CHEM 1211: Principles of Chemistry I (U)</p>	<p>Doctorate: Ph.D. Bioengineering (Georgia Institute of Technology, 2007)                       Master's: M.S. Bioengineering (Georgia Institute of Technology, 2002)                       Graduate Sem Hrs in Chem/Chem Engr                      CHEM 6531 Molecular Biochem (3)                      CHE 6003 Chem Process Safety (1)                      CHE 6200 Transport Phenomena (3)</p>	<p>EGSC’s officials concur with the Off-Site Committee’s finding that Dr. Tolentino has earned too few graduate semester hours in chemistry or chemical engineering to be considered qualified to teach undergraduate courses in chemistry. His part-time faculty employment will not continue at EGSC for that purpose.</p>

		CHEM 6501 Biochemistry I (3) Total Sem Hrs=10  Bachelor's: B.S. Chemistry (Georgia Southern University, 1998)	
--	--	--	--

**Ms. Lisa Yocco:** We regret that EGSC did not highlight this instructor’s achievements and expertise in mathematics more strongly in her previous Faculty Roster. We failed to list her graduate semester hours of earned credit in mathematics which total over 30.

1	2	3	4
NAME (F, P)	COURSES TAUGHT	ACADEMIC DEGREES & COURSEWORK	OTHER QUALIFICATIONS & COMMENTS
Yocco, Lisa(F)	MATH 0998: Math Modeling Support (1) (D) MATH 0999: College Algebra Support (1) (D) MATH 1101: Quantitative Skills and Reasoning (3) (UT) MATH 1111: College Algebra (3) (UT) MATH 1113: Pre-Calculus (3) (UT) MATH 1232: Survey of Calculus (3) (UT)	Master's: M.S. Mathematics Education (Florida State University) Graduate Sem Hrs in MATH  Total Sem Hrs in Math= over 30 credits.  Bachelor's: B.S. Mathematics (Augusta College) Math 480 Introduction to Applications for Math teachers Math 560 Elementary Topology STS 510 Statistics Behavior Science <b>GSU – Doctoral Program</b> MAT 780 02 Math Applications Using Tech MATH 5234G Number Theory EDR 761 02 Introductory Statistics <b>University of Florida Master’s in Math</b> Math 445 Intermediate Calculus Math 441 Introductory Set Theory  <b>Armstrong State College Master’s in Mathematics</b>	Ms. Yocco also has 35 years of experience teaching undergraduate mathematics: Developmental Algebra, Business Math, College Algebra, Math Modeling, Quantitative Skills and Reasoning, Trigonometry, Pre-Calculus, Statistics, Survey of Calculus, Calculus. Ms. Yocco’s experience with the teaching of math can also be seen in her publication of this text, through five editions: Harshbarger, Ronald J., Yocco, Lisa S., College Algebra in Context with Applications for the Managerial, Life, and Social Sciences, 6 <sup>th</sup> edition, Pearson Addison Wesley Publishing Company, 697 pp., 2017. She has also published this supplemental guide, through seven editions: Yocco, Lisa S., and Harshbarger, Ronald J., Graphing Calculator Guide: <i>Easy Steps to Success</i> , to accompany <i>Mathematical Applications for the Managerial, Life, and Social Sciences</i> , Seventh Edition, by Harshbarger/Reynolds, Boston: Cengage Publishing Company, 2009. Ms. Yocco’s impressive academic preparation, her extensive experience in teaching a vast array of college-level math courses, and her proved ability to communicate the teaching of math as seen in her publications justify her teaching all the math courses offered at EGSC up through and including the Survey of Calculus.



		Math 550 Principles of Computer Science <b>Portland State University Summer Institute</b> CI 810 Summer Institute Technology in Math <b>Colorado State University Summer Institute</b> <b>Valdosta State University Summer Institute</b>	
--	--	--	--

**Dr. Edward Bayens:** In February 2019, a new Dean of Humanities and Social Sciences was hired by EGSC. Analysis of Dr. Edward Bayens’ credentials for SACSCOC reaccreditation by his assistant discovered that he was scheduled by the previous Dean, and was teaching, three PSYC 1101 General Psychology courses without proper credentials. His schedule for the Fall was changed to two sections of SOCI 1101 Introduction of Sociology for which his assistant said he was qualified. However, as a result of the analysis of credentials conducted this past academic year, the new Dean discovered that Dr. Bayens’ credentials for teaching Sociology – which did include some valuable graduate course work and constructive work experience – were not strong enough to continue hiring Dr. Bayens as a part-time instructor for those courses either. He has not been assigned courses for Fall 2019 and will not be assigned classes in either discipline again. His corrected Faculty Roster is as follows:

1	2	3	4
NAME (F, P)	COURSES TAUGHT	ACADEMIC DEGREES & COURSEWORK	OTHER QUALIFICATIONS & COMMENTS
Bayens, Edward J (P)	PSYC 1101: General Psychology (3) (UT) SOCI 1101: Introduction to Sociology (3) (UT)	Doctorate: Ph.D. Higher Education (Florida State University, 1987)  Master's: M.A. Student Personnel Services in Higher Education (Western Kentucky University, 1975) Graduate Sem Hrs Related to Psychology CNS ED 558SCNS ED 560H CNS ED 664 CNS ED 552 CNS ED 554 CNS ED 674 Total Hrs in Psychology= 18 Graduate Sem hrs in Sociology SOCLGY 545 – 3 SOCLGY 530G - 3 Total Hrs in Sociology= 6  Bachelor's: Mass	After an in-depth analysis of his graduate transcripts, EGSC has determined that he does not have sufficient graduate coursework in Psychology-related studies or Sociology to justify these teaching assignments. He was an “as needed” part-time faculty member who was not rehired to teach these courses after Spring 2020.

		Communications (Western Kentucky University, 1971)	
--	--	--	--

**Mr. Larry Braddy:** Mr. Braddy could have been listed on a Faculty from Prior Review Form when the Compliance Certification was submitted since he was at EGSC during the last reaffirmation ten years ago with the same credentials and teaching assignments. Prior Review was not claimed earlier, however, and the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee has cited him as not having previously shown 18 graduate credits related to two of his four teaching assignments in Psychology—Intro to Psychology (PSYC 1101) and Human Growth and Development (2103). EGSC officials regret not listing his substantial completed graduate coursework related to psychology in his previously submitted Faculty Roster, thinking perhaps that the relatedness of his master’s in counseling to psychology would be sufficiently obvious. But the master’s degree is in education, an M.Ed., so we now understand that listing his 18 related hours of graduate coursework is commonly expected in the Faculty Roster. That correction has been made in the revised Faculty Roster below. Clearly, Mr. Braddy’s master’s degree in counseling has major areas of content overlap with the field of Psychology and the courses in Psychology that he teaches. The Off-Site Committee confirmed that when it accepted his education counseling Psychology credentials for teaching courses in Psychological Adjustment (PSYC 2101) and the Psychology of Abnormal Behavior (PSYC 2002) and said that we “might be able to provide strong justification for psychology.” Unfortunately, no justification had been provided in column 4 previously. We now argue that psychological counselors not only must deal with deviant behavior but also related issues of normal Human Growth and Development, so he has competence for teaching that course as well. We also argue that this is largely a counseling psychology degree program with very little content focus on issues of teaching or education pedagogy, so the depth of study in Psychology is sufficient to include acquired expertise for teaching the Introduction to Psychology. All of the courses in this program have the discipline label ECP—Education Counseling Psychology. In the revised Faculty Roster below, 23 graduate semester hour equivalents were earned in an ECP concentration related to the teaching field of Psychology, which is substantially more than the expected minimum of 18 with any master’s degree which is in compliance with the Commission’s Faculty Credential Guidelines.

1	2	3	4
NAME (F, P)	COURSES TAUGHT	ACADEMIC DEGREES & COURSEWORK	OTHER QUALIFICATIONS & COMMENTS
Braddy, Larry (F)	PSYC 1101: General Psychology (3) (UT) PSYC 2101: Psychological Adjustment (3) (UT) PSYC 2102: Psychology of Abnormal Behavior (3) (UT) PSYC 2103: Human Growth and Development (3) (UT)	Master's: M.Ed. in Rehabilitation Counseling (University of Georgia, 1981)  Grad Qtr Hrs Related to PSYC ECP 701 Ind Appraisal (5) ECP 888 Counseling (5) ECP 980 Practicum (5) ECP 765 App Proj Couns (5) ECP 901 Vocational Devel (5) ECP 600 Spec Problems (10) Total Quarter Hrs = 35	Mr. Braddy’s master’s degree in counseling has major areas of content overlap with the field of psychology and the courses in psychology that he teaches. The Off-Site Committee confirmed that when it accepted his education counseling psychology credentials for teaching courses in Psychological Adjustment (PSYC 2101) and the Psychology of Abnormal Behavior (PSYC 2002) and said that we “might be able to provide strong justification for psychology.” Unfortunately, no justification had been provided in the previous version of this Faculty Roster. We now argue that psychological counselors not only must deal with deviant behavior but also related issues of normal Human Growth and Development, so he has competence for

		<p>Sem Equivalents = 23</p> <p>Bachelor's: Business Management (Mercer University, 1983)</p> <p>Bachelor's: Political Science (University of Georgia, 1969)</p>	<p>teaching that course as well. We also argue that this is largely a counseling psychology degree program with very little content focus on issues of teaching or education pedagogy, so the depth of study in psychology is sufficient to include acquired expertise for teaching the introduction to psychology. All of the courses in this program have the discipline label ECP— Education Counseling Psychology. In the revised Faculty Roster below, 23 graduate semester hour equivalents were earned in an ECP concentration related to the teaching field of psychology which is substantially more than the expected minimum of 18 with any master's degree which is in compliance with the Commission's Faculty Credential Guidelines.</p> <p>Larry Braddy was a full-time faculty member at the time of the College's previous decennial review and is listed on the EGSC Faculty from Prior Review Form 2020.</p>
--	--	---	---

**Dr. James A. Brady:** Dr. Brady earned a Master of Arts in Communication from Duquesne University in 1986, as indicated in the following table. Regrettably, another person name Bradley's MA transcript was linked to Dr. Brady's name in the *Compliance Certification*. This error has been corrected.

1	2	3	4
NAME (F, P)	COURSES TAUGHT	ACADEMIC DEGREES & COURSEWORK	OTHER QUALIFICATIONS & COMMENTS
Brady, James A (F)	COMM 1110: Public Speaking (3) (UT)	<p>Doctorate: Ed.D. in Ethical Leadership (Ovlivet Nazarene University, 2017)</p> <p>Master's: Master of Arts in Communication (Duquesne University, 1986)</p> <p>Bachelor's: B.A. Political Science &amp; History (University of Pittsburgh, 1984)</p>	We regret for mistakenly presenting a master's degree awarded to a Mr. Bradley as the master's degree for Dr. Brady. Dr. Brady's master's degree has replaced the incorrect posting.

**Ms. Sue Bragg:** Ms. Bragg has a B.S. in Sociology and a Masters in Social Work. Her Social Work graduate degree included many courses that covered material normally taught in Sociology also as presented in her revised roster.

1	2	3	4
NAME (F, P)	COURSES TAUGHT	ACADEMIC DEGREES & COURSEWORK	OTHER QUALIFICATIONS & COMMENTS
Bragg, Susan (F)	SOC 1101: Introduction to Sociology (3) (UT) SOC 1160: Social Problems (3) (UT)	Master's: M.S.W. Social Work (Savannah State University) Graduate Credits Related to SOC 1160 MSWK 6660 SWK Practice Indiv./Families (5) MSWK 6752 Crisis Intervention (3) Social Welfare Policy – 3 credits Social Environment I – 3 credits Social Environment II – 3 credits Child Adolescents and Family – 3 credits  Total Related Sem Hrs=20 BS. In Sociology, Georgia Southern University, 2001	Sociology and Social Work have some disciplinary overlap, but we now understand that they are commonly considered separate academic fields of study. As the Off-Site Committee suggested, the content of the Social Problems course (SOC 160) is an area where sufficient overlap with academic preparation in social work exists and could be justified. The catalog description for that course states: “SOC 1160 Social Problems deals with the major social problems in society from the sociological perspective. Emphasis is placed upon identifying the problems in order that they can be dealt with constructively.” The 20 semester hours of social work courses completed by Ms. Bragg as recorded in the corrected Faculty Roster below are clearly social-problems oriented, intervention-oriented, and therefore sufficiently related to the sociological content of this course. A statement of justification is added to that effect in column 4 of the revised Faculty Roster below. For similar academic reasons, she could be justified teaching SOC 2293, Introduction to Marriage and Family, in the future. However, as the Off-Site Committee suggested, the sociological theories and constructs found in the Introduction to Sociology course would normally be different from social work practice theories and constructs, making it more difficult to justify Bragg’s teaching that course without having completed any graduate coursework in Sociology, but she has successfully taught sociology courses with EGSC since 2013 with excellent evaluations.

**Mr. Dwayne Brown:** Mr. Brown is well qualified to teach Sociology. Prior to teaching at EGSC, Mr. Dwyane Brown taught Sociology courses at the University of Phoenix-Augusta Campus from 2006-2014. He also taught Sociology courses at Southern Wesleyan University-North Augusta, SC, from 2012-2019.

1 NAME (F, P)	2 COURSES TAUGHT	3 ACADEMIC DEGREES & COURSEWORK	4 OTHER QUALIFICATIONS & COMMENTS
Brown, Dewayne N. (P)	PSYC 1101: General Psychology (3) (UT) SOC 1101: Introduction to Sociology (3) (UT)	Master's: M.S. Human Services (Walden University, 2017)  Master's: M.Ed. Counseling & Psychology (Troy University, 2013)  Master's: Human Relations (University of Oklahoma, 2001)  Total Sem Hrs = 18+  Bachelor's: Health Care Management (Southern Illinois University, 1999)	The Off-Site Committee questioned his qualifications to teach the Introduction to Sociology because of the lack of any evidence that graduate coursework had been completed in Sociology. After completing an in-depth analysis of all of his graduate transcripts, EGSC officials concur with the Off-Site Committee's observation that he lacks substantial graduate coursework in Sociology but he does have other noteworthy credentials to be qualified to teach SOCI 1101. Prior to teaching at EGSC, Mr. Brown taught Sociology Courses at the University of Phoenix-Augusta Campus, from 2006-2014. He also taught Sociology courses at Southern Wesleyan University-North Augusta, SC, from 2012-Present. He is qualified to teach psychology courses having completed over 18 graduate semester hours of coursework in psychology as identified in this corrected Faculty Roster

**Dr. Roger Byrd:** Dr. Byrd is well qualified to teach Political Science after doing so for 15 years at Brewton – Parker College and 7 years at East Georgia State College, as well as working with adult education for 11 years at Oconee Fall Line Technical College.

1 NAME (F, P)	2 COURSES TAUGHT	3 ACADEMIC DEGREES & COURSEWORK	4 OTHER QUALIFICATIONS & COMMENTS
Byrd, Roger (P)	POLS 1101: American Government (3) (UT)	Doctorate: Ed.D. Leadership (Valdosta State University)  Master's: M.P.A. Public Admin. (Valdosta State University) M.S. Criminal Justice(Valdosta State University) Graduate Sem Hrs Related to POLS PADM 7140 Govt Budgeting (3) PADM 7170 Org Theory/Behavior (3) PADM 7240 Community Based Org (3)	Dr. Roger Byrd is well qualified to teach Political Science after doing so for 15 years at Brewton – Parker College and 7 years at East Georgia State College, as well as working with adult education for 11 years at Oconee Fall Line Technical College. There are also many public administration courses he has taken in his M.P.A. that correlate with his teaching and represent common content for the two different but related fields of study in Political Science and Public Administration. We regret that we did not previously list his 18 graduate semester hours of coursework completed which are related to the field of political science or provide a statement of justification in his earlier

		<p>PADM 7190 Public Policy Form (3)                  PADM 7370 Comparative Pub Policy (3)                  PADM 7060 Quantitative Methods (3)                  Total Sem Hrs = 18                  B.S. Political Science (Brewton-Parker College)</p>	<p>Faculty Roster. Most importantly, we failed to cite his practical experience with government as an elected member of the Georgia House of Representatives for 22 years and serving as the Chief of Staff to the Office of the Speaker of the Georgia House of Representatives for two years which gives Dr. Byrd a real-world political perspective and experience in American government that college students need. He is a member of the Georgia Political Science Association, and due to his deep understanding of and expertise in his field, he is regularly called upon to comment on American Politics at varied venues and conferences.</p>
--	--	--	--

**Dr. H. Lee Cheek, Jr. (also cited above regarding CATS 1101):** Dr. H. Lee Cheek, Jr. is professionally prepared to teach HIST 2111 U.S. History to 1865 as the result of his education, professional publications, contribution to scholarly publications, and professional associations.

1	2	3	4
NAME (F, P)	COURSES TAUGHT	ACADEMIC DEGREES & COURSEWORK	OTHER QUALIFICATIONS & COMMENTS
<p>Cheek, Howard Lee (F)</p>	<p>CATS 1101: Critical &amp; Academic Thinking for Success (1) (UT)                  COSP 1101: Correll Scholars Program Seminar (1) (UT)                  COSP 1102: Correll Scholars Program Seminar on State and Regional Issues (1) (UT)                  COSP 2101: Correll Scholars Program Seminar on National and International Issues (1) (UT)                  COSP 2102: Correll Schlrs Prgm Practicum (1) (UT)</p>	<p>Doctorate: Ph.D. Politics (The Catholic University of America, 1998)                  Master's: M.Div. (Duke University, 1994)                  Master's: Master of Public Affairs (Western Carolina University, 1988)                  Graduate Sem Hrs In/Related to History                  HIST 534 The American South (3)                  HIST 680 Readings in History (3)                  Total Sem Hrs = 6                  Bachelor's: B.A. in Political Science &amp; History (Western Carolina University)</p>	<p>Dr. Cheek holds a Ph.D. in politics, with a general focus on American political development, and with a particular concentration on Nineteenth-Century America. Cheek is the author of the forthcoming <u>Recovering the American Founding</u> (Notre Dame University Press, 2022), a book that is a study of the historical development of the Early Republic. He is the editor of <u>Patrick Henry-Onslow Debate: Republicanism and Liberty in American Political Thought</u> (Lanham, Maryland: Lexington Books, 2013 [with Carey M. Roberts and Sean R. Busick (and both of the co-authors are historians)]), a series of historical texts with commentary, which has been reviewed exclusively in historical journals. Dr. Cheek is also the author or editor of numerous other works that are in the field of or closely related to America historical studies including John C. Calhoun's <u>A Disquisition on Government</u> (South Bend, Indiana: St.</p>

	<p>HIST 2111: U.S. History to 1865 (3) (UT)                  POLS 1101: American Government (3) (UT)                  POLS 2301: Comparative Politics (3) (UT)</p>		<p>Augustine’s Press, 2007; second edition, 2016 [Edited and supplied historical and critical introduction]); <u>Calhoun: Selected Writings and Speeches</u> (Washington, D.C.: Regnery Books, 2003); and his most well-known work, <u>Calhoun and Popular Rule</u> (Columbia and London: University of Missouri Press, June 2001, a work that was either a finalist or semi-finalist for numerous historical organization awards, including The Genovese Award, The Historical Society (finalist); the Merle Curti Award in Intellectual History, Organization of American Historians (nominated); and the D. B. Hardeman Prize, Lyndon Baines Johnson Foundation (nominated) [partial list].</p> <p>As a journal and manuscript referee in the field of American history, Cheek’s contribution has been solicited from and provided to University of Kentucky Press, Continuum Books, <u>Journal of Social History</u>, <u>Fides et Historia</u>, Lexington Books, and the University of Missouri Press. As a book reviewer, Cheek has contributed to <u>Choice</u> (five reviews per year), <u>History: Review of New Books</u>, and his <i>editorial advisory board</i> assignments include <u>Studies in Burke</u>, as well as other historically-related journals.</p>
--	--	--	--

**Dr. John Giebfried:** Dr.Giebfried’s\_degrees, work, and teaching in history have prepared him well in his discipline. Missing from the sources available to the Off-Site Committee was Dr. Giebfried's doctoral transcript.

1	2	3	4
NAME (F, P)	COURSES TAUGHT	ACADEMIC DEGREES & COURSEWORK	OTHER QUALIFICATIONS & COMMENTS
Giebfried, John (F)	HIST 1121: Survey of Western Civilization I (3) (UT) HIST 1122: Survey of Western	Doctorate: PhD History (Saint Louis University, 2015)  Master's: M.A. in Crusader Studies (University of Toronto, 2010)	Dr. Giebfried’s graduate degrees in history appear to have concentrated entirely on early Western World/European history. Consequently, the Off-Site Committee found his teaching assignments in HIST 1121 and 1122 (Western Civilization) to be justified, and they were not

	Civilization II (3) (UT) HIST 2112: U.S. History since 1865 (3) (UT)	Bachelor's: B.A. in History (St. Francis Xavier University)	questioned. However, his apparent lack of graduate coursework in U.S. history in addition to what he may have completed in his undergraduate degree program, was cited as questionable. Upon further review of his graduate academic credentials, professional experience, and scholarship achievements, EGSC officials found that Dr. John Giebfried has significant undergraduate course work in U.S. history which qualified him to work as a curatorial intern for the U.S. History Museum where he transcribed historical documents. A voracious reader of U.S. history texts, plus 29 credit hours of teaching U.S. history courses with exceptional teaching evaluations at two USG institutions, has further qualified Dr. Giebfried to teach the introductory survey U.S. history courses. He has not been, nor will he be, utilized for our upper level U.S. history course offerings.
--	---	---	--

**Mr. Ronald Hassan:** Mr. Hassan has 14 years experience as an Instructional Designer and Manager of the Maryland Fire & Rescue Institute at the University of Maryland, College Park, overseeing the fire certification system for entire state. This important role and numerous other qualifications presented in the Qualifications and Comment column below make Mr. Hassan an eminent member of EGSC's FESA faculty. His corrected Faculty Roster follows:

1	2	3	4
NAME (F, P)	COURSES TAUGHT	ACADEMIC DEGREES & COURSEWORK	OTHER QUALIFICATIONS & COMMENTS
Hassan, Ronald (P)	FESA 2101: Principles of Emergency Services (3) (UT) FESA 2105: Building Construction for Fire Protection (3) (UT)	Master's: M.S. Human Resource Development (Towson University, 2005)  Bachelor's: B.S. Fire Science and Industrial Safety (University of Maryland, 1990)	EGSC officials regret not having cited Mr. Hassan's exceptional professional experience and career accomplishments in the field of fire protection and emergency services in his previously submitted Faculty Roster with the Compliance Certification. He is extremely well-qualified to teach in EGSC's FESA degree programs. Graduate degree opportunities in this field are rare, and he lacks such credentials, but his professional experience, national certifications, and scholarship achievements in the field serve as strong justifications for his FESA teaching assignments at EGSC.










		<p>After 20 years of certified professional service with Maryland’s Prince George’s County Fire/EMS Department, he retired as Battalion Chief in 2005. During the following 14 years, he was an Instructional Designer and Manager of the Maryland Fire &amp; Rescue Institute at the University of Maryland, College Park, overseeing the fire certification system for entire state. In 2000, he completed the Executive Fire Officer Program at the National Fire Academy. For the last seven years he has been an Instructor at the National Fire Academy teaching, <i>21<sup>st</sup> Century Training for FIRE and EMS Training Officers</i> and <i>Contemporary Training Concepts in Fire/EMS</i> utilizing student-centered learning, flipped classrooms, and online educational technology to train emergency services professionals from across the country. Presently he is also the Training Coordinator for the International Association of Firefighters.</p>
--	--	---










**NOTE: Nine additional faculty were subsequently listed on the Committee’s Request for Justifying and Documenting Qualifications of Faculty, but those listings were duplicative of those already addressed above.**

**CONCLUSION**

EGSC thanks the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee for identifying those of its faculty who required more complete documentation of their qualifications and/or justifications for the courses they are assigned to teach. Where requested, missing transcripts have been added and justifications have been presented. In the few cases that course assignments based on faculty qualifications cannot be justified, those faculty will no longer be assigned to teach those courses. EGSC faculty are qualified to teach the courses they are assigned in each of the College’s educational programs.

**Sources**

-  EGSC Expectations for Teaching Qualifications
  -  EGSC Faculty Qualifications Profile and Authorized Course Assignment Parameters
  -  EGSC Non-Compliant Faculty Course Assignment Practices
  -  SACSCOC Faculty Credential Guidelines
  -  SACSCOC Resource Manual 6.2.a Faculty Qualifications
-  Brady James DU Masters Transcript
-  EGSC Faculty Credentials Policy

-  EGSC Faculty From Prior Review Form 2020
-  EGSC Faculty Qualifications Profile - Samuel Holcomb 8.1.2020
-  EGSC Fall 2020 Faculty and Staff Workshop Agendas (Page 2)
-  Giebfried J STL Doctorate Transcript
-  Hassan R TU Master's Transcripts
-  Hundley - GSU Masters Transcripts
-  Lee Jason C Biology Education Teaching and Training Experience
-  Payne Marvalisa Master Transcript
-  Todd J GSU Transcripts

**6.2.b Program Faculty**

For each of its educational programs, the institution:

b. employs a sufficient number of full-time faculty members to ensure curriculum and program quality, integrity, and review.

**Judgment**

Compliant    Partial Compliance    Non-Compliant    Not Applicable

**Narrative**

**EGSC Compliance Certification**

[Link to Compliance Certification 6.2.b](#)

**Off-site Committee Comments**

The institution employs 84 full-time instructional faculty and the student to faculty ratio was 26:1 in 2018. The average class size is 20.90 and this average is similar across the two academic schools. A dean for each school provides oversight for the academic administration of programs. The Dean of the School of Humanities and Social Sciences is supported by Academic Coordinators, and a Director of Fire and Emergency Services Administration. The Dean of the School of Mathematics and Natural Sciences is supported by Department Chairs and a Director of Nursing. In addition, there is a Program Coordinator assigned to each department. Information on percent of courses taught by faculty type (FT/PT) is provided for each program and location but no benchmarks or definitions are provided for sufficiency to allow for objective comparisons across programs and modalities. Based on this information, further evidence is needed to demonstrate that the following academic program has sufficient full-time faculty: AA and BA in Fire and Emergency Services (appears that no courses are taught by full-time faculty).

**Institution Response**

EGSC thanks the Off-Site Committee for recognizing that the institution has demonstrated compliance with many of the elements of this standard which call for the disaggregation and analysis of the sufficiency of full-time faculty by academic program. After reflecting on the Committee’s feedback and the earlier narrative for this standard in the Compliance Certification, we concur with the Committee’s principal finding that there appears to have been a lack of sufficient evidence of full-time faculty staffing for the A.A. and B.A. programs in Fire and Emergency Services Administration (FESA). Regrettably, the previous data analysis was presented in such a way that full-time faculty with administrative duties were categorized as *PT Admin* in the data analysis without providing the Off-Site Committee with an explanation (i.e. footnote) in the data tables that these faculty were indeed full-time faculty with administrative duties. Therefore, a reasonable interpretation by the Off-Site Committee was that FESA courses were being taught by part-time faculty. However, this is untrue. Thus, this Focused Report will use four metrics to demonstrate EGC’s sufficiency of full-time faculty for its academic programs (a) percent of courses taught by full-time faculty; (b) average teaching workloads of full-time faculty; (c) semester credit hours generated by faculty member; and (d) total student credit hours generated by faculty type. Furthermore, these analyses will demonstrate that the FESA degree programs are in

compliance with standard 6.2.b and will not repeat material previously presented in the Compliance Certification which was treated as compliant. Moreover, to reinforce the case previously made in the Compliance Certification for the sufficiency of full-time faculty to ensure curriculum and program quality, integrity, and review by academic program, disaggregated faculty data by program, location, and mode of instruction have been updated below with the latest statistics for 2019-2020.

**2019-2020 UPDATES OF FULL-TIME AND PART-TIME TEACHING LOADS BY ACADEMIC PROGRAM, LOCATION, AND MODE OF DELIVERY**

Table 1 below shows the disaggregation of full-time and part-time faculty by academic program for the Fall 2019 and Spring 2020 semesters. It shows the total semester credit hours taught by full-time and part-time faculty for each academic program. These tables demonstrate an extremely high reliance on full-time faculty to deliver instruction in many of EGSC’s academic programs. Furthermore, at least half or more of the semester credit hours taught in 2019-20 were taught by full-time faculty, which is a strong indication of EGSC’s commitment to curriculum and program quality, integrity, and review.

**Table 1: Full-time and Part-time Faculty Teaching Loads in 2019-2020 by Academic Program**

Academic Program	Full-time			Part-time			Total		
	n	Semester Credit Hours	%	n	Semester Credit Hours	%	n	Semester Credit Hours	%
Humanities and Social Sciences									
AA in Art/Certificate in Digital Photography	1	33	91.7%	1	3	8.3%	2	36	100%
AA in Communication Arts	4	135	93.8%	1	9	6.3%	5	144	100%
AA in Criminal Justice	1	30	83.3%	1	6	16.7%	2	36	100%
AA in Elementary Education	1	31	83.8%	2	6	16.2%	3	37	100%
AA in English	15	453	84.0%	7	86	16.0%	22	539	100%
AA in FESA/BA in FESA	1	30	50.0%	3	30	50.0%	4	60	100%
AA in History	6	161	91.5%	3	15	8.5%	9	176	100%
AA in Political Science	5	158	96.3%	1	6	3.7%	6	164	100%
AA in Psychology	4	132	89.8%	1	15	10.2%	5	147	100%
AA in Sociology	3	94	91.3%	1	9	8.7%	4	103	100%
AS in Business Administration	2	75	78.1%	3	21	21.9%	5	96	100%
AS in Recreation	2	72	100.0%	0	0	0.0%	2	72	100%

	Full-time			Part-time			Total		
<b>Mathematics and Science</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>Semester Credit Hours</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>Semester Credit Hours</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>Semester Credit Hours</b>	<b>%</b>
AS in Biology	4	133	67.5%	5	64	32.5%	9	197	100%
AS in Chemistry	1	28	70.0%	2	12	30.0%	3	40	100%
AS in Mathematics	12	380	100.0%	0	0	0.0%	12	380	100%
BS in Biology	4	115	100.0%	0	0	0.0%	4	115	100%
RN to BSN	1	32	72.7%	1	12	27.3%	2	44	100%
	Full-time			Part-time			Total		
<b>Combined Schools</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>Semester Credit Hours</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>Semester Credit Hours</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>Semester Credit Hours</b>	<b>%</b>
Core Curriculum	74	2290	82.6%	52	482	17.4%	126	2772	100%

Data indicate that full-time faculty taught at least 50% of the semester credit hours for the Fall 2019 and Spring 2020 semesters for all academic programs. Although the FESA programs’ percentage of courses taught by full-time faculty is at 50%, the full-time faculty member also serves as the Program Director/Academic Discipline Coordinator for both programs which provides a means to ensure program quality, integrity, and review. Furthermore, the programs are relatively new (BA in FESA started Spring 2016; AA in FESA started Fall 2017) with average class sizes of less than seven students (see EGSC AA Fire and Emergency Services – Average Course Size). Nevertheless, the BA in FESA program is the only bachelor’s degree program in the state of Georgia that adheres to the Fire and Emergency Services Higher Education (FESHE) curriculum created by the National Fire Academy (see FESHE Recognition), and the programs’ continual improvement consistently leads to positive student outcomes (see FESA Program Impact).

Table 2 below shows the disaggregation of full-time teaching loads by academic program for the Fall 2019 and Spring 2020 semesters. It shows the average workload per semester of full-time faculty for each academic program. It should be noted that the AA and BA in FESA programs has one full-time faculty member serves both programs.

**Table 2: Average Semester Teaching Loads of Full-Time Faculty by Academic Program in 2019-2020**

<b>Academic Program</b>	<b>Number of Full-time Faculty</b>	<b>Avg. Full-time Teaching Load 19-20</b>
<b>Humanities and Social Sciences</b>		
AA in Art/Cert. in Digital Photography	1	15.0
AA in Communication Arts	4	16.5
AA in Criminal Justice	1	15.0
AA in Elementary Education	1	15.5
AA in English	15	15.1

AA in FESA/BA in FESA	1	15.0
AA in History	6	13.4
AA in Political Science	5	15.8
AA in Psychology	4	16.5
AA in Sociology	3	15.7
AS in Business Administration	2	18.0
AS in Recreation	2	16.25
<b>Mathematics and Science</b>		
AS in Biology	4	16.6
AS in Chemistry	1	14.0
AS in Mathematics	12	15.8
BS in Biology	4	14.4
RN to BSN	1	16.0
<b>Combined Schools</b>		
Core Curriculum	74	15.4

Based on the data, on average full-time faculty in most academic programs teach between 15-16 semester credit hours each semester per the full-time teaching load expectation stated in the EGSC Faculty Handbook. Furthermore, the data indicate slight variance above the 15-16 semester credit hours as stated in the Faculty Handbook (See Faculty Handbook, p.21) for some academic programs. This is because most full-time faculty provide service to other academic programs related to EGSC’s core curriculum (i.e. 42 semester credit hours) that is required for most academic programs. EGSC continues to actively recruit highly qualified part-time faculty each academic year to aid with teaching. EGSC’s rural location and a desire by many applicants to teach remotely often makes it difficult to attract faculty to teach face-to-face courses.

The following data demonstrate that EGSC has sufficient full-time faculty to ensure curriculum and program quality, integrity, and review at each of its off-site locations and via distance education.

**Augusta Site**

Students at the Augusta location can only complete courses in the EGSC’s core curriculum but cannot complete an associate or bachelor’s degree program offered by EGSC by taking course offered in a traditional face-to-face format at the Augusta site (but may complete an associate or bachelor’s degree by taking wholly online courses or courses taught in Swainsboro or Augusta). However, EGSC has sufficient full-time faculty to ensure curriculum and program quality, integrity, and review in this limited educational mission.

**Table 3: Teaching Loads at the Augusta Instructional Site by Program**

Combined Schools	Full-time			Part-time			Total		
	n	Semester Credit Hours	%	n	Semester Credit Hours	%	n	Semester Credit Hours	%
Core Curriculum	11	257	90.2%	3	28	9.8%	14	285	100%

**Dual Enrollment Sites**

High school students can only complete limited courses in EGSC’s core curriculum but cannot complete an associate or bachelor’s degree program offered by EGSC by taking courses offered at the high school site. However, EGSC has sufficient full-time faculty to ensure curriculum and program quality, integrity, and review in this limited educational mission.

**Table 4: Teaching Loads in Dual Enrollment Sites by Program**

Combined Schools	Full-time			Part-time			Total		
	n	Semester Credit Hours	%	n	Semester Credit Hours	%	n	Semester Credit Hours	%
Core Curriculum	3	21	77.8%	2	6	22.2%	5	27	100%

**Distance Education**

It is possible for students to complete the following academic programs entirely through distance education or a combination of face-to-face and distance education. Nevertheless, EGSC has sufficient full-time faculty to ensure curriculum and program quality, integrity, and review in this limited educational mission.

**Table 5: Teaching Loads in Distance Education by Program**

Academic Program	Full-time			Part-time			Total		
	n	Semester Credit Hours	%	n	Semester Credit Hours	%	n	Semester Credit Hours	%
Humanities and Social Sciences									
AA in Art/Cert. in Digital Photography	1	12	100%		0	0.0%	1	12	100%
AA in Communication Arts	3	30	90.91%	1	3	9.1%	4	33	100%
AA in Criminal Justice	1	15	100%	0	0	0.0%	1	15	100%
AA in Elementary Education	1	3	100%	0	0	0.0%	1	3	100%
AA in English	11	95	73.1%	4	35	26.9%	15	130	100%
AA in FESA/BA in FESA	1	30	50.0%	3	30	50.0%	4	60	100%
AA in History	5	33	100%	0	0	0.0%	5	33	100%
AA in Political Science	5	39	100%	0	0	0.0%	5	39	100%
AA in Psychology	4	42	100.0%	0	0	0.0%	4	42	100%
AA in Sociology	3	27	100.0%	0	0	0.0%	3	27	100%
AS in Business Administration	2	42	93.3%	1	3	6.7%	3	45	100%

AS in Recreation	1	26	100.0%	0	0	0.0%	1	26	100%
	<b>Full-time</b>			<b>Part-time</b>			<b>Total</b>		
<b>Mathematics and Science</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>Semester Credit Hours</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>Semester Credit Hours</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>Semester Credit Hours</b>	<b>%</b>
AS in Mathematics	9	98	100.0%	0	0	0.0%	9	98	100%
RN to BSN	1	32	72.7%	1	12	27.3%	2	44	100%
	<b>Full-time</b>			<b>Part-time</b>			<b>Total</b>		
<b>Combined Schools</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>Semester Credit Hours</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>Semester Credit Hours</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>Semester Credit Hours</b>	<b>%</b>
Core Curriculum	60	666	75.6%	23	215	24.4%	83	881	100%

**Statesboro Site**

It is possible for students to complete several programs at the Statesboro site through a combination of face-to-face courses and distance education courses. Data indicate that EGSC has sufficient full-time faculty to ensure curriculum and program quality, integrity, and review. It should be noted that the AS in Business Administration program is being strategically expanded from the Swainsboro campus to the Statesboro site which is denoted by the limited credit hours offered for the Fall 2019 and Spring 2020 semesters.

**Table 6: Teaching Loads at the Statesboro Site by Program**

<b>Academic Program</b>	<b>Full-time</b>			<b>Part-time</b>			<b>Total</b>		
<b>Humanities and Social Sciences</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>Semester Credit Hours</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>Semester Credit Hours</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>Semester Credit Hours</b>	<b>%</b>
AA in Communication Arts	2	48	94.1%	1	3	5.9%	3	51	100%
AA in Elementary Education	1	12	66.7%	2	6	33.3%	3	18	100%
AA in English	6	118	77.1%	3	35	22.9%	9	153	100%
AA in History	3	71	96.0%	1	3	4.0%	4	74	100%
AA in Political Science	2	45	100.0%	0	0	0.0%	2	45	100%
AA in Psychology	2	42	100.0%	0	0	0.0%	2	42	100%
AA in Sociology	2	31	77.5%	1	9	22.5%	3	40	100%
AS in Business Administration	1	6	40.0%	2	9	60.0%	3	15	100%
AS in Recreation	1	6	100.0%	0	0	0.0%	1	6	100%
	<b>Full-time</b>			<b>Part-time</b>			<b>Total</b>		
<b>Mathematics and Science</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>Semester Credit Hours</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>Semester Credit Hours</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>Semester Credit Hours</b>	<b>%</b>
AS in Mathematics	8	129	100.0%	0	0	0.0%	9	129	100%
	<b>Full-time</b>			<b>Part-time</b>			<b>Total</b>		
<b>Combined Schools</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>Semester Credit Hours</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>Semester Credit Hours</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>Semester Credit Hours</b>	<b>%</b>



Core Curriculum	33	595	80.3%	21	146	19.7%	54	741	100%
-----------------	----	-----	-------	----	-----	-------	----	-----	------

**Swainsboro Campus**

All programs excluding the online FESA programs and RN-BSN are available on the Swainsboro campus. Data indicate that EGSC has sufficient full-time faculty to ensure curriculum and program quality, integrity, and review.

**Table 7: Teaching Loads at the Main Campus in Swainsboro by Program**

Academic Program	Full-time			Part-time			Total		
	n	Semester Credit Hours	%	n	Semester Credit Hours	%	n	Semester Credit Hours	%
<b>Humanities and Social Sciences</b>									
AA in Art/Cert. in Digital Photography	1	21	87.50%	1	3	12.5%	2	24	100%
AA in Communication Arts	1	27	90.0%	1	3	10.0%	2	30	100%
AA in Criminal Justice	1	15	100%	0	0	0.0%	1	15	100%
AA in Elementary Education	1	16	100%	0	0	0%	1	16	100%
AA in English	7	163	92.1%	1	14	7.9%	8	177	100%
AA in History	2	33	78.6%	2	9	21.4%	4	42	100%
AA in Political Science	2	47	88.7%	1	6	11.3%	3	53	100%
AA in Psychology	2	48	100%	0	0	0.0%	2	48	100%
AA in Sociology	2	33	100%	0	0	0.0%	2	33	100%
AS in Business Administration	1	15	71.4%	1	6	28.6%	2	21	100%
AS in Recreation	2	40	100%	0	0	0.0%	2	40	100%
		<b>Full-time</b>			<b>Part-time</b>			<b>Total</b>	
<b>Mathematics and Science</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>Semester Credit Hours</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>Semester Credit Hours</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>Semester Credit Hours</b>	<b>%</b>
AS in Biology	3	40	76.9%	2	12	23.1%	5	52	100%
AS in Chemistry	1	28	77.8%	1	8	22.2%	2	36	100%
AS in Mathematics	4	96	100%	0	0	0.0%	4	96	100%
BS in Biology	4	106	100%	0	0	0.0%	4	106	100%
		<b>Full-time</b>			<b>Part-time</b>			<b>Total</b>	

Combined Schools	n	Semester Credit Hours	%	n	Semester Credit Hours	%	n	Semester Credit Hours	%
Core Curriculum	38	751	89.6%	14	87	10.4%	52	838	100%

**2019-20 STUDENT CREDIT HOURS GENERATED BY FULL-TIME AND PART-TIME FACULTY MEMBER AND ACADEMIC PROGRAM, LOCATION, AND MODE OF DELIVERY**

The following data demonstrate student credit hours generated (SCHG) by faculty type and academic program and provide further evidence that EGSC has sufficient full-time faculty to ensure curriculum and program quality, integrity, and review at each of its off-site locations and via distance education.

**Table 8: Student Credit Hours Generated Per Full-Time and Part-Time Faculty Member in 2019-2020 by Academic Program**

Academic Program	Full-time			Part-time			Total		
	n	SCHG	%	n	SCHG	%	n	SCHG	%
<b>Humanities and Social Sciences</b>									
AA in Art/Certificate in Digital Photography	1	612	91.7%	1	15	8.3%	2	627	100%
AA in Communication Arts	4	3055	93.8%	1	186	6.3%	5	3241	100%
AA in Criminal Justice	1	621	83.3%	1	99	16.7%	2	720	100%
AA in Elementary Education	1	557	83.8%	2	141	16.2%	3	698	100%
AA in English	15	8718	84.0%	7	1713	16.0%	22	10431	100%
AA in FESA/BA in FESA	1	162	50.0%	3	246	50.0%	4	408	100%
AA in History	6	3913	91.5%	3	225	8.5%	9	4138	100%
AA in Political Science	5	3735	96.3%	1	159	3.7%	6	3894	100%
AA in Psychology	4	3258	89.8%	1	327	10.2%	5	3585	100%
AA in Sociology	3	2359	91.3%	1	207	8.7%	4	2566	100%
AS in Business Administration	2	1878	78.1%	3	465	21.9%	5	2343	100%
AS in Recreation	2	1595	100.0%	0	0	0.0%	2	1595	100%
	Full-time			Part-time			Total		
<b>Mathematics and Science</b>	n	SCHG	%	n	SCHG	%	n	SCHG	%
AS in Biology	4	2996	67.5%	5	1191	32.5%	9	4187	100%
AS in Chemistry	1	316	70.0%	2	160	30.0%	3	476	100%
AS in Mathematics	12	8270	100.0%	0	0	0.0%	12	8270	100%
BS in Biology	4	1668	100.0%	0	0	0.0%	4	1668	100%

RN to BSN	1	147	72.7%	1	54	27.3%	2	201	100%
	<b>Full-time</b>			<b>Part-time</b>			<b>Total</b>		
<b>Combined Schools</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>SCHG</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>SCHG</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>SCHG</b>	<b>%</b>
Core Curriculum	74	48981	82.6%	52	9641	17.4%	126	58622	100%

Data indicate that EGSC full-time faculty taught a larger number of student credit hours than part-time faculty during 2019-2020 for most of its academic programs and further indicate EGSC has sufficient of full-time to ensure curriculum and program quality, integrity, and review.

**Augusta Site**

Students at the Augusta location can only complete courses in the EGSC’s core curriculum but cannot complete an associate or bachelor’s degree program offered by EGSC by taking course offered in a traditional face-to-face format at the Augusta site (but may complete an associate or bachelor’s degree by taking wholly online courses or courses taught in Swainsboro or Augusta). Data indicate that EGSC full-time faculty taught a larger number of student credit hours than part-time faculty during 2019-2020 at the *Augusta Site* and provides further evidence that EGSC has sufficient of full-time to ensure curriculum and program quality, integrity, and review.

**Table 9: Student Credit Hours (SCHG) Generated Per Full-Time and Part-Time Faculty Member at the Augusta Instructional Site by Program**

Combined Schools	Full-time			Part-time			Total		
	n	SCHG	%	n	SCHG	%	n	SCHG	%
Core Curriculum	11	5001	90.2%	3	516	9.8%	14	5517	100%

**Dual Enrollment Sites**

High school students can only complete limited courses in EGSC’s core curriculum but cannot complete an associate or bachelor’s degree program offered by EGSC by taking courses offered at the high school site. Data indicate that EGSC full-time faculty taught a larger number of student credit hours than part-time faculty during 2019-2020 at *Dual Enrollment Sites* and provides further evidence that EGSC has sufficient of full-time to ensure curriculum and program quality, integrity, and review.

**Table 10: Student Credit Hours Generated Per Full-Time and Part-Time Faculty Member at Dual Enrollment Sites by Program**

Combined Schools	Full-time			Part-time			Total		
	n	SCHG	%	n	SCHG	%	n	SCHG	%
Core Curriculum	3	345	77.8%	2	102	22.2%	5	447	100%

**Distance Education**

It is possible for students to complete the following academic programs entirely through distance education or a combination of face-to-face and distance education. Data indicate that EGSC full-time faculty taught a larger number of student credit hours than part-time faculty via *Distance Education* and provides further evidence that EGSC has sufficient of full-time to ensure curriculum and program quality, integrity, and review.

**Table 11: Student Credit Hours (SCHG) Generated Per Full-Time and Part-Time Faculty Member in Distance Education by Program**

Academic Program	Full-time			Part-time			Total		
	n	SCHG	%	n	SCHG	%	n	SCHG	%
<b>Humanities and Social Sciences</b>									
AA in Art/Cert. in Digital Photography	1	243	100%		0	0.0%	1	243	100%
AA in Communication Arts	3	652	90.91%	1	87	9.1%	4	739	100%
AA in Criminal Justice	1	312	100%	0	0	0.0%	1	312	100%
AA in Elementary Education	1	60	100%	0	0	0.0%	1	60	100%
AA in English	11	2023	73.1%	4	746	26.9%	15	2769	100%
AA in FESA/BA in FESA	1	162	50.0%	3	246	50.0%	4	408	100%
AA in History	5	843	100%	0	0	0.0%	5	843	100%
AA in Political Science	5	894	100%	0	0	0.0%	5	894	100%
AA in Psychology	4	1212	100.0%	0	0	0.0%	4	1212	100%
AA in Sociology	3	699	100.0%	0	0	0.0%	3	699	100%
AS in Business Administration	2	1128	93.3%	1	99	6.7%	3	1227	100%
AS in Recreation	1	573	100.0%	0	0	0.0%	1	573	100%
		<b>Full-time</b>			<b>Part-time</b>			<b>Total</b>	
<b>Mathematics and Science</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>SCHG</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>SCHG</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>SCHG</b>	<b>%</b>
AS in Mathematics	9	2089	100.0%	0	0	0.0%	9	2089	100%
RN to BSN	1	147	72.7%	1	54	27.3%	2	201	100%
		<b>Full-time</b>			<b>Part-time</b>			<b>Total</b>	
<b>Combined Schools</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>SCHG</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>SCHG</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>SCHG</b>	<b>%</b>
Core Curriculum	60	14679	75.6%	23	4590	24.4%	83	19269	100%

**Statesboro Site**

It is possible for students to complete several programs at the Statesboro site through a combination of face-to-face courses and distance education courses. Data indicate that EGSC full-



AA in Art/Cert. in Digital Photography	1	369	87.50%	1	15	12.5%	2	384	100%
AA in Communication Arts	1	699	90.0%	1	39	10.0%	2	738	100%
AA in Criminal Justice	1	309	100%	0	0	0.0%	1	309	100%
AA in Elementary Education	1	284	100%	0	0	0%	1	284	100%
AA in English	7	3043	92.1%	1	257	7.9%	8	3300	100%
AA in History	2	834	78.6%	2	180	21.4%	4	1014	100%
AA in Political Science	2	1179	88.7%	1	159	11.3%	3	1338	100%
AA in Psychology	2	1017	100%	0	0	0.0%	2	1017	100%
AA in Sociology	2	732	100%	0	0	0.0%	2	732	100%
AS in Business Administration	1	387	71.4%	1	72	28.6%	2	459	100%
AS in Recreation	2	8660	100%	0	0	0.0%	2	860	100%
		<b>Full-time</b>			<b>Part-time</b>			<b>Total</b>	
<b>Mathematics and Science</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>SCHG</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>SCHG</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>SCHG</b>	<b>%</b>
AS in Biology	3	687	76.9%	2	104	23.1%	5	791	100%
AS in Chemistry	1	316	77.8%	1	88	22.2%	2	404	100%
AS in Mathematics	4	2141	100%	0	0	0.0%	4	2141	100%
BS in Biology	4	1530	100%	0	0	0.0%	4	1530	100%
		<b>Full-time</b>			<b>Part-time</b>			<b>Total</b>	
<b>Combined Schools</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>SCHG</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>SCHG</b>	<b>%</b>	<b>n</b>	<b>SCHG</b>	<b>%</b>
Core Curriculum	38	15070	89.6%	14	1433	10.4%	52	16503	100%






In summary, EGSC has sufficient full-time faculty to ensure curriculum and program quality, integrity, and review for each of its academic programs at its main campus, off-site locations, and via distance education. Moreover, given the newness of the FESA programs and FESA student credit hours generated by faculty type respective to EGSC’s other academic programs, the FESA programs have sufficient full-time faculty.

**CONCLUSION**

The following four metrics were used to demonstrate EGC’s sufficiency of full-time faculty for its academic programs (a) percent of courses taught by full-time faculty; (b) average teaching workloads of full-time faculty; (c) semester credit hours generated by faculty member; and (d) total student credit hours generated by faculty type. EGSC’s reliance on 50+% full-time faculty for its academic programs is notable, given its geographic location within the state, compared to peer

institutions within the University System of Georgia (see USG Number and Percent of Courses Taught by Instructor Type, Fall 2018) and document compliance with Standard 6.2.b.

## Sources

-  EGSC FESA Average Course Size
-  EGSC FESA Program Impact
-  EGSC Faculty Handbook CAB 2-18-2020 (Page 21)
-  Fire and Emergency Services Higher Education Recognition
-  USG Number and Percent of Courses Taught by Instructor Type Fall\_2018

### **6.3 Faculty Appointment and Evaluation**

The institution publishes and implements policies regarding the appointment, employment, and regular evaluation of faculty members, regardless of contract or tenure status.

#### **Judgment**

Compliant    Partial Compliance    Non-Compliant    Not Applicable

#### **Narrative**

##### **EGSC Compliance Certification**

[Link to EGSC Compliance Certification 6.3](#)

##### **Off-site Committee Comments**

Policies in all three areas of appointment, employment, and evaluation of faculty are published online and employees are informed of the online location of these policies (e.g., EGSC Faculty Handbook). These policies and procedures for hiring, employment, and evaluation clearly differentiate between full- and part-time faculty and tenure-track and non-tenure-track faculty, where appropriate. Institutional adherence to appointment policies is illustrated with job postings, sample recommendations to hire, and other documents from recent faculty searches. Example policies from the areas of wellness, campus safety, workload, and others are provided, along with examples of implementation of policy implementation. Consistent with the evaluation policies set by the USG system, there are policies governing an annual review of faculty, both full- and part-time. However, fulfillment of this policy is not clear from the provided documentation. The provided charts (evaluations checklist) for the last two years are vague in some cases, and missing information in others. On one chart it is hard to tell if it is an evaluation timeline or generic documentation of enforcement. On other charts there are blank spaces flagged as “observation needed” or “not performed,” without clear indication of why and whether this is consistent with policy.

##### **Institution Response**

First, EGSC officials thank the Off-Site Committee for finding the previously submitted Compliance Certification narrative and documentation regarding published policies for faculty appointment, employment, and regular evaluation compliant with the expectations of Standard 6.3. Thanks too for finding the previously submitted evidence of policy implementation sufficient for demonstrating compliance with 6.3 on matters of faculty appointment and employment. We regret that some of the evidence previously submitted to demonstrate implementation of policies on the regular evaluation of faculty was not as complete or clearly presented as it should have been for full compliance with this standard. Specific weaknesses observed by the Committee in the faculty evaluations checklists for the previous two years were of particular concern, raising questions as to whether evaluation policies were being followed fully. Corrective actions taken and further explanations are presented in this Focused Report to address those few remaining questions raised in the Off-Site Committee’s report. Hopefully, the supplemental evidence and explanations provided in this narrative are sufficient to tie up EGSC’s remaining loose ends for a finding of full compliance with this standard.

It is important to note that EGSC’s Compliance Certification narrative for Standard 6.3 included 18 different examples demonstrating that published policies on the regular evaluation of faculty are implemented at EGSC. Only four of those 18 examples involving the checklists/charts of who was evaluated when were questioned as potentially insufficient by the Off-Site Committee. The Committee apparently found the others compliant as no weaknesses were identified in them. No



weaknesses were observed by the Committee in the four examples of completed annual faculty evaluation forms, the four examples of completed classroom observation forms, the two examples of completed tenure and promotion reviews, and the four examples of completed post-tenure reviews. This extensive collection of 14 completed faculty evaluations across different categories of faculty review clearly demonstrate that EGSC's published policies on faculty evaluation are implemented.

Admittedly, the checklists/charts originally submitted to support the Compliance Certification narrative are somewhat confusing, in part because they were not standardized in their content even within schools. Multiple academic administrators were responsible for conducting annual faculty evaluations and recorded their completions differently—some using specific dates and others simply using the semester completed. They lacked standardization. Lack of standardization existed across schools also. The checklists for the School of Humanities and Social Sciences were for full-time faculty only, and the checklists for the School of Mathematics and Natural Sciences included part-time faculty. According to EGSC policy, part-time faculty are evaluated differently than full-time faculty so when elements of evaluation for full-time faculty were recorded differently on the checklist for part-time faculty as "NA" or "student evaluation," that is because those full-time evaluation elements were not applicable for part-timers and their evaluations relied on student evaluations according to policy. But that was not clearly explained. Although annual evaluations for tenured faculty are typically completed, classroom observations are performed for tenured faculty every three years. On the checklists, classroom observations for tenured faculty may have been recorded as "not performed" which is correct according to policy, but that was not clearly explained.

There was a big difference in the completeness of the checklists for the School of Humanities and Social Sciences between 2017-18 and 2018-19 which was due largely to administrative turnover and understandable circumstantial factors. In January 2018, the School of Humanities and the School of Social Sciences were merged, and Dean Cheek suddenly had responsibility for evaluating twice as many faculty than he did previously. He managed to complete 50 evaluations himself that spring and a number of classroom observations as well. As the checklist for 2018-19 indicates, annual evaluations and classroom observations were completed for all 51 faculty in that school in large measure because the administrative responsibilities for those evaluations was shared among several academic administrators and not handled by Dr. Cheek alone. In one instance, Prof. Walker was not observed by Dean Cheek in AY 2017-2018 due to a potential conflict of interest as Dean Cheek was teaching courses that fell under Prof. Walker's purview as Director of FESA. None of these circumstances were explained previously.

Due to the amount of work involved in overseeing the combined schools, Dr. Sharman and Prof. Jim Beall were hired as program coordinators on the Statesboro and Swainsboro sites, respectively, and they were tasked with conducting classroom observations in Fall 2018. This distribution of workload facilitated the completion of observations such that they were all completed in AY 2018-2019.

Dean Cheek stepped down as dean in December 2018, and Dean Cunha was hired, assuming the position in late January 2019. He completed the evaluations in spring 2019 which Dr. Cheek would have performed had he remained dean. In fall 2019, Dr. Sharman and Mr. Jim Beall had both been promoted, and Dr. Upchurch and Prof. Courtney Joiner were assigned to be the new program coordinators in Statesboro and Swainsboro, respectively. With a new dean and a new administrative assistant, the new program coordinators were initially unable to access information related to the classroom observation rotation for tenured faculty, so they decided that unless a tenured faculty member could show when he/she had been observed, Dr. Upchurch and Prof. Joiner would conduct observations of all tenured faculty to set a baseline start for a three-year rotation moving forward. With all of this administrative turnover, priorities were obviously given to observing and evaluating all faculty in that school in 2018-19.

Had the part-time faculty not been included in the other school’s checklists, complete coverage of annual evaluations for full-time faculty would have been communicated clearly. On the two checklists for the School of Mathematics and Natural Sciences, only one full-time faculty member’s observation was not completed due to an oversight in 2017-2018. Professor Antre’ Drummer’s classroom observation was not done that year. However, the faculty evaluation was completed. In the following year (2018-2019), both a classroom and faculty evaluation was done for all full-time faculty including Professor Drummer.

The institution respectfully requests that the On-site Reaffirmation Committee weigh EGSC’s overall evidence of compliance with Standard 6.3, including our substantial evidence of compliance in the implementation of regular faculty evaluations. The Resource Manual for 6.3 defines regular faculty evaluation as reviews which occur “at least every three years.” EGSC’s evaluation policies call for more frequent annual evaluations, but if one is missed accidentally or for good reason in a given year, EGSC would still be compliant with the minimum expectations held by SACSCOC. Likewise, the Resource Manual calls for sources of evidence that “show policies and procedures are followed in general terms.” While EGSC’s implementation evidence may not be uniformly perfect, it is clearly and substantively reflective of policy implementation in general terms. EGSC has demonstrated strong commitment to policy adherence for faculty evaluation, even under unexpected and challenging circumstances.

Much has been said here about the regular evaluation of EGSC’s full-time faculty. In order to ensure that EGSC is demonstrating its commitment to policy implementation regarding the regular evaluation of its part-time/adjunct faculty, four more examples of such recently completed observations and evaluations of part-time faculty members are provided below in this Focused Report and its Sources.

School of Humanities and Social Sciences:

Boudreaux, Leah INSTRUCTIONAL EVALUATION FORM  
 Garrett, Lani INSTRUCTIONAL EVALUATION FORM





School of Mathematics and Natural Sciences:

Lleras, Daniel INSTRUCTIONAL EVALUATION FORM  
 Sen, Moon INSTRUCTIONAL EVALUATION FORM

**CONCLUSION**

EGSC publishes and implements policies regarding the appointment, employment, and regular evaluation of faculty members, regardless of contract or tenure status.

**Sources**

-  Boudreaux, Leah INSTRUCTIONAL EVALUATION FORM 2-12-2020
-  Garrett, Lani INSTRUCTIONAL EVALUATION FORM 3.12.2020
-  Lleras, Daniel INSTRUCTIONAL EVALUATION FORM 3.3.2020
-  Sen, Moon INSTRUCTIONAL EVALUATION FORM 3.3.2020

### **7.3 Administrative Effectiveness**

The institution identifies expected outcomes of its administrative support services and demonstrates the extent to which the outcomes are achieved.

#### **Judgment**

Compliant    Partial Compliance    Non-Compliant    Not Applicable

#### **Narrative**

##### **EGSC Compliance Certification**

[Link to Compliance Certification for 7.3](#)

##### **Off-site Committee Comments**

The institution listed 28 administrative support units for which outcomes were planned and assessed. Data collection and analysis plans were presented along with outcome achievement reports for academic year 2017-2018 and academic year 2018-2019. A cross-section of the achievement reports failed to demonstrate the extent to which the planned outcomes were achieved. Incongruities between planned and achieved outcomes were found for 3 administrative service units, Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs, Student Accounts/Payroll, and Database Administration. The dissimilar outcomes do not demonstrate how the units achieve planned outcomes or how the unit seeks improvement based on the analysis of the results.

##### **Institution Response**

The Off-Site Review Committee noted two related issues to be addressed by the institution for Comprehensive Standard 7.3.

- “A cross-section of the achievement reports failed to demonstrate the extent to which the planned outcomes were achieved.”
- “Incongruities between planned and achieved outcomes were found for 3 administrative service units, Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs, Student Accounts/Payroll, and Database Administration. The dissimilar outcomes do not demonstrate how the units achieve planned outcomes or how the unit seeks improvement based on the analysis of the results.”

EGSC thanks the Off-Site Review Committee for identifying potential shortcomings in some of its administrative unit assessment reports for FY 2017-18 and FY 2018-19. The extent to which planned outcomes were achieved will be addressed first, followed by an in-depth review of the assessment reports of the Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs, Student Accounts/Payroll, and Database Administrator.

#### **ACHIEVEMENT OF PLANNED ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT OUTCOMES**

Presented below are links to the FY 2017-18 and FY 2018-19 assessment reports for the administrative unit that were presented in the *Compliance Certification*, with summaries of the extent outcomes were achieved in these two fiscal years. The assessment plans and reports of the Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs, the Director of Student Accounts and Payroll, and

Data Administration are examined separately in the following section that addresses incongruities between planned and achieved outcomes.

Administrative Unit Assessment	Extent Outcomes Are Achieved	FY 2017-18 Report	FY 2018-19 Report
Humanities/Social Sciences Dean	Outcomes for course success course scheduling, and program enrollment with numeric results and action needed specified.	Report	Report
Mathematics/Natural Sciences Dean	Outcomes for course success course scheduling, and program enrollment with numeric results and action needed specified.	Report	Report
AVP Enrollment Mgmt.	Outcomes for employee turnover, morale, and employee to student ratio; actions needed are the same on both reports.	Report	Report
VP Business Affairs	Outcomes focus on report compliance and management of college budgets with detailed results and further actions stated as needed.	Report	Report
Auxiliary/Dining Services	Outcomes for cost control and student participation with numeric results and actions needed updated annually.	Report	Report
Business/Plant Operations	Outcomes for customer satisfaction and meeting compliance requirements; compliance results reported with no additional actions needed where compliance is maintained.	Report	Report
Grants & Contracts	Action needed on FY 2017-18 report became outcome on FY 2018-19 report.	Report	Report
Human Resources	CCG outcome lacks a measure; results not quantified.	Report	Report
AVP External Campuses/ Augusta	Outcome focus on increasing enrollment and cooperation with Augusta University; results are quantified, and actions needed detailed.	Report	Report
Director EGSC Statesboro	Outcome focus on increasing enrollment, visibility and outreach to high schools; results are quantified, and actions needed detailed.	Report	Report
VP Information Technology	Outcomes for equipment, compliance, system support are presented with specific measures; results and actions needed are detailed.	Report	Report
Enterprise Services	99 - 100 percent compliance rates specified for 3 outcomes; results presented in detail; no actions needed where outcome is met.	Report	Report
Infrastructure Services	Outcomes focus equipment replacement and monitoring work orders with reported	Report	Report

	results. Actions needed will be taken when necessary.		
Support Services	Outcomes are presented as percentages with detailed results and actions needed.	Report	Report
Information Security Officer	Outcomes presented in the form of reports and security enhancement implementation with detailed results and actions needed.	New July 2018	Report
Web Services	Outcomes related to maintaining the EGSC Website presented with specific measures, detailed results and actions needed	Report	- Report
VP Institutional Advancement	Outcomes related to fundraising, asset management, and stakeholder relationships presented with specific measures, detailed results and actions needed.	Report	Report
Fulford Center	Outcomes focusing on program expansion with specific measures, detailed results and actions needed.	Report	Report
MMGA Youth Science/ Tech Center	Outcomes focusing on program expansion with specific but modest measures, detailed results and actions needed.	Report	Report
Alumni Services	Outcomes related to increasing contacts and building relationships with alumni with assessment results reported and actions needed specified	Report	Report
Event Planner	Outcomes divided into recurring and non-recurring event categories; assessment results and actions needed described in detail.	Report	Report
Chief of Staff & Legal Counsel	Outcomes related to providing legal advice, managing policy process, and the complaint hotline presented with specific measures, quantified assessment results and detailed actions needed.	Report	Report
Strategic Planning/ Institutional Research	Outcomes and measures focus on quality of reporting and compliance with reporting criteria and deadlines; results based on routine and non-routine project completion and actions needed are specified.	Report	Report

**INCONGRUITIES BETWEEN PLANNED AND ACHIEVED OUTCOMES**

**Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs**

Both annual assessment reports presented in the *Compliance Certification*, as well as the assessment plans for the Office of the Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs (VPASA) were prepared by the previous VPASA, Dr. Deborah Vess. First, the assessment plans and reports of the previous VPASA will be reviewed, followed by the plans and report for FY 2019-20 of the current VPASA, Dr. Sandra Sharman.

Reproduced below are the portions of FY 2017-18 and FY 2018-19 VPASA assessment reports prepared by Dr. Vess that were presented in the *Compliance Certification*. The outcome and measures presented from the FY 2017-18 Report are the same outcome and measures that were presented in the VPASA’s Data Maintenance and Collection Plan and Plan for Annual Analysis of Assessment Results. The approvals cited as assessment results for the RN-BSN Program were the intended results and the citation of actions needed are appropriate next steps for the continued success of the RN-BSN Program. Similarly, the retention team outcome and related measures presented from the FY 2018-19 Report are the same outcome and measures that were presented in the VPASA’s Data Maintenance and Collection Plan and Plan for Annual Analysis of Assessment Results. However, the 70 percent success rate measure for FY 2018-19 was not addressed as an assessment result.

Dr. Sharman was appointed as VPASA in July 2019 and the VPASA’s assessment plans have been revised. With its successful establishment, the RN-BSN Program was replaced by initiatives for other baccalaureate programs and the retention team outcome was replaced by the hiring a Director of Retention. The change in the retention outcome is consistently presented across the revised VPASA’s Data Maintenance and Collection Plan, Plan for Annual Analysis of Assessment Results, and the FY 2019-20 Report. In addition, the FY 2019-20 Report indicates that the Director of Retention position has been filled.

<b>Report Year</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Measures</b>	<b>Assessment Results</b>	<b>Action Needed</b>
FY 2017-18	Successfully provide support and lead academic programs through accreditation projects, specifically the RN-BSN program.	Program has a successful SACSCOC site visit and is approved by the SACSCOC Board of Trustees. Program is admitted to ACEN candidacy. Program progresses to ACEN site visit.	RN-BSN approved by SACSCOC board of trustees. RN-BSN program admitted to ACEN candidacy. ACEN Site Visit scheduled for September.	SACS feedback was positive. Evaluate feedback of ACEN upon receipt. Continue to support program and to facilitate collaboration between AA, EM, marketing, and other units for increased enrollment.
FY 2018-19	Form a retention team.	Retention team approved and formed by summer 2018. Success rate of students contacted will be 70 percent or higher in FY 19.	Retention team implemented and held meetings. Chair in 2019 was Sherrie Helms. A new chair will be appointed for 2020.	Committee will begin amassing data to evaluate student progress. Early alert system is currently in use via Grades First and faculty report during the sixth week of the semester

**Student Accounts/Payroll**

In EGSC’s *Compliance Certification*, even though the examples presented there and reproduced below were labelled Student Accounts/Payroll, assessment plans and reports for the payroll function were included, but not for the student affairs function. Over the last three fiscal years, one director has been responsible for overseeing both the student accounts and payroll functions within the Department of Business Affairs.

Presented below are links to separate assessment plans and reports for the student accounts function and those for the payroll function, which have been formatted to improve clarity. For both functions, assessment outcomes and related measures are presented consistently across assessment plans and annual reports.

- EGSC BA Student Accounts Data Maintenance and Collection Plan
- EGSC BA Student Accounts Plan for Analysis of Administrative Assessment Results
- EGSC BA Student Accounts Assessment Report FY 2017-18
- EGSC BA Student Accounts Assessment Report FY 2018-19
- EGSC BA Student Accounts Assessment Report FY 2019-20

- EGSC BA Payroll Data Maintenance and Collection Plan
- EGSC BA Payroll Plan for Analysis of Administrative Assessment Results
- EGSC BA Payroll Assessment Report FY 2017-18
- EGSC BA Payroll Assessment Report FY 2018-19
- EGSC BA Payroll Assessment Report FY 2019-20

The table presented in EGSC’s *Compliance Certification* for Student Accounts/Payroll is correctly relabeled below as Payroll. To clarify the examples presented, The Director of Student Accounts and Payroll has provided the following comments for the payroll assessment reports.

ADP was the system of record for time reporting for payroll. Effective March 25, 2018, OneUSG Connect became the system of record for time reporting for payroll [USG BOR Business Procedures Manual 5.2 Human Resources Operations (Page 3)]. The time card is a legal document and is an essential piece of the time reporting mechanism for OneUSG Connect and payroll processing. Without complete and approved time cards, hours worked, and absence requests may not be paid timely, which can lead to payroll expenses not being reported or accrued in the appropriate month/quarter/year. The decision making of the users of monthly budgets, grant reports, and quarterly financials can be affected by incorrect and untimely data. A backlog of unapproved absences can also impact employee benefits in cases of FMLA and unpaid leave. The institution and related departments may realize additional benefit expenses that cannot be recouped from the employee.

Report Year	Outcome	Measures	Assessment Results	Action Needed
FY 2017-18	Employee payroll and benefit withholding are accurate and made in the appropriate accounting period.	The number of time cards approved by employees and authorized by supervisors each pay period.	With ADP, bi-weekly employee approval percentages averaged appx. 75% and monthly employee approval percentages averaged appx.	The implementation of OneUSG Connect on 03.25.18, eliminated the need for bi-weekly employees and monthly faculty and staff to approve time cards.

			43%.	
FY 2018-19	Satisfy the financial and information needs of its internal and external audiences: monthly/annual financial/budget reporting is accurate.	Payroll to General Ledger Interface Task Completed Timely	With the implementation of OneUSG, our institution's accounting processes for payroll are much more dependent upon the processes performed (after payroll confirm) at the Shared Services Center (SSC) and ITS.  The institution is unable to proceed with GL processing without notifications from SSC.  Processing issues and delays occasionally occur.	With the implementation of OneUSG, the accounting journals generated (processes performed by the Payroll Practitioner) are auto-posted.

**Database Administration**

The third unit for which incongruities between planned and achieved outcomes were Database Administration. Links to the assessment plans, annual assessment reports, and data summary tables are listed below. Assessment outcomes and their related measures are consistently stated across all Data Administration plans and reports.

- EGSC IT Database Administration Data Maintenance and Collection Plan
- EGSC IT Database Administration Plan for Analysis of Administrative Assessment Results
- EGSC IT Database Administration Assessment Report FY 2017-18
- EGSC IT Database Administration Assessment Data Summaries FY 2017-18
- EGSC IT Database Administration Assessment Report FY 2018-19
- EGSC IT Database Administration Assessment Data Summaries FY 2018-19
- EGSC IT Database Administration Assessment Report FY 2019-20
- EGSC IT Database Administration Assessment Data Summaries FY 2019-20

The following assessment examples are excerpted from EGSC's *Compliance Certification*. Both the outcomes and very high measures of success presented for Data Administration are crucial to the smooth functioning of the College's information systems, particularly the Student Information System (SIS). Therefore, they are assessed continually and included in the annual assessment reports. These high success rates have been maintained consistently over the last three fiscal years, as documented in the annual assessment reports and data summaries. According to EGSC's database administrator:




































- EGSC SIS (Student Information Systems – Banner, AppXtender, DegreeWorks, Argos) systems will be available 99% of the time during normal production hours: This assessment is critical because the college is highly dependent on access to computing resources and the data they contain, and we work really hard and have spent considerable funds to purchase these systems that the entire college relies on.
- 90% of User Access request will be completed within 3 days of submission: This assessment is important to ensure that there are available resources to meet the support demands for the college. As new staff are hired / leave we need to ensure that staff have the necessary access to perform their job duties and then when they leave the data resources are protected from misuse by closing the accounts/access.




































Report Year	Outcome	Measures	Assessment Results	Action Needed
FY 2017-18	EGSC SIS systems will be available 99% of the time during normal production hours.	Normal Production Hours are from 7am to 1:00am and the backup/maintenance time is from 1:00 am to 7:00am Monday – Sunday. Outages will be recorded as a School Dude ticket and can be exported as a list and summarized with Excel.	0.27% downtime was recorded this year during a partial outage of Banner Web.	Goal met; no action needed.
FY 2018-19	90% of User Access request will be completed within 3 days of submission once all required documentation / approval has been submitted.	User Access Request will be captured using Network Access Request and Banner Access Request Forms and will be indexed into AppXtender. The data can be extracted using Argos Dashboard "Access Request in Xtender" and summarized in Excel using pivot table.	98% of Network Access Request and Banner Access Request were completed within 3 days of submission.	Goal met, no action needed.



**CONCLUSION**

The Focused Report review of administrative unit assessment reports for FY 2017-18 and FY 2018-19 indicate some unevenness of quality and presentation of assessment outcomes, measures, results, and actions needed. EGSC appreciates the work of the Off-Site Review Committee in bringing this opportunity for continuous improvement to EGSC’s attention. The concerns raised by the Off-Site Committee are helpful and are being used to improve administrative unit assessment reports for FY 2019-20 that will be presented to the On-Site Committee to demonstrate the College’s compliance with Standard 7.3. However, the Focused Report review demonstrates that, although further improvement in the assessment process are appropriate and desirable, EGSC does identify expected outcomes of its administrative support services and does demonstrate the extent to which the outcomes are achieved.

## Sources

-  EGSC AA Dean M-NS School Annual Assessment Report FY 2018-19
-  EGSC AA Dean H-SS School Annual Assessment Report FY 2017-18
-  EGSC AA Dean H-SS School Annual Assessment Report FY 2018-19
-  EGSC AA Dean M-NS School Annual Assessment Report FY 2017-18
-  EGSC Augusta Annual Assessment Report FY 2017-18
-  EGSC Augusta Annual Assessment Report FY 2018-19
-  EGSC BA Auxiliary & Dining Services Annual Assessment Report FY 2017-18
-  EGSC BA Auxiliary & Dining Services Annual Assessment Report FY 2018-19
-  EGSC BA Business & Plant Operations Annual Assessment Report FY 2017-18
-  EGSC BA Grants & Contracts Annual Assessment Report FY 2017-18
-  EGSC BA Grants & Contracts Annual Assessment Report FY 2018-19
-  EGSC BA Human Resources Annual Assessment Report FY 2017-18
-  EGSC BA Human Resources Annual Assessment Report FY 2018-19
-  EGSC BA Payroll Annual Assessment Report FY 2017-18 Revised
-  EGSC BA Payroll Annual Assessment Report FY 2018-19 Revised
-  EGSC BA Payroll Annual Assessment Report FY 2019-20
-  EGSC BA Payroll Data Maintenance Collection Plan
-  EGSC BA Payroll Plan for Annual Analysis of Assessment Results
-  EGSC BA Student Accounts Annual Assessment Report FY 2017-18
-  EGSC BA Student Accounts Annual Assessment Report FY 2018-19
-  EGSC BA Student Accounts Annual Assessment Report FY 2019-20
-  EGSC BA Student Accounts Assessment Data Maintenance Collection Plan
-  EGSC BA Student Accounts Plan for Annual Analysis of Assessment Results
-  EGSC BA VPBA Annual Assessment Report FY 2017-18
-  EGSC BA VPBA Annual Assessment Report FY 2018-19
-  EGSC IA Alumni Services Annual Assessment Report FY 2017-18
-  EGSC IA Alumni Services Annual Assessment Report FY 2018-19
-  EGSC IA Events Planner Annual Assessment Report FY 2017-18
-  EGSC IA Events Planner Annual Assessment Report FY 2018-19
-  EGSC IA Fulford Center Annual Assessment Report FY 2017-18
-  EGSC IA Fulford Center Annual Assessment Report FY 2018-19
-  EGSC IA MMGYSTC Annual Assessment Report FY 2017-18
-  EGSC IA MMGYSTC Annual Assessment Report FY 2018-19

-  EGSC IA VPIA Annual Assessment Report FY 2018-19
-  EGSC IA VPIA Annual Assessment Report FY2017-18
-  EGSC IT Database Administration Annual Assessment Report 2017-18
-  EGSC IT Database Administration Annual Assessment Report FY 2018-19
-  EGSC IT Database Administration Annual Assessment Report FY 2019-20
-  EGSC IT Database Administration Data Maintenance & Collection Plan
-  EGSC IT Database Administration Plan for Annual Analysis of Assessment Results
-  EGSC IT Databse Administration Assessment Data Summaries FY 2017-18
-  EGSC IT Databse Administration Assessment Data Summaries FY 2018-19
-  EGSC IT Databse Administration Assessment Data Summaries FY 2019-20
-  EGSC IT Enterprise Services Annual Assessment Report FY 2017-18
-  EGSC IT Enterprise Services Annual Assessment Report FY 2018-19
-  EGSC IT Information Security Annual Assessment Report FY 2018-19
-  EGSC IT Infrastructure Services Annual Assessment Report FY 2017-18
-  EGSC IT Infrastructure Services Annual Assessment Report FY 2018-19
-  EGSC IT Support Services Annual Assessment Report FY 2017-18
-  EGSC IT Support Services Annual Assessment Report FY 2018-19
-  EGSC IT VPIT Annual Assessment Report FY 2017-18
-  EGSC IT VPIT Annual Assessment Report FY 2018-19
-  EGSC IT Web Services Annual Assessment Report FY 2017-18
-  EGSC IT Web Services Annual Assessment Report FY 2018-19
-  EGSC PO Legal Affairs Annual Assessment Report FY 2017-18
-  EGSC PO Legal Affairs Annual Assessment Report FY 2018-19
-  EGSC PO Strategic Planning & Institutional Research Annual Assessment Report FY 2018-19
-  EGSC PO Strategic Planning & Institutional Research Annual Assessment Report FY 2017-18
-  EGSC SA Enrollment Management Annual Assessment Report FY 2017-18
-  EGSC SA Enrollment Management Annual Assessment Report FY 2018-19
-  EGSC Statesboro Annual Assessment Report FY 2017-18
-  EGSC Statesboro Annual Assessment Report FY 2018-19
-  EGSC VPASA Adm. Plan for Annual Analysis of Assessment Results 7-20-2020
-  EGSC VPASA Administrative Assessment Data Maintenance & Collection Plan 7-20-2020.
-  EGSC VPASA Annual Assessment Report FY 2017-18 (Page 2)
-  EGSC VPASA Annual Assessment Report FY 2018-19 (Page 2)
-  EGSC VPASA Annual Assessment Report FY 2019-20
-  EGSC VPASA Data Maintenance and Collection Plan
-  EGSC VPASA Data Maintenance and Collection Plan (Page 2)

-  EGSC VPASA Plan for Annual Analysis of Assessment Results
-  USG BOR Business Procedures Manual 5.2 Human Resources Operations (Page 3)

**8.1 Student Achievement**

The institution identifies, evaluates, and publishes goals and outcomes for student achievement appropriate to the institution's mission, the nature of the students it serves, and the kinds of programs offered. The institution uses multiple measures to document student success.

**Judgment**

Compliant    Partial Compliance    Non-Compliant    Not Applicable

**Narrative**

**EGSC Compliance Certification**

[Link to Compliance Certification for 8.1](#)

**Off-site Committee Comments**

The institution presented data on several student achievement metrics used by the institution to document student success. These metrics were first-time full-time 3-year graduation rate, freshman one-year retention rate, overall course success rate, and annual number of graduates. The institution also identified its key completion indicator to be three-year graduation rate of first-time full-time students. Thresholds of acceptability were also presented for the same metrics. Additional metrics were also presented but did not include thresholds of acceptability. Furthermore, the institution provided evidence that it publishes its metrics on its website. The website sample did show some of the metrics for student success but not all. The institution should demonstrate that it publishes the results of all the metrics used to document student success.

**Institution Response**

The Off-Site Review Committee noted two deficiencies in EGSC’s Compliance Certification narrative which require clarification and correction in this Focused Report response for Core Requirement 8.1:

- “The institution presented data on several student achievement metrics used by the institution to document student success.... Additional metrics were also presented but did not include thresholds of acceptability.”
- “Furthermore, the institution provided evidence that it publishes its metrics on its website. The website sample did show some of the metrics for student success but not all. The institution should demonstrate that it publishes the results of all the metrics used to document student success.”

Upon further reflection, EGSC concurs with the Committee’s findings and have taken corrective action to address these shortcomings both in the Focused Report narrative below and in the student achievement content published on the EGSC website. Thanks to the Committee’s feedback, we have now published our consistent set of five mission-relevant student achievement metrics (i.e., “criteria” to use the Resource Manual’s term), which are highlighted in this narrative and published on our Student Achievement website. All five metrics of student achievement have reasonable “thresholds of acceptability” which are stated here and published on the website consistently. All five metrics also have outcomes recorded in tabular form, along with interpretations of student success findings reflected in those outcomes in textual form cited here and published on the website. Collectively, these corrective actions constitute a substantial overhaul of the content presented in

the Compliance Certification narrative. The narrative below and its supporting documentation should now be much better aligned with the Commission’s expectations for full compliance with this core requirement.

In the process of achieving this improved state of affairs, some of the metrics mentioned earlier were not retained as they lacked sufficient justification and centrality to the institution’s educational mission. Some of the detailed breakouts of the data for particular metrics were either removed as irrelevant or collapsed for a simpler presentation of the student achievement data, especially when differences in the disaggregated data appeared negligible. In addition, greater attention was given and cited to the mission-relatedness of the metrics and their assessment results, as is expected in the Resource Manual’s guidance.

One of the most important adjustments made here concerns the identification of the thresholds of acceptability. The Resource Manual’s Note for CR 8.1 states the definition of such thresholds this way: “...**the thresholds of acceptability are the minimal expectations set by the institution to define its own acceptable level of achievement (i.e., a minimum target).**” Frankly, we erred in preparing the Compliance Certification when we cited our aspirational goals rather than minimum expectations. Those aspirational goals came from our Complete College Georgia reports to the System Office for a number of student achievement metrics instead of identifying our minimal and reasonable targets or thresholds for acceptable student achievement results, according to the SACSCOC Core Requirement. The narrative below and its supporting Student Achievement website now cite thresholds of acceptability instead of our aspirational goals. These thresholds are reasonable minimal targets of student achievement and student success for each metric. The rationales for setting those minimal targets of acceptability also received greater attention and justification below than was presented previously.

**DISTINCTIVE CHARACTERISTICS OF EGSC’S MISSION AND STUDENT BODY AFFECTING STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT MEASURES TO BE HIGHLIGHTED**

Although EGSC is a Level II institution offering three baccalaureate degrees, most of our students are enrolled as freshmen or sophomores with plans to transfer to a four-year university (often before completing one of the EGSC transfer associate degree programs). That fact tends to depress the EGSC graduation and retention rates and inflate our transfer-out rates. Most of those students who enroll at EGSC’s off-campus instructional site, in Statesboro, are preparing to qualify for undergraduate transfer admission after their first 30 semester hours to Georgia Southern University in Statesboro, a Comprehensive University in the USG. Likewise, most of those enrolled at EGSC’s off-campus instructional site on the Augusta University campus are preparing to qualify for undergraduate transfer admission after their first 30 hours to that Research University in the USG. Admission standards at EGSC are access-oriented, and therefore are much lower than those at the USG’s comprehensive and research universities, which are much more selective. That is another factor that tends to depress retention and graduation rates at EGSC.

EGSC’s associate degree programs, regardless of where or how they are offered, are transfer associate instead of career associate degree programs. That means that these associate degree largely duplicate the general education curriculum and other lower division courses found in the first two years of degree completion requirements of baccalaureate degree programs for specific upper division majors. Career associate programs typically consist of fewer general education requirements and more major field requirements than transfer associate programs because their primary intent is not to transfer graduates into upper division majors of four-year degrees but to prepare graduates for career entry in their chosen major field of study at the associate degree level. Students enrolled in career associate degrees tend to have more of a reason to persist and complete such degrees than students in transfer associate programs since the former leads to employment and the latter

leads to more undergraduate education. That fact needs to be taken into account when examining graduation rates of peer comparator institutions.

Georgia’s public higher education system has two major system components, neither of which include comprehensive community colleges. The University System of Georgia (USG), in which EGSC is a member, is heavily baccalaureate, graduate, and professional from the associate to the doctoral degree level (including professional M.D. and J.D. degrees). There are four mission categories of institutions among the 26 member institutions in the USG, including, 4 Research Universities, 4 Comprehensive Universities, 9 State Universities and 9 State Colleges. The state colleges (including EGSC), all of which are Level II, are transfer associate heavy rather than career associate heavy, and 3 are associate dominant rather than balanced in their transfer associate and bachelor degree offerings. Most of the associate degrees offered throughout the USG are transfer associates, although some institutions offer career associate degrees, largely in the nursing and health professions where state shortages exist for such graduates.

EGSC is one of the three associate degree dominant state colleges and offers no career associate programs in a traditional sense nor the ASN degree. Several of the USG state colleges have been elevated from Level I to Level II in the past decade, some more recently than others, including EGSC. The Technical College System of Georgia (TCSG) consists of a statewide distribution of 22 Level I technical colleges offering diploma and associate degrees in career-oriented fields of preparation.

The USG’s mission categories are highly correlated with first-year retention and graduation rates of three years for associate degrees and six years for baccalaureate degrees of First-Time Full-time (FTFT) Freshman cohorts. The higher an institution of higher education rises from the state college category to the research university category, the stronger the retention and graduation rates tend to be. Therefore, setting reasonable thresholds of acceptable student success must take such categorical differences of USG institutions into account. Table 1 contains the first-year retention and graduation rates for associate degree students separately from baccalaureate students by mission category.

**Table 1: Most Recent Retention and Graduation Rates by Degree level and Mission Category in the USG**

USG Mission Category	Associate Degree Students		Bachelor Degree Students	
	1st-Yr FTFT Retention Rate	3-Yr FTFT Graduation Rate	1st-Yr FTFT Retention Rate	6-Yr FTFT Graduation Rate
Research University	72%	19%	89%	75%
Comprehensive University	NR*	NR*	76%	46%
State University	64%	12%	72%	44%
State College	55%	15%	64%	23%
Total USG	62%	14%	79%	54%

\*NR=Not reliable rates due to relatively small cohort sizes.

As Table 1 indicates, 1st-year retention rates and 3-year graduation rates are substantially higher for associate degree students at institutions with the more selective admission standards and comprehensive curricula. The one research university offering associate degree programs on its campuses in Metropolitan Atlanta (Georgia State University) has a 1st-year retention rate that is 17 percentage points higher and a 3-year graduation rate that is 4 percentage points higher than the comparable rates for state colleges respectively. That effect is even more pronounced for baccalaureate degree students where 1st-year retention rates are 25 percentage points higher and

6-year graduation rates are 52 percentage points higher at the research universities than the comparable rates at the senior colleges, respectively.

Within the state colleges category, small state colleges located in rural areas of the state with currently a largely associate transfer mission tend to have lower retention rates than other state colleges near or in cities and with more established baccalaureate programs. Gordon State College in Barnesville, South Georgia State College in Douglas, and EGSC in Swainsboro are rural peer comparators in that regard. As Table 2 indicates, their combined 1st-year retention rates for their associate degree students are notably lower than the comparable combined rates for the other state colleges. Since the bachelor’s degree programs at all three of these institutions are younger than 6 years old, none have 6-year graduation rates, to date, so such a metric of student achievement is precluded for them.

**Table 2: Associate Retention and Graduation Rates Among Peer Senior Colleges**

Select State Colleges and Subtotals	Associate Degree Students	
	1st-Yr FTFT Retention Rate	3-Yr FTFT Graduation Rate
Gordon State College	54%	15%
East Georgia State College	50%	13%
South Georgia College	44%	16%
Combined Totals for These	50%	15%
Combined Totals for Others	64%	15%

When institutional mission as described above is considered, it is easy to understand why various criteria or metrics of student achievement are chosen to be highlighted at EGSC. First-year retention rates are vitally important to assess and monitor for the health of EGSC’s enrollment and the educational welfare of EGSC’s students. Three-year graduation rates are also vital, but are perhaps not as important as the transfer-out rates within three years, given EGSC’s central mission as a transfer institution, which provides opportunities for under-prepared college students to succeed sufficiently in their early collegiate experience to qualify for transfer into baccalaureate programs whether they complete an associate’s degree or not. Lack of success in completing EGSC courses can be a major stumbling block to student retention, successful transfer, and program graduation. Consequently, monitoring and improving successful completion of courses is vitally important in that regard. While there continues to be USG emphasis on improving retention and graduation rates statewide, the Complete College Georgia (CCG) initiative is equally committed to increasing the number of college degrees and other post-secondary credentials needed for the educated workforce of the future in Georgia. Consequently, degree productivity is an important measure of student achievement at EGSC and throughout the USG.

**STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT METRICS WITH REASONABLE MINIMUM THRESHOLDS OF ACCEPTABILITY AND FINDINGS OF STUDENT SUCCESS**

EGSC’s longstanding and primary educational mission has been to provide post-secondary access to and transfer opportunity in collegiate education to many students in East Central Georgia who aspire to complete a four-year bachelor’s degree but who may not qualify for admission to their university of choice as freshmen. Its campus operations on or near the Augusta University campus and the Georgia Southern University campus have that as their principal aim. All of EGSC’s two-year degree programs are transfer associate degrees which consist of curricular pathways typically taken by college freshmen and sophomores who aspire to complete a baccalaureate degree in a particular major field of study as college juniors and seniors. The following metrics of student achievement document the extent to which EGSC accomplishes its educational mission and facilitates the collegiate success of its students.



**Three-Year Transfer-Out Rates of Student Success**

Since EGSC is largely a transfer institution for the first two years of college, it makes sense that the most important metric of student achievement at EGSC is the rate at which its students successfully transfer to another college or university. Examining those rates in the context of a three-year window since beginning as first-time full-time (FTFT) students at EGSC makes these transfer-out rates comparable to the rates of associate degree completions within three years since beginning as FTFT freshmen at EGSC (i.e., graduation rates). The 3-year graduation rate is a key statistic reported to IPEDS on the federal level each fall as part of EGSC’s Enrollment Report, but data on the 3-year transfer-out rate has to be sought through another national agency—the National Student Clearinghouse. The latest data available for EGSC on its 3-year transfer-out rates are for the 2011, 2012, and 2013 FTFT freshman cohorts as shown in Table 3. The 3-year graduation rates and the 3-year transfer-out rates are calculated separately. For both rates, a cohort member can only be counted once in either of the two categories of transfer student or graduated student.

**Table 3: EGSC’s Three-Year Transfer-Out Rates  
Threshold of Acceptability: 60 Percent**

<b>Three-Year Transfer-Out Data</b>	<b>2011 Cohort</b>	<b>2012 Cohort</b>	<b>2013 Cohort</b>	<b>All 3 Cohorts</b>
Fall Cohort Number	1,541	1,171	929	3641
Number Transferred-out in 3 Years	1,071	773	614	2458
<b>3-Year Transfer-out Rate</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>66%</b>	<b>66%</b>	<b>68%</b>

**Key Finding:** National data confirm that two-thirds of EGSC’s FTFT freshmen successfully transfer to another college or university of choice within three years after starting as beginning freshmen at EGSC. That is a high rate of student success which is normally not seen when only examining 3-year graduation rates and first-year retention rates which can be depressed when large numbers of students leave the institution with no explanation such as successfully transferring out. These transfer-out results confirm that EGSC is accomplishing its primary transfer mission in a substantial way.

**Justification for the Minimal Threshold of Acceptability at 60%:** The key finding of a two-thirds transfer-out rate has been relatively stable for the last three cohorts of available national data. However, since 2013, EGSC has added three baccalaureate programs and risen from Level I to Level II. As those 4-year programs mature and others are added in the future, it is reasonable to expect that a slightly smaller percentage of future FTFT freshman cohorts will want to transfer out of EGSC to complete a bachelor’s degree when they can remain at EGSC and complete the bachelor’s here. A minimum threshold of acceptability of 60% for student achievement as reflected in the 3-year transfer-out rate at EGSC takes such continuing growth of baccalaureate degree programs into account.

**Three-Year Graduation Rates of Student Success**

Federal and state interest in collegiate graduation rates has existed for well over a decade. It was triggered largely by the rapid rise in tuition for baccalaureate degrees and focused largely on the 6-year graduation rates for 4-year degrees. Two-year colleges were incorporated into that interest in increasing by examining the 3-year graduation rates for associate degree completions. As is true in the USG and elsewhere, graduation rates for bachelor’s degrees are substantially higher than for associate degrees, especially when many associate degrees are transfer-oriented instead of career-oriented and completion of a transfer associate degree is not necessary for transfer into a bachelor’s degree program. The institution’s transfer-out rate, if it is large as it is at EGSC, also depresses the

graduation rate and the first-year retention rate. EGSC’s associate degree 3-year graduation rate is based on the percentage of a FTFT fall semester cohort who completed an associate degree within three years after becoming a beginning freshman at EGSC and is reported annually in the federal IPEDS report on Fall Enrollment (see Table 4). Two-year colleges have complained for many years that focusing only on the 3-year graduation rate without considering the 3-year transfer-out rate can paint a misleading picture of student achievement and student success in transfer-oriented 2-year programs of study.

**Table 4: EGSC’s Three-Year Graduation Rates  
Threshold of Acceptability: 12 Percent**

Fall Semester	Cohort Graduates	FTFT Cohort	3-Year Graduation Rate
Fall 2012	126	1,171	11%
Fall 2013	112	929	12%
Fall 2014	133	973	14%
Fall 2015	131	1,044	13%
Fall 2016	127	980	13%
<b>Overall for 5 Years</b>	<b>629</b>	<b>5,097</b>	<b>12%</b>

**Key Finding:** There have been small percentage fluctuations in the 3-year graduation rates for associate degrees at EGSC over the last five years, but 12% has been the average over that time. That may appear low, but when this 12% average is added to the overall 68% 3-year transfer-out rate, it can be concluded that 8 out of every 10 EGSC beginning freshmen are successful in either achieving a transfer associate’s degree or transferring out to another college or university of their choice.

**Justification for the Minimal Threshold of Acceptability at 12%:** The 12 percent minimum threshold is twice that of the 3-year graduation rate of 6% for EGSC’s Fall 2011 FTFT Cohort just prior to the launching of EGSC’s CCG initiative, which constituted a major improvement. It is consistent with the average 3-year graduation rate of EGSC’s five most recently reported FTFT fall cohorts. It is also consistent with the 12% 3-year graduation rate for state universities in the USG as noted in Table 1. It is a few percentage points lower than the graduation rates at peer state colleges as presented in Table 2, but it is important to note that both Gordon State and South Georgia State offer career associate programs in nursing which tend to have high graduation rates, pulling their graduation rates up. Gordon also offers 12 baccalaureate degree programs associated with their transfer associate pathway programs which encourage transfer associate degree completions at Gordon for continued study at the bachelor’s level at Gordon. Likewise, South Georgia offers 6 bachelor’s degree programs associated with their transfer associate degree pathway programs, twice as many as EGSC. In that context, EGSC’s 12% threshold of acceptability appears reasonable and could be raised in the future as baccalaureate degree offerings increase. As stated previously, 3-year graduation rates for associate degree completion are the focus here because of EGSC’s (and Gordon’s and South Georgia’s) long-term commitment to transfer associate degree offerings and the relatively recent initiation of bachelor’s degree programs (at all three peer state colleges) which have not yet been in existence long enough to have valid 6-year graduation rates.

**First-Year Retention Rates**

As defined in IPEDS reporting, the 1st-Year Retention rate is the percentage of a fall’s FTFT cohort who returns to enroll in the following fall semester one year later. Undergraduate student attrition tends to be greatest in the first year or two of collegiate study. First-year retention rates tend to be much greater at a highly selective research university than at a largely two-year college with open

admission standards. Substantial differences in student preparation for college and the difficulties of getting admitted at those two extremes have a lot to do with more attrition at the two-year college. But as was noted above, some of what might appear to be attrition when only looking at EGSC’s 1st-year retention rates may not be a function of students dropping out of college as it may be successfully transferring to another college or university of choice after the freshman year has been successfully completed. EGSC’s first-year retention rates are reported in Table 7 for the last five years.

**Table 5: EGSC’s First-Year Retention Rates  
Threshold of Acceptability: 50 Percent**

Fall Semester	Cohort Retained	FTFT Cohort	First-Year Retention Rate
Fall 2014	528	973	54%
Fall 2015	556	1,044	53%
Fall 2016	482	980	49%
Fall 2017	478	933	51%
Fall 2018	478	954	50%
<b>Overall</b>	<b>2,522</b>	<b>4,884</b>	<b>52%</b>

**Key Finding:** About half of EGSC’s first-time full-time freshmen each fall do not re-enroll at EGSC the following fall. However, the three-year transfer-out rates cited above suggest that a substantial number of these non-returning students were probably successfully transferred to other colleges and universities which is, after all, EGSC’s principal mission.

**Justification for the Minimal Threshold of Acceptability at 50%:** Based on the overall first-year retention at EGSC for the past five years of 52%, the USG’s first-year retention rate for associate students at the 9 state colleges of 55% (see Table 1), and the combined rate for the three rural peer state colleges of 50%, a threshold of acceptable student success of 50% appears very reasonable. Again, none of us know what effect the coronavirus pandemic will have on students returning to college in Fall 2020, but this threshold is presently justified by past data.

**Successful Course Completions**

Failure to successfully complete college-level courses is a major stumbling block to student retention, progression, transfer, and graduation, especially for first-year students where one or two failed courses can result in a devastated cumulative GPA from which recovery is extremely difficult. That fact is well-recognized at EGSC and throughout the USG as campuses engage in the Gateway to Completion initiative (G2C). The principal purpose of that initiative is to redesign first-year general education courses with high DFWI rates which are undermining early student success in college to achieve higher passing rates in those gateway courses to student success. Presented in Table 6 below are the course completion success rates for the five most recent academic years, 2015-16 through 2019-20. Course completion success is defined as having earned a “C” or better in a completed course during the academic year.

**Table 6: EGSC’s Rates of Successful Course Completions  
Threshold of Acceptability: 60 Percent**

Course Success Rates	Fall 2015	Fall 2016	Fall 2017	Fall 2018	Fall 2019
On-Campus Course Success Rates	69%	70%	67%	65%	66%
Online Course Success Rates	64%	67%	67%	64%	62%
<b>Overall Course Success Outcomes</b>	<b>68%</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>67%</b>	<b>64%</b>	<b>65%</b>

**Key Finding:** Successful completions of on-campus and online courses have been relatively stable over the last five years with about two-thirds of all courses being completed successfully.

**Justification for the Minimal Threshold of Acceptability at 60%:** EGSC has open admission standards meaning that under-prepared students are given access to opportunity to demonstrate success in completing college coursework. Many are not able to do so because of their academic deficiencies and despite attempts to provide supplemental academic support. In Fall 2018 admission standards were loosened to their current level of openness, and successful course completion rates both on-campus and online dipped a little. Given the current heavy reliance on online learning during the coronavirus pandemic, it is possible that 2020-21 success rates could drop further. Under these circumstances, the threshold of acceptability of 60% appears reasonable.

**Degrees Conferred as a Measure of Student Success**

While the rate at which students graduate is important, the absolute number of degrees awarded is equally important within the USG’s Complete College Georgia (CCG) initiative and the need for a more educated workforce in the future. Listed below in Table 7 are the number of graduates for the last five fiscal years (FY) as reported to IPEDS each year, beginning with the summer semester and concluding with the following spring semester. Prior to EGSC’s initiation of its CCG plans, the number of degrees awarded in FY 2011-12 was 168, about half as many as in the average for the last five years.

**Table 7: Annual Number of Degrees Conferred/Graduates at EGSC  
Threshold of Acceptability: 300**

Fiscal Year	FY 2015-16	FY 2016-17	FY 2017-18	FY 2018-19	*FY 2019-20	Avg/Year
<b>Graduates</b>	359	346	302	322	304	326

\*FY 2019-20 USG Degrees Conferred not yet reported to IPEDS.

**Key Finding:** The annual number of degrees conferred at EGSC over the past five years has fluctuated somewhat but exceeded 300 each year. The average per year of 326 was roughly double the number in 2011-12 prior to the onset of EGSC’s Complete College Georgia plans.

**Justification for the Minimal Threshold of Acceptability at 300:** Up until Fall 2019 when headcount enrollment dropped by 200 students, annual fall enrollment remained relatively stable, fluctuating by about 100 students up or down since Fall 2012. In that context, it is not surprising that the number of degrees conferred has also been relatively stable in recent years. It is not clear how the coronavirus pandemic will affect enrollments and degree completions going forward, but setting the minimum threshold of acceptability at 300 appears reasonable at this time in this context.

**PUBLICATION OF STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT METRICS ON EGSC WEBSITE**

The five student achievement metrics (i.e., criteria) discussed above are published with their basic definitions, data tables, thresholds of acceptability, and key findings of student success on the EGSC Student Achievement Webpage on the EGSC Website. All of that published material duplicates in a consistent manner what is reported above in this response for those metrics other than the justifications for the thresholds of acceptability. The five metrics are also listed in the same order that they appear above.

**CONCLUSION**

EGSC identifies, evaluates, and publishes goals and outcomes for student achievement appropriate to the College's mission, the nature of the students it serves, and the kinds of programs offered. EGSC uses multiple measures to document student success.

**Sources**

-  EGSC IPEDS Fall 2012 FTFT Cohort Graduation Rate Survey Summary 2018 Report Year
-  EGSC IPEDS Fall 2013 FTFT Cohort Graduation Rate Survey Summary 2019 Report Year
-  EGSC Student Achievement Webpage Revision
-  USG EGSC Degrees Conferred FY 2016
-  USG EGSC Degrees Conferred FY 2017
-  USG EGSC Degrees Conferred FY 2018
-  USG EGSC Degrees Conferred FY 2019
-  USG FTFT 1-Year Bachelor Retention Rate Report 2018
-  USG FTFT 1-Year Retention Rate Report 2014
-  USG FTFT 1-Year Retention Rate Report 2015
-  USG FTFT 1-Year Retention Rate Report 2016
-  USG FTFT 1-Year Retention Rate Report 2017
-  USG FTFT 1-Year Retention Rate Report 2018
-  USG FTFT 3 Year Grad Rate Report 2012
-  USG FTFT 3 Year Grad Rate Report 2013
-  USG FTFT 3 Year Grad Rate Report 2014
-  USG FTFT 3 Year Grad Rate Report 2015
-  USG FTFT 3 Year Grad Rate Report 2016
-  USG FTFT 6-Year Bachelor Grad Rate Report 2013

**8.2.b Student Outcomes: General Education**

The institution identifies expected outcomes, assesses the extent to which it achieves these outcomes, and provides evidence of seeking improvement based on analysis of the results in the areas below:

b. student learning outcomes for collegiate-level general education competencies of its undergraduate degree programs.

**Judgment**

Compliant    Partial Compliance    Non-Compliant    Not Applicable

**Narrative**

**East Georgia State College Compliance Certification**

[Link to Compliance Certification for 8.2.b](#)

**Off-site Committee Comments**

The institution’s general education program follows the system Board of Regents policy on core curriculum. This policy states that each institution’s core curriculum will consist of 42 semester credit hours, including minimum credit hours in specified areas. Each system institution develops institution-specific general education student learning outcomes (SLOs) that are aligned with the system-defined areas/goals. The institution developed its general education SLOs in 2011 and they were reaffirmed in 2019. Several of the outcomes are stated in a circular fashion such that success of the outcomes is assumed by collegiate success of the student by using the language “at the level necessary to succeed in higher education.”

No definitions, benchmarks, targets, or rubrics are provided to guide assessment. Program maps demonstrate the alignment of academic program SLOs with general education program SLOs. The assessment of the academic program SLOs is provided as evidence of the general education SLO assessment, however, there is no separate assessment of the general education SLOs across programs. Comprehensive program reviews of general education were completed in 2009 and 2016 but these did not focus on SLO assessment. Changes have been made to address course pass rates, retention rates, and graduation rates. These changes, however, do not appear to be based on assessment of the general education SLOs. There is no articulation of a process of general education SLO assessment separate from academic program SLO assessment that demonstrates the extent to which it achieves each of the general education SLOs and provides evidence that it is seeking improvement based on the results of this process.

**Institution Response**

EGSC officials were disappointed by the Off-Site Committees findings that so many aspects of the college’s general education assessment process and outcomes were either deficient or missing. In response to those findings, campus-wide academic administrators met repeatedly in Summer 2020 to review this feedback and take corrective action. All of the noted deficiencies that led to a finding of noncompliance will be addressed in this Focused Report. Those deficiencies include the following:

- **Questionable wording of several SLOs for general education:** We regret that EGSC may have relied too much on guidance provided by USG policy and the System’s General Education Council in the formulation and approval of EGSC’s general education SLOs, dating

back to nearly a decade ago. We now more fully understand that responding to USG expectations is in many ways different from responding to SACSCOC expectations in this regard and take the Off-Site Committee’s feedback seriously and positively. Corrective action taken in response to the Committee’s report includes having made wording adjustments to the questionable SLOs as is discussed in more detail below.

- **Lack of sufficient separation of general education assessments from educational program assessments:** We see now that the use of Program Maps in the Compliance Certification to point evaluators back to program assessment results instead of focusing explicitly on general education assessment results under 8.2.b was not the appropriate approach to documenting EGSC’s compliance with 8.2.b. EGSC is an associate degree dominant institution. Prior to 2017, EGSC only offered one associate degree. In 2017, EGSC was approved by the USG to offer a series of “associate degrees with disciplinary distinction.” EGSC then began separately assessing attainment of the learning outcomes for each of these new degree programs in addition to continuing our long-time assessment of general education. There is a close relationship between assessment of these individual degree programs and assessment of general education (particularly in an associate degree dominant institution such as EGSC). However, we recognize that these are distinct assessment systems. In seeking to demonstrate that relationship, we concur with the Committee that too little was explained and documented previously about the definitions, benchmarks, targets, and rubrics used to guide general education assessment. We also concur that addressing 8.2.b separately from 8.2.a is necessary so that assessments and observed results for expected general education outcomes are explicit and clear. Consequently, in this Focused Report we have described and documented our end-of-course assessments which have been administered regularly since our current general education SLOs were adopted approximately 10 years ago. These assessments are administered in the general education courses most closely related to each identified general education SLO. In this focused report, we have abandoned the approach taken in our Compliance Certification of describing assessment of general education SLOs as part of the assessment of educational program SLOs. More about that corrective action taken is provided below.
- **Confounding other forms of general education assessment with the assessment of general education SLOs:** We concur with the Committee’s findings that our Compliance Certification focused heavily on assessments affecting general education courses and the general education program, which typically did not include assessments of general education SLOs as the Committee correctly noted. Those other forms of assessment included comprehensive program reviews of general education and the CCG initiatives involving Gateways to Completion and Momentum Year. Although using these other forms of assessment are important to EGSC for improving the general education program and student success in completing its most challenging requirements, we regret that we did not stay focused in our Compliance Certification on assessments of expected general education student learning outcomes when responding previously to 8.2.b. The corrective action taken in this Focused Report includes deleting references to those other forms of general education assessment and focusing solely on the assessments of general education SLOs as described below.
- **No articulation of a process of general education SLO assessment that demonstrates the extent to which EGSC achieves each of its general education SLOs:** Regrettably, this observation of the Committee is also true. We failed previously in our Compliance Certification to not only describe the extent to which each general education SLO was achieved or not achieved, we also often failed to conduct investigative analyses of those results to identify actions which could be taken to improve general education learning outcomes going forward. Data does exist for course-level general education SLO assessments for the past four assessment cycles at EGSC, and it is now cited and discussed in this Focused Report below. Addressing needed improvements in those existing general education

assessment processes is also underway. Specifically, EGSC has adopted revised wording and content for all seven general education SLOs effective for the 2020-2021 academic year. EGSC will also immediately implement a process to standardize rubric-based assessments of relevant end-of-course and mid-term student work products as discussed and documented below.

- **No articulation of a process of general education SLO assessment that provides evidence that EGSC is seeking improvement based on an analysis of results in this SLO assessment process:** We agree with the Committee’s observation that the improvements to general education cited previously were linked largely to program evaluations and student success evaluations of general education courses and were not linked to assessments and analysis of the expected student learning outcomes in general education. Again, in our Compliance Certification we erred in not staying focused on the improvement of student learning in general education as is expected in 8.2.b. The corrective actions taken to improve the existing general education assessment processes address these previous weaknesses in pursuing improvement in student learning in general education at EGSC.

Although these missteps made in the previous Compliance Certification narrative for demonstrating compliance with 8.2.b were notable, EGSC officials appreciate the Off-Site Committee’s detailed and candid feedback on them. We are taking that feedback seriously, implementing extensive corrective actions to address each of the Committee’s concerns, and remain committed to continuous improvement of our assessment processes for improving the expected student learning outcomes of general education at EGSC.

**Questionable Wording of Several SLOs for General Education at EGSC**

The Off-Site Committee cited weaknesses in EGSC’s SLOs for general education when it said, “Several of the outcomes are stated in a circular fashion such that success of the outcomes is assumed by collegiate success of the student by using the language ‘at the level necessary to succeed in higher education’.” We interpret that feedback to mean that in such SLOs, specific aspects of expected student learning are not identified sufficiently and that overall achievement of the SLO is merely a function of passing the course or courses in question (i.e., the level necessary to succeed in higher education). Admittedly, if a transcript of passed college courses were considered sufficient to document the student learning expected of a college graduate, all of the national attention given to identifying SLOs and instituting SLO assessment processes separate from course grades and transcript records of completed courses by the USDOE and national and regional accreditors over the last several decades would not have evolved or become necessary.

In that context and as a result of further in-depth reflection on the wording and interpretation of EGSC’s now former SLOs for general education, the EGSC faculty Senate agreed with the EGSC Academic Policies and Curriculum Committee that revising the wording of these SLOs was needed to be more specific in their reference to key aspects of student learning in each competency area which are expected to be demonstrated in the assessment results of general education SLOs. To do that, we first considered four key elements which are now shown in Table 1. Those elements include the former SLO and its competency area in general education, the specific general education courses where end-of-course assessments of SLO achievement would be best conducted, the catalog course description of each of those courses, and the current revised SLO and its related competency area in general education. Identifying the general education courses which most closely align with basic general education competencies and examining their course content helped to inform the process of revising the newly adopted SLOs for general education at EGSC which are now more specific in their content and not circular in their expected achievement.

SLOs for educational programs are commonly understood to be what the graduating student of an educational program takes away in terms of in-depth knowledge, skills and attitudes from the



educational experience of completing a degree program in a particular major field of study. Assessments of the achievement of such SLOs are often best conducted in a degree program’s capstone courses, projects, or theses. General education on the other hand is typically offered to undergraduates in the early years of a collegiate degree program and consists of a broad-field set of studies in different disciplinary courses and for which there is no capstone experience. Consequently, assessments of general education are often best conducted in the different basic competency areas of general education at the course level, preferably with end-of-course assessments that reflect cumulative learning in the course or courses involved.

**Table 1: Elements of Each General Educational Competency Area Considered When Revising the Wording of SLOs for General Education at EGSC**

Previous General Education SLOs and Competency Areas	Best Gen Ed Courses for End-of-Course Assessments	Catalog Course Descriptions	Current Revised Gen. Ed. SLOs and Competency Areas
<p>Students will demonstrate the ability to read and write with the competence necessary to succeed in higher education.</p> <p>(Communication Competencies)</p>	<p>ENGL 1101: English Composition I ENGL 1102: English Composition II</p>	<p>ENGL 1101 English Composition I. A composition course focusing on skills required for effective writing in a variety of contexts, with emphasis on exposition, analysis, and argumentation, and also including introductory use of a variety of research skills.</p> <p>ENGL 1102 English Composition II A composition course that develops writing skills beyond the levels of proficiency required by ENGL 1101, emphasizes interpretation and evaluation and that incorporates a variety of more advanced research methods.</p>	<p>Students will demonstrate college-level writing proficiency in written exposition, analysis, argumentation, interpretation, and evaluation using properly researched sources of information.</p> <p>(Writing Competency Area)</p>
<p>Students will demonstrate the ability to solve problems algebraically, numerically, and graphically at the level necessary to succeed in higher education.</p> <p>(Mathematical Competencies)</p>	<p>MATH 1001: Quantitative Skills-Reasoning MATH 1111: College Algebra</p>	<p>MATH 1101 Introduction to Mathematical Modeling. An introduction to mathematical modeling using graphical, numerical, symbolic, and verbal techniques to describe and explore real-world data and phenomena. Emphasis is on the use of elementary</p>	<p>Students will demonstrate college-level proficiency in using basic numerical, symbolic, graphical, and mathematical functions for analyzing data and solving quantitative problems with the aid of appropriate technology.</p>

		<p>functions to investigate and analyze applied problems and questions supported by the use of appropriate technology, and on effective communication of quantitative concepts and results.</p> <p>MATH 1111 College Algebra A functional approach to algebra that incorporates the use of appropriate technology. Emphasis will be placed on the study of functions, their graphs, inequalities, and linear quadratic piece-wise defined rational, polynomial, exponential, and logarithmic functions. Appropriate applications will be included.</p>	(Quantitative Competency Area)
<p>Students will demonstrate the ability to speak and listen with the competence necessary to succeed in higher education.</p> <p>(Communication Competencies)</p>	<p>COMM 1110: Public Speaking</p>	<p>COMM 1110 Public Speaking. The organization of materials and the vocal and physical aspects of delivery in various speaking situations.</p>	<p>Students will demonstrate necessary organization of materials for effective vocal and physical presentations in varied speaking contexts.</p> <p>(Oral and Multi-media Presentation Competency)</p>
<p>Students will demonstrate the ability to gather, analyze, and evaluate information to make effective decisions.</p> <p>(Critical Thinking Competencies)</p>	<p>CATS 1101: Critical and Academic Thinking for Success                  HIST 1112: Western Civilization since 1648                  HIST 2111: Survey of US History I</p>	<p>CATS 1101 Critical &amp; Academic Thinking for Success. This CATS 1101 course is the freshman seminar course at East Georgia State College. The course serves as a guide and support for students as they transition into college and develop their identity as student scholars. Methods of instruction include both discussion of key topics in class (thinking) and completion of</p>	<p>Students will demonstrate use of the principles of critical thinking including the gathering, analysis, and evaluation of information to formulate substantive and creative perspectives on challenging events in one's history and experience.</p> <p>(Critical Thinking Competency)</p>

		<p>assignments outside of class (doing). The required readings and class presentations guide students in their growth as scholars who pose problems, discover solutions, resolve controversies, evaluate knowledge and use effective communication skills. The course includes a badging (passport/portfolio) activity that enables students to self-regulate and take responsibility for their learning and production of knowledge. Lab activities linked to the course provide students with a venue for the practice of critical thinking, student engagement and effective communication. The course connects the new student to the resources and people on campus that can help the student be successful.</p> <p>HIST 1122 Survey of Western Civilization II. The second half of a two-semester survey of the political, social, and cultural developments of western civilization. The primary emphasis will be on the modern period.</p> <p>HIST 2111 Survey of U.S. History I. A survey of U.S History to the post-Civil war period.</p> <p>NOTE: All three of these courses contain substantial commitments to teaching the content of the course from a critical thinking perspective and</p>	
--	--	--	--

		helping to develop the student’s critical thinking competency.	
Students will demonstrate the ability to analyze effectively works of literature, art, or music.  (Cultural Competencies)	ENGL 2111: World Literature I ENGL 2112: World Literature II ART 1100: Introduction to Art	ENGL 2111 World Literature I A survey of important works of world literature from ancient times through the mid-seventeenth century.  ENGL 2112 World Literature II A survey of important works of world literature from the mid-seventeenth century to the present.  ART 1100 Introduction to Art Complements art theory with art criticism to provide insight into the characteristics and scope of the visual arts.	Students will demonstrate the recognition of important works of literature or art and the periods in history when they were created and analyze basic characteristics and differences among their different forms.  (Humanities Competency)
Students will demonstrate effective use of scientific methods.  (Scientific Competencies)	BIOL 1103: Introduction to Biology I ISCI 1101: Integrated Science CHEM 1211 Principles of Chemistry I	BIOL 1103 Introductory Biology I Co-requisite: BIOL 1103L A general biology course focused on cell structure and function, cell division, plant and animal energy pathways, genetics, evolution, diversity, structure and function of organisms, interaction with the environment, and global issues. This course is intended for non-science majors only and will not satisfy core requirements for science majors.  BIOL 1103L Introductory Biology I Lab Co-requisite: BIOL 1103 A general biology laboratory course focused on cell structure and function, cell division, plant and animal energy pathways, genetics, evolution,	Students will demonstrate familiarity with basic nomenclature, theories, investigative practices, and laboratory work in the sciences as well as the functional components and use of the scientific method in natural science research.  (Scientific Competency)

		<p>diversity, structure and function of organisms, interaction with the environment, and global issues. Laboratory to accompany BIOL 1103</p> <p>ISCI 1101 Integrated Science A multi-disciplinary course for non-science majors. Students are introduced to fundamental principles of astronomy, biology, chemistry, geology, and physics. The course will focus on the scientific method and critical thinking and will include written laboratory exercises.</p> <p>CHEM 1211 Principles of Chem I The fundamental principles, concepts, and theories, of chemistry are presented including nomenclature, chemical symbols, formulas, equations, and stoichiometry. This course will examine atomic structure, periodic law, chemical bonding, molecular structure and polarity, as well as basic chemical reactions such as oxidation-reduction reactions and acid-base reactions. Thermochemical concepts, as well as the properties of solids, liquids, and gases will be discussed. The laboratory will introduce students to chemical safety the use of basic equipment, and methods of data collection, as well as the synthesis, Isolation, and analysis of chemical compounds.</p>	
--	--	---	--

<p>Students will demonstrate the ability to analyze human behavior from a variety of perspectives.</p> <p>(Behavior Competencies)</p>	<p>POLS 1101 American Government                  PSYC 1101: Introduction to General Psychology                  SOCI 1101: Introduction to Sociology</p>	<p>POLS 1101 American Government                  A study of the political structures and actual functions of the various levels of government in the United States. The national government plus state and local governments of Georgia will be emphasized. Successful completion satisfies the legislative requirements for instruction in the constitutions of the U. S. and Georgia.</p> <p>PSYC 1101 Introduction to General Psychology                  A broad survey of the major topics in psychology including, but not limited to research methodology, biological and social factors influencing behavior, development, learning, memory, personality, and abnormal.</p> <p>SOCI 1101 Introduction to Sociology                  A survey of the discipline of sociology. Topics will include sociological theory, methods and selected substantive area.</p>	<p>Students will demonstrate recognition of the basic principles and theories of human behavior, social organizations, government, laws and policies, behavioral and social deviance, and social scientific research methods.</p> <p>(Social Science Competency)</p>
---	---	---	--

It should be obvious from the revisions made to the current seven general education SLOs for EGSC that the suggested circular argumentation cited by the Off-Site Committee has been eliminated from the first three SLOs. Furthermore, all seven SLOs have been edited, expanded, and sharpened to articulate the specific aspects of student learning which are expected to be assessed and achieved for each competency. The presence of those specific details will guide the development of the assessment rubrics which will be created and used to evaluate the extent to which not only the overall SLO is achieved but also the extent to which the specific identified dimensions of the SLO are also achieved. Having this additional detail in the SLO and in SLO's assessment rubric will facilitate the identification of which dimensions of the observed learning outcomes are stronger than others and where further improvements should be targeted to increase SLO achievement in the future. As is explained below, all seven of these SLOs are expected to be assessed annually by faculty, using

the associated rubric to judge the achievement levels of the SLO that are present in an appropriate end-of-course student work product.

### **Lack of Sufficient Separation of General Education Assessments from Educational Program Assessments**

**The Off-Site Review Committee stated,** “there is no separate assessment of the general education SLOs across programs” and “there is no articulation of a process of general education SLO assessment separate from academic program SLO assessment that demonstrates the extent to which it achieves each of the general education SLOs and provides evidence that it is seeking improvement based on the results of this process.” EGSC agrees with the Off-Site Committee findings that EGSC’s Compliance Certification did not clearly present the manner in which general education SLOs are assessed separately from assessment of degree programs. Therefore, EGSC has taken corrective actions in this Focused Report to more fully and appropriately describe EGSC’s approach to assessment of General Education.

First, we abandoned the approach taken in our Compliance Certification of presenting our assessment of general education SLOs as part of the assessment of educational program SLOs and returned to a description of course-level assessments in the general education courses most closely related to each identified general education SLO. The Program Maps which were presented in the Compliance Certification to make the connections between general education and educational program learning outcomes assessments no longer apply for the assessment of general education SLOs at EGSC. The assessment of general education SLOs is once again totally completed through a separate set of processes and procedures from those used to evaluate educational program learning outcomes. It is worth noting that in recent cycles of SLO assessment, assessments of general education SLOs have continued to include substantial numbers of assessments in general education courses rather than educational program courses.

Second, we gathered the evidence collected over the past four annual assessment cycles which was initiated at the course-level in general education and summarized the four years of assessment activity, outcomes, and improvements sought in four charts or sets of tables corresponding to the last four assessment cycles (i.e., for 2016-17, 2017-18, 2018-19 and 2019-20; see EGSC General Education SLO Assessment Summary AY 2016 - AY 2020). In addition, links to sample correspondence between the faculty and EGSC’s SACSCOC Institutional Liaison concerning the assessment of general education SLOs along with course level assessment reports submitted with the correspondence are presented below.

- General Education SLO Assessment Report (Political Science) Email 5-11-2020
- General Education SLO Assessment Report (POLS 1101) 5-11-2020
- General Education SLO Assessment Report (Biology) Email 5-7-2020
- General Education SLO Assessment Report (BIOL 1104) 5-7-2020
- General Education SLO Assessment Report (History) Email 1-22-2019
- General Education SLO Assessment Report (HIST 2112) 1-22-2019
- General Education SLO Assessment Report (Communications) Email 12-10-2018
- General Education SLO Assessment Report (COMM 1101) 12-10-2018
- General Education SLO Assessment Report (Chemistry) Email 6-19-2018
- General Education SLO Assessment Report (CHEM 1211) 6-19-2018
- General Education SLO Assessment Report (English) Email 5-9-2018
- General Education SLO Assessment Report (ENGL 1101) 5-9-2018
- General Education SLO Assessment Report (Psychology) Email 5-10-2017
- General Education SLO Assessment Report (PSYC 1101) 5-10-2017
- General Education SLO Assessment Report Templates Email 2-2-2017
- General Education SLO Assessment Report Templates Email 5-8-2015

Regrettably, that documentation was not included in the Compliance Certification but is included here in the supporting Source documentation. Those charts contain references to the definition of methods used to conduct general education SLO assessments, achievement targets, whether achievement targets were met or not, and improvements sought. Admittedly, that documentation can and will be substantially improved in the future. There are a few blank spaces in the charts where an annual assessment for a SLO is missing although the affected SLO was assessed in other years. Some of the methods of assessment used were not optimal. Many targets were met, so linkages of assessment results to improvements sought were not always present. Quite frankly, such weaknesses in our previous general education assessment procedures are in part the result of using the former general education SLOs which were not as strong and detailed as those currently in use.

Third, the process of reconfiguring and rewording of our current general education outcomes suggested to us other improvements which could be made to the existing general education assessment processes. By including the identification of more specific detail on the different dimensions of student learning which are important for students to demonstrate in each SLO, we saw the value and possibilities of conducting richer SLO assessments across those specific dimensions of expected student learning for each general education competency. It occurred to us that rubrics for each SLO could be created which separately listed the different dimensions of expected student learning and the overall SLO on the vertical axis and the observed level of student achievement on each SLO dimension and overall SLO on the horizontal axis of the matrix. Each cell in the resulting assessment matrix would contain a description of the characteristics of the student's performance which warranted his/her placement in that cell by the faculty evaluator. The resulting assessment rubric is expected to be used to identify where a student is strongest and weakest on the different dimensions of the SLO which not only produces a rich analysis of learning outcomes for each SLO but also provides assessment results which indicate where improvements in student learning are most needed.

Each of the rubrics to be constructed for this improved assessment process will contain three categorical levels of student achievement on the horizontal axis: Exceeding Expectations, Meeting Expectations, and Not Meeting Expectations. Summarizing assessment outcome results for a group of students completing the course using percentage distributions across those three performance categories separately for each SLO dimension and for the overall SLO generates a highly detailed and rich description of the extent to which expected SLOs are achieved. And patterns in those results indicate where improvements are needed when decisions need to be made based on assessment results as to where to pursue improvements in student learning in general education.

Although targets for expected student performance in this improved assessment process will be based on the faculty's tolerance for the percentage of students not meeting expectations, another improvement made to the existing assessment process is the faculty's adoption of the principle that student learning in general education will never be perfect and always has room for improvement, even when an identified performance target has been met or exceeded. Consequently, pursuing continuing improvement will become the expected norm rather than something which happens only when a target is not met.

It also occurred to us that our general education assessment processes could be improved if each of the affected courses identified an appropriate student work product/performance completed near the end of the course where the SLO Assessment Rubric could be used by the faculty member to assess the extent to which each dimension of the SLO and the SLO overall was achieved. End-of-course assessments should reflect the greatest gains in student learning for the expected SLO, so those are now expected to be used in the assessments of all seven general education SLOs.



Not only have the assessments of general education SLOs been totally separated once again at EGSC from the assessments of educational program SLOs, other improvements will be initiated for strengthening existing assessment methods, findings, and analyses for improving student learning in general education.

### **Confounding Other Forms of General Education Assessment with the Assessment of General Education SLOs**

The On-Site Review Committee dismissed the relevancy of some of the assessment and improvement activities reported in the Compliance Certification involving general education. They said, "Comprehensive program reviews of general education were completed in 2009 and 2016 but these did not focus on SLO assessment...Changes have been made to address course pass rates, retention rates, and graduation rates. These changes, however, do not appear to be based on assessment of the general education SLOs." Those observations are correct, and we regret having included those other forms of general education assessment in the previous submission.

Perhaps we were not as current in our understanding of the changes in the *Principles* which occurred in 2018 as we should have been. In the previous Comprehensive Standard 3.3.1.1 on Institutional Effectiveness, there was a dual focus on evaluating both the educational program and its student learning outcomes. Prior to 2018, comprehensive program reviews, program accreditation assessments, and other forms of program evaluation were appropriate to cite along with the expected assessments of the program's SLOs. After 2018, the revised Standards 8.2.a for educational programs and 8.2.b for general education outcomes narrowed their assessment focus to only SLOs and their improvement in both instances.

Consequently, this Focused Report admits that the various forms of ongoing evaluations which include comprehensive program reviews and other evaluations of student success involving general education are not directly relevant to demonstrating compliance with Standard 8.2.b and its focus on SLOs. References to such program evaluations of general education and initiatives to improve student success in general education courses which were reported previously in the Compliance Certification for 8.2.b are no longer cited to demonstrate compliance with this standard in this Focused Report.

### **No Articulation of a Process of General Education SLO Assessment that Demonstrates the Extent to which EGSC Achieves Each of its General Education SLOs**

**The Off-Site Review Committee stated that it found** "no definitions, benchmarks, targets, or rubrics are provided to guide assessment" and "no articulation of a process of general education SLO assessment...that demonstrates the extent to which it achieves each of the general education SLOs". Again, we concur with this finding of the Compliance Certification for 8.2.b and regret the approach taken previously to assess the former seven SLOs for general education.

It is indeed unfortunate that the evidence we collected over the past four years on assessments of our general education SLOs was not presented in the Compliance Certification. As noted above, evidence collected over the past four annual assessment cycles which was initiated at the course-level in general education for each general education SLO was available. The last four years of assessment activity, outcomes, and improvements sought are now summarized and presented in charts or sets of tables linked here and available in the supporting Source documents to this Focused Report. Those documents contain references to the definition of methods used to conduct general education SLO assessments, achievement targets, whether achievement targets were met or not, and improvements sought from 2016-17 through 2019-20.(See EGSC General Education SLO Assessment Summary AY 2016 - AY 2020.)

Admittedly, that documentation could and will be substantially improved. There are blank spaces in the chart where an annual assessment for a SLO is missing although the affected SLO was assessed in other years. Some of the methods of assessment used could have been stronger. Many targets were met, so linkages of assessment results to improvements sought were not always present. Analysis of assessment results was present but typically was skimpy. Quite frankly, such weaknesses in our previous general education assessment procedures are in part the result of focusing on the former general education SLOs which were not as strong and detailed as they should have been and certainly not as strong and detailed as the revised SLOs.

As stated above, the Off-Site Committee's findings prompted us to first make needed and valuable changes to the content and wording of our existing general education SLOs. Those improvements not only strengthen our case for compliance with the identification of appropriate student learning outcomes for general education, they have led to the implementation of other improvements made in our assessment methods and procedures for determining the extent to which those SLOs are achieved. The systematic creation of SLO Assessment Rubrics for end-of-course student work product evaluations for all seven general education SLOs described above represents a major substantive improvement in the way EGSC assesses student achievement and analyzes its assessment results in compliance with Standard 8.2.b.

### **No Articulation of a Process of General Education SLO Assessment that Provides Evidence that EGSC is Seeking Improvement Based on an Analysis of Results in this SLO Assessment Process**

The Off-Site Review Committee stated that it found "no articulation of a process of general education SLO assessment...that...provides evidence that it is seeking improvement based on the results of this process". Again, we concur with the finding that our Compliance Certification did not adequately present this evidence describing the assessment of our former seven SLOs for general education.

It is indeed unfortunate that the evidence we did collect over the past four years on assessments of our general education SLOs was not presented in the Compliance Certification. As noted above, evidence collected over the past four annual assessment cycles which was initiated at the course-level in general education for each general education SLO was available. The last four years of assessment activity, outcomes, and improvements sought are now summarized and presented in four charts or sets of tables corresponding to each of the last four annual assessment cycles. (See EGSC General Education SLO Assessment Summary AY 2016 - AY 2020.) Those documents contain references to actions taken to improve student learning and the learning environment in general education courses from 2016-17 through 2019-20.




















Admittedly, past evidence of seeking improvement in student learning in general education is not as strong as it could be. Since many targets set for student performance in SLOs were met according to assessment results, needs for improvement were sometimes not identified and further analysis of the assessment results was subsequently absent in some cases. Thus, our efforts to seek improvement were in some cases not based on sufficient analysis of assessment results.

Weaknesses such as these in assessment processes for general education and educational programs are relatively commonplace. However, the improvements made in EGSC's ongoing assessment processes for general education which were prompted by the Off-Site Committee's recent evaluation and are implemented going forward are perhaps not so typical. These changed processes as described above constitute major and significant improvements in all aspects of compliance with Standard 8.2.b, including the meaningful pursuit of improved student learning based on solid analyses of assessment results.

## CONCLUSION

EGSC has identified expected student learning outcomes for collegiate-level general education competencies for its degree programs, has assessed the extent to which it has achieved those outcomes, and has continually sought improvement based on analysis of the assessment results.

## Sources

-  EGSC General Education SLO Assessment Summary AY 2016 - AY 2020
-  General Education SLO Assessment Report (BIOL 1104) 5-7-2020
-  General Education SLO Assessment Report (Biology) Email 5-7-2020
-  General Education SLO Assessment Report (CHEM 1211) 6-19-2018
-  General Education SLO Assessment Report (COMM 1110) 12-10-2018
-  General Education SLO Assessment Report (Chemistry) Email 6-19-2018
-  General Education SLO Assessment Report (Communications) Email 12-10-2018
-  General Education SLO Assessment Report (ENGL 1101) 5-9-2018
-  General Education SLO Assessment Report (English) Email 5-9-2018
-  General Education SLO Assessment Report (HIST 2112) 1-22-2019
-  General Education SLO Assessment Report (History) Email 1-22-2019.
-  General Education SLO Assessment Report (MATH 1111) 7-30-2018
-  General Education SLO Assessment Report (Mathematics) Email 7-30-2018
-  General Education SLO Assessment Report (POLS 1101) 5-11-2020
-  General Education SLO Assessment Report (PSYC 1101) 5-10-2017
-  General Education SLO Assessment Report (Political Science) Email 5-11-2020
-  General Education SLO Assessment Report (Psychology) Email 5-10-2017
-  General Education SLO Assessment Report Templates Email 2-2-2017
-  General Education SLO Assessment Report Templates Email 5-8-2015

## **10.7 Policies for Awarding Credit**

The institution publishes and implements policies for determining the amount and level of credit awarded for its courses, regardless of format or mode of delivery. These policies require oversight by persons academically qualified to make the necessary judgments. In educational programs not based on credit hours (e.g., direct assessment programs), the institution has a sound means for determining credit equivalencies.

### **Judgment**

Compliant    Partial Compliance    Non-Compliant    Not Applicable

### **Narrative**

#### **East Georgia State College Compliance Certification**

[Link to Compliance Certification for 10.7](#)

#### **Off-site Committee Comments**

The institution conforms to commonly accepted higher education practices, including those set by the state system, for determining the amount of credit awarded for its courses. Regardless of format or mode of delivery, there are established levels of expected student engagement, both in-class and out-of-class. Extensive examples are provided of courses with varying credit hours, term lengths, and delivery modes but no evidence was found for the claim that a review of engagement minutes, used to support designations for credit hours, occurs during the curriculum process. Oversight for course approval is provided by academically qualified persons sitting on the Academic Policies and Curriculum Committee as well as the Faculty Senate. Policies are published in appropriate locations, including the online catalog and Policies & Procedures webpage. Missing from the narrative is a discussion or evidence of policies for determining the level of credit. The Credit Hours Awarded Policy does not mention level of credit and no examples are given to describe how level is determined at any of the stages of the curriculum approval process.

#### **Institution Response**

EGSC officials appreciate the findings of the Off-Site Committee that the institution’s policy on credit hours is in compliance with the Commission’s and federal definitions of semester credit hours and its implementation is confirmed by numerous examples of courses with varying credit hours, term lengths and delivery modes. The Off-Site Review Committee noted only two remaining issues to be addressed by the institution for 10.7 in this Focused Report:

- Extensive examples are provided of courses with varying credit hours, term lengths, and delivery modes but no evidence was found for the claim that a review of engagement minutes, used to support designations for credit hours, occurs during the curriculum process.
- Missing from the narrative is a discussion or evidence of policies for determining the level of credit. The Credit Hours Awarded Policy does not mention level of credit and no examples are given to describe how level is determined at any of the stages of the curriculum approval process.

### **Approvals of the Amounts of Credit to be Awarded During the Curriculum Approval Process Based on Engagement Minutes**

EGSC's Credit Hour Awarded Policy adopted in 2016 includes this statement:

For all curriculum proposals sent to the Academic Policies and Curriculum Committee for approval both the instructional time and out-of-class time will be indicated. Prior to submission to the Faculty Senate and the President for approval, the Academic Policies and Curriculum Committee will verify the appropriateness of the credit hours listed in the curriculum proposal.

The previous Application for Proposed New Course cited in the Compliance Certification included a section that outlined characteristics of the proposed course, including hours per week lecture, hours per week laboratory, and total credit hours, but it did not explicitly call for an indication of the out-of-class time per week. Furthermore, the 2016 credit hour policy expresses the expected 750 minutes of instructional time and 1,500 minutes of out-of-class time on a per semester credit hour basis instead of a weekly basis to better include courses taught on different term lengths. Admittedly, there were elements of the Application form cited in the Compliance Certification which were not completely consistent with EGSC's current credit hour policy.

While out-of-class time had not been explicitly stated in the Application for Proposed New Course form in the past, the form's content did call for an attached course syllabus which describes in-class and out-of-class assignments. Consequently, the curriculum review process involved at least implicit consideration of the reported instructional time and out-of-class syllabus course requirements for their appropriateness to the amount of credit hours to be awarded.

Nevertheless, in response to the Off-Site Committee's observation and our subsequent determination that the alignment of the Proposed New Course form could be more tightly configured with the college's credit hour policy, the Application for Proposed New Course form has been revised in two ways. First, the "Hours Per Week Lecture" and "Hours Per Week Lab" lines have been replaced with "Instructional Minutes/Sem Hr," "Out-of-class Minutes/Sem Hr," and "Total Engagement Minutes/Sem Hr." Secondly, the text box section of the form previously labeled, "COURSE SYLLABUS ATTACHED: (a reasonably complete outline of the main points of the course)" has been replaced with a text box labeled, "Explanation of Compliance with the Credit Hours Awarded Policy (COURSE SYLLABUS ATTACHED)." Both of these changes in the format of the revised Application for Proposed New Course form ensure that our policy's stipulations concerning the consideration of engagement minutes are explicitly reviewed during the curriculum approval process as being appropriate and in compliance with college policy. And such adherence will continue to be documented with an attached course syllabus.

### **EGSC Policy on Level of Course Credit Hours**

The Off-Site Committee was concerned that the Compliance Certification narrative gave too little attention to a discussion or evidence of policies for determining the level of credit. EGSC officials concur with that observation. Such a discussion follows.

EGSC offers three levels of course instruction: 1) learning support courses (developmental or remedial in SACSCOC terminology with course numbers less than 1000); 2) undergraduate lower division courses (numbered in the 1,000s or 2,000s) covering freshman and sophomore courses taken to complete associate degrees or the first two years of a four-year bachelor's degree—mostly Core Curriculum (general education) courses or lower-division electives and prerequisites for upper division courses; and 3) undergraduate upper division courses (numbered in the 3,000s or 4,000s) covering courses taken by juniors and seniors to complete major field requirements of baccalaureate degree programs. The levels of course credit in the USG and at EGSC are governed by a combination

of governing board policies, commonly accepted practices within the USG, and curriculum approval processes both at EGSC and the governing board.

In Section 3.3.7 of the Board of Regents Policy Manual, the governing board's general policy on Learning Support is stated. The USG's Academic & Student Affairs Handbook contains a number of detailed policies regarding Learning Support in Section 2.9, much of which was recently revised for System institutions in 2019. As Section 2.9.1 indicates, "learning support" is a generic term for programs designed to assist students in successfully completing collegiate courses in mathematics and English who fall below USG collegiate placement standards upon admission. In past eras, these courses were known as developmental studies and had to be taken as remediation and completed successfully as a prerequisite to enrolling in college-level mathematics and English courses at USG institutions. They are now taken as co-requisite courses to assist under-prepared students in the successful completion of their initial college-level math or English course and are exited once a passing grade is achieved in the college-level course. That is why they are called "learning support." Students register for "institutional credit" in learning support courses, but that credit cannot be used for meeting collegiate degree completion requirements. The course numbers and titles for learning support courses are dictated by USG policy in Section 2.9.2 of the Handbook, and EGSC's learning support courses comply with that policy.

Similarly in Section 3.3.1 of the BOR Policy Manual, the governing board's general policy on the Core Curriculum for undergraduate general education is stated. More detailed policies on the Core Curriculum are published in Section 2.4 of the USG's Academic & Student Affairs Handbook. Included among those in Section 2.4.10 are the guidelines for common course prefixes, numbers, and descriptions for elective and required courses in the Core. All of those Core courses are numbered in the 1,000s and 2,000s because they are intended to apply to the first two years of college study taken by freshmen and sophomores either in an associate degree program or the first two years of a bachelor's degree program.

Whereas learning support and the Core Curriculum are broadly applicable across USG institutions, they have been subject to extensive System-level coordination. Degree programs are much more institution-specific and governed by individual institution missions. Although specific policies are not stated about the difference between undergraduate lower division and undergraduate upper division courses, the common practice adopted by USG institutions is that which is cited above. EGSC's course requirements for its associate degrees consist of courses numbered in the 1,000s and 2,000s and are composed largely of the Core Curriculum requirements since they are considered to be transfer associate rather than career associate degree programs (see BOR Policy Manual 3.8.2.1 and 3.8.2.2 for the difference in their definition). EGSC's baccalaureate programs consist of many course requirements at the 3,000 and 4,000 levels as they are expected to have a more comprehensive set and more in-depth study pursued by juniors and seniors in a specific major field than associate degrees. Such course numbering and course content conventions are not only commonly understood in the USG, but they are reinforced at the System level when new degree programs go up for governing board approval after receiving institutional approval. EGSC's faculty also understand that difference as is reflected in the differences between course completion requirements for their associate and bachelor's degrees.

An example of those differences in levels of instruction are clear when comparing the 18 credit hours of 2,000-level FESA course requirements for completing the associate's degree in Fire and Emergency Administration with the same 18 lower division credit hours but an additional 48 required FESA upper division credit hours at the 3,000 and 4,000 level for completing the bachelor's degree in FESA. The upper division hours are much broader in coverage of the major field and more advanced than the lower division courses.













Such differences are common between lower division and upper division studies in other fields of study as well. EGSC's A.S. transfer associate degree in biology includes 12 credit hours of introductory lower division courses in biology whereas the bachelor's degree in biology includes at least 34 credit hours of a much more diverse and advanced array of upper division studies in biology.

EGSC's previous and revised Application for Proposed New Course form helps ensure that course level is taken into account during the curriculum approval process. A section of that form calls for specific references to similar courses by number and title at institutions in the University System of Georgia. The purpose of this section is to assist in designating the appropriate course level to proposed courses in accordance with generally accepted practices and policies of the USG.

### CONCLUSION

EGSC publishes and implements policies for determining the amount and level of credit awarded for its courses, regardless of format or mode of delivery. These policies are overseen by the Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs.

### Sources

-  EGSC Application for Proposed New Course
-  EGSC Application for Proposed New Course July 2020
-  EGSC Credit Hours Awarded Policy
-  EGSC Credit Hours Awarded Policy June 2020
-  USG ASA Handbook 2.9 Learning Support
-  USG ASA Handbook 2.9 Learning Support (Page 9)
-  USG Academic & Student Affairs Handbook \_ 2.4 Core Curriculum
-  USG Academic & Student Affairs Handbook \_ 2.4 Core Curriculum (Page 9)
-  USG BOR Policy 3.3 Curriculum
-  USG BOR Policy 3.3.7 Learning Support
-  USG BOR Policy 3.8.1 Degrees
-  USG BOR Policy Manual \_ 3.8 Degrees

**12.2 Student Support Services Staff**

The institution ensures an adequate number of academic and student support services staff with appropriate education or experience in student support service areas to accomplish the mission of the institution.

**Judgment**

Compliant    Partial Compliance    Non-Compliant    Not Applicable

**Narrative**

**Compliance Certification**

[Link to Compliance Certification 12.2](#)

**Off-site Committee Comments**

The institution provides a variety of student and academic support services consistent with its mission and typical of best practices among similar colleges. However, the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee was unable to determine that all personnel possess the education and experience required by the institution’s job descriptions to perform the responsibilities of the positions held. The following personnel requires further justification:

- The Housing Safety Assistant provides no educational qualifications and does not possess the required experience.
- The Housing Safety demonstrates experience consistent with the requirements of the job description but provides no educational qualifications.
- The Coordinator of Student Life does not possess the level of experience required by the job description.

The institution indicates that it supports professional development and considers professional development in the personnel evaluation process. However, the institution does not provide evidence of professional development or its inclusion in the evaluation process.

The institution indicates that the Division of Academic and Student Affairs annually evaluates the number of personnel to ensure that they are meeting the mission of the institution. However, the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee was unable to determine the process utilized to determine the adequacy of numbers of academic and support personnel, and no evidence was provided to support the adequacy of personnel in these areas.

**Institution Response**

EGSC thanks the Off-Site Committee for finding that the all but a small number of student support staff appeared to have sufficient educational and/or experiential credentials for their positions at the college. We regret not having provided more information about the credentials of those four individuals, and the response below should address those few specific concerns satisfactorily. We also regret not having provided evidence of existing professional development for our support staff as well as more information as to how the adequacy of staffing for EGSC’s student support functions is determined. Those two issues are also addressed below.



**EDUCATION AND EXPERIENCE OF STUDENT SERVICES PERSONNEL**

The Off-Site Committee did not question the credentials provided in the Compliance Certification of any of the academic and student support staff administrators or other professional support staff at EGSC. The four individuals cited with questionable qualifications were all in the lower ranks of support personnel. All four hold no supervisory responsibilities for other staff, and their job responsibilities involve largely assisting roles in support of the managerial responsibilities of their superiors. The high school diploma and a driver’s license are the minimum requirements for three of the positions (Housing Safety Assistants) and the fourth requires an associate degree and two years of experience (Coordinator of Student Life).

Regrettably, when the staff roster was assembled, the education columns for three of the Housing Safety Assistants were left blank. They should have been completed, because all three met the minimum job requirements by holding at least a high school diploma—one of the three holds a bachelor’s degree. Although the Preliminary Reaffirmation Committee Report stated that one of those individuals also lacked sufficient experience, according to Ms. Michael’s official job description as a Housing Safety Assistant, two years of experience is a preferred rather than required minimum qualification. There are no minimum experience qualifications for this position at EGSC. The higher-ranking positions in the Housing Department include the Coordinator of Residential Life, the Assistant Director of Housing and the Director of Housing, all of whom have substantial responsibilities for managing on-campus housing operations including the provision of supervision to the Housing Safety Assistants.

The job description for the Coordinator of Student Life calls for minimum qualifications of an associate’s degree and two years of experience. As was stated in the previous staff roster, Ms. Cheers holds a bachelor’s and a master’s degree which is more than sufficient for her position. Regrettably, the original staff roster only cited her one year of experience in her current position and did not report the 8 years of previous related experience. With those corrections in place, she too is well-qualified for her position.

The corrected version of the student support staff roster for these four individuals is presented below in Table 1. Housing Quality of Life surveys were conducted in Spring 2018 and Spring 2019

**Table 1: Student Support Staff Education and Experience**

<b>Position</b>	<b>Name</b>	<b>Education</b>	<b>Experience</b>
Housing Safety Assistant Position Description	(A) Ms. Andreana Michael	<b>High School Diploma</b>	1 years' experience as Housing Safety Assistant  <b>4 years' experience in customer service and retail</b>
Housing Safety Assistant Position Description	(A) Mr. Wayne Jukes	<b>High School Diploma</b>	3 years' experience as Housing Safety Assistant  <b>32 years' experience as a security guard for a Georgia Power company (retired)</b>
Housing Assistant Position Description	(A) Ms. Virginia McAllister	<b>Bachelor of Science in</b>	3 years' experience as a Public Safety Officer

		<b>Criminal Justice – Columbus State University</b>	5 years' experience as Housing Assistant
Coordinator of Student Life Position Description	(A) Ms. Veronica Cheers	Accounting Diploma from Ogeechee Technical College  Bachelor of Science Psychology from Columbia Southern University  Master's in Management from University of Phoenix	1-year experience with EGSC at Coordinator of Student Life  <b>4 years' experience working within a counseling setting as a substance abuse counselor, social service case manager, and clinical decision support representative</b>  <b>4 years' experience as Program Coordinator, Our Girls Rock Too (Volunteer Mentoring Organization)</b>

**PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND TRAINING OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE SUPPORT STAFF**

EGSC officials regret that we spoke in general rather than specific terms about the existence of professional growth and training opportunities for the academic and student support staff in our previously submitted Compliance Certification for Standard 12.2. A wide range of required and elective support staff participation is expected in many different forms of professional development and training experiences at EGSC for its academic and student support personnel. Some job training is specific to the position held and provided through a supervisor. Some occurs when participating in statewide or regional professional conferences in person or virtually. Some are in-house briefings which cut across departmental units concerning new or changed regulations or campus conditions in need of problem-solving. Some provide financial assistance to employees to attend professional conferences or complete degrees related to their professional advancement. Listed below in Table 2 are some of the many examples of professional growth and training opportunities available for or expected of personnel in various student support departments at EGSC.

**Table 2: Student Support Staff Development**

Unit	Development Activity/ Initiative	Participants	Frequency	Required or Optional
Academic Support Services	USG Momentum year Summits	Director Learning Commons	Varies	Required
Counseling and Disability Services	Continuing Education Hours	All licensed professional counselors (LPCs).	35 hours every two years	Required to maintain certification/licensure.
Counseling and Disability Services	Disability Services Provider Conference	LPCs	Annual	Required

Counseling and Disability Services	Regional Disability Services Provider Meetings	LPCs	Once per academic term	Required
Choice Program	Student Peer Mentor & Staff Training: Four videos with strategies for peers providing academic support. The videos cover four separate topics related to providing academic supports on campus, including an overview video, one on task analysis to help ease planning for academic supports, the importance of flexibility when working as peer support, and some tips and strategies for supporting a student with writing assignments. *Think College videos	Student Peer Mentors and staff	Before the start of the semester- <i>Supporting Students with Intellectual Disabilities.</i> Week 1- <i>Task Analysis and Academic Mentoring</i> week four weeks, Week 3- <i>Adapting to Individual Student Needs</i> Week-4 <i>Writing Papers</i>	Required
Choice Program	Student Mentors and Staff-Coaching and Mentoring Modules-*Think College Learn- Each module includes text as well as video, web resources, and downloadable content to help you to learn more about the topic area.	Student Peer Mentors and staff-upon hiring and before the start of the semester *Modules as assigned	Student Peer mentors- *Coaching and Mentoring All Program Staff – * <i>Assessing Disability Services</i> *Job Coach Staff - *Job Development	Required for all as assigned
Choice Program	As needed/on request for instructional staff- *Think College Learn- *Universal Design module uses text, video, case studies, and a variety of tools to help faculty learn how to apply universal design principles and strategies to any course in any discipline.	(EGSC) Instructional Staff	As needed/on-demand	Not required Available as needed/ upon request
Housing	Quarterly All-Staff Meetings	All Housing Full-time and Part-time (non-student) staff	4 times per year	Required
Housing	Webinars (ACUHO-I)	Director of Housing, Assistant Director of Housing, Residence Life Coordinator	As available	Optional
Housing	Weekly Student Staff Meetings	Director of Housing, Assist.	Weekly	Required

		Dir. Of Housing, Resident Assistants		
Housing	Bi-weekly One on One Meetings	Director of Housing meets with Assist. Dir. And Residence Life Coordinator	Bi-weekly	Required
Housing	Resident Assistant Competency Model	Resident Assistants	Ongoing	Required
Library and Media Services	Increase Knowledge in Competency Area through participation in webinars, conferences, and reading academic journals	Library Director, Librarian, Library Associate, Library Assistant	Once per academic term	Required
Office of Student Conduct	Student Conduct, Housing and Counseling Meetings	Director of Housing, Assistant Director of Housing, Director of Student Conduct, Director of Counseling, Director of Academic Support in Residences, Title IX Director, Student Conduct Coordinator	Weekly	Required
Office of Student Conduct	University System of Georgia Conduct Officers Meeting	Senior Conduct Officers from all University System of Georgia colleges and universities	Once per academic term	Required
Student Affairs/ Enrollment Services	Customer Services Training	All staff in the department, including the Statesboro and Augusta instructional sites; training was via Polycom	Fall Semester 2019; plan to offer training annually	Required
Student Affairs	Encourage staff to participate in the Tuition Assistance Program (TAP – the College pays for participant tuition and fees) and earn advanced academic degrees.	All employees	TAP may be used during any of the academic semesters.	Optional
Student Affairs	Encourage staff to attend and participate in professional conferences related to their jobs.	All employees	Professional conferences are held at various times during the year. Attendance at the conferences is influenced by	Optional

			budgets and work conflicts.	
Student Affairs	Encourage staff to participate in the Staff Leadership Program to improve the management systems of individuals.	All employees: individuals are selected following a panel review of the Staff Leadership Program applications; staff who are not selected in one year are encouraged to apply in a subsequent year.	Group meets monthly for 12 months	Optional

**EVALUATION OF THE ADEQUACY OF ACADEMIC AND STUDENT SUPPORT STAFFING LEVELS**

The adequacy of personnel staffing in each of the academic and student support units is evaluated and revised each year during the budgeting process for the upcoming fiscal year. As units prepare their budget requests for each fiscal year, they are asked to provide information about changes to staffing needs and possible costs of adding personnel. Justification for such expenditures is required on this document in support of staff change proposals.

First, each unit determines its priorities for the coming fiscal year. Priorities are based largely on the previous year’s assessments of the unit’s operational strengths and weaknesses, the extent to which its expected outcomes are or are not being achieved, and the extent to which outcomes need to change to reflect new institutional direction and/or changes in the operating environment. Those proposals are funneled up to the next level of organizational supervision and revised further at that level before ultimately reaching the VPASA for a division-wide review and prioritization of needs to propose to the President along with the priorities of the other administrative support divisions. Whether proposing a new position or justifying changes to existing positions, each potential change is carefully considered to maximize the efficient use of financial resources without reducing the benefit to students.

The tables below show how the adequacy of personnel staffing in each of the academic and student units was evaluated in 2020 through this budgeting process for FY 2021 at EGSC. Table 3a contains for each unit in the Academic and Student Affairs Division the assessment of staff adequacy by position.

**Table 3a: EGSC Academic and Student Affairs Division FY 2019-20**

Department	Unit	Staff Adequacy Assessment
Academic Affairs	VP for Academic and Student Affairs	Inadequate
	• Dean of Humanities/Social Sciences	Adequate
	• Dean of Math/Natural Sciences	Adequate
	• African American Male Initiative	Adequate
	• Center for Teaching and Learning	Adequate
	• eLearning (dual report to IT)	Adequate
	AVP for Academic Affairs	Adequate
	• Library	Adequate
	• Learning Commons	Adequate
	• CHOICE	Adequate
	• Dual Enrollment	Adequate
Student Affairs	VP for Academic and Student Affairs	Adequate
	• Housing	Adequate
	• Military Resource Center	Adequate
	• Student Conduct	Adequate
	• Student Life	Adequate
	• Counseling & Disability Services	Adequate
	AVP for Student Affairs.	Adequate
	• Admissions	Adequate
	• Financial Aid	Adequate
• Registrar	Adequate	

Table 3b presents the reorganization of the EGSC Academic and Student Affairs Division for FY 2020-21. Units with no proposed staffing changes are indicated as being retained with no change in supervisor. Any costs associated with the reorganization are listed in the last column of Table 3b.

**Table 3b EGSC Academic and Student Affairs Division Reorganization FY 2020-21**



Department	Unit	Staff Changes	Cost of Changes
Academic Affairs	VP for Academic & Student Affairs	Revised Responsibilities	No Change
	• Dean of Humanities/Social Sciences	Retained	No Change
	• Dean of Math/Natural Sciences		
	• Center for Teaching and Learning		
	• eLearning (dual report to IT)		
	• Learning Commons	Transfer from AVP AA	
	• Director of Retention	New Position	\$60.5 K
	• Director of Academic Support Residence Halls	New Position	\$53.4 K
	AVP for Academic Affairs & Enrollment	Responsibilities Retained from AVP AA	No Change
	• Library		No Change
• CHOICE	No Change		
• Dual Enrollment			
Student Affairs	VP for Academic & Student Affairs	Retained	No Change
	• Housing		No Change
	• Military Resource Center		
	• Student Conduct		
	AVP for Academic Affairs & Enrollment	Revised Responsibilities	No Change
	• Admissions	Transfer from AVP SA	No Change
	• Registrar		
	AVP for Student Affairs.	Revised Responsibilities	No Change
	• Financial Aid	Retained	No Change
	• Student Life		
• Counseling & Disability Services			
• African American Male Initiative			
	Transfer from VP ASA		








The reorganization of the EGSC Academic and Student Affairs Division was approved by the Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs in consultation with the deans of the academic schools and the associate vice presidents for Academic Affairs and Student Affairs. The reorganization was then submitted to the President of the College for final approval.

**CONCLUSION**

EGSC ensures an adequate number of academic and student support services staff with appropriate education or experience in student support service areas to accomplish the mission of the College.

**Sources**

-  EGSC Coordinator of Student Life\_Academic and Student Affairs\_Veronica Cheers\_2.19.2019
-  EGSC Director of Academic Support in Residence Halls Job Description

-  EGSC Director of Retention Job Description
-  EGSC Housing - Resident Assistant Competencies
-  EGSC Housing Quality of Life Survey Results - Spring 2018
-  EGSC Housing Quality of Life Survey Results - Spring 2019
-  EGSC Housing Safety Assistant\_Housing\_Andreana Michael\_7.29.2019
-  EGSC Housing Safety Assistant\_Housing\_Wayne Jukes\_4.2.2019
-  EGSC\_Housing\_Assistant\_Virginia\_McAllister\_5\_5\_2016



**12.4 Student Complaints**

The institution (a) publishes appropriate and clear procedures for addressing written student complaints, (b) demonstrates that it follows the procedures when resolving them, and (c) maintains a record of student complaints that can be accessed upon request by SACSCOC.

**Judgment**

Compliant    Partial Compliance    Non-Compliant    Not Applicable

**Narrative**

**EGSC Compliance Certification**

Compliance Certification for 12.4

**Off-site Committee Comments**

The institution observes a primarily decentralized approach to the resolution of written student complaints. The institution encourages the resolution of all student complaints as early in the process as possible, preferably in the informal, unwritten stage. Once informal processes are exhausted, the student is directed to the Student Complaint Mechanisms webpage on which the student selects the appropriate policy and follows its process for written student complaints. The institution provides copies of the policies for the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee’s review. If the student is unable to determine which policy is appropriate or does not find an appropriate policy, the institution provides direct, online access to the Bobcat Growl. The institution indicates that accommodations are made for students who cannot participate in the appropriate process in person – in particular those whose classes are taught at alternate instructional sites or online.

The Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs monitors the Bobcat Growl. The institution provided a sample page of the log generated by the Bobcat Growl. The log template requests the Complaint Area, Student Name, Student ID, Student Email and Telephone, and a Description of the complaint. The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee noted that the majority of the complaints did not provide requested contact information, and the majority were anonymous. Thus, no follow-up with the complainant was possible. The institution did not provide logs of any other type of written grievance or identify the elements retained in each record.

The institution provides several examples of documented cases in which a written complaint or grievance was resolved in accordance with the prescribed process, indicating that the institution follows its policies. However, the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee was unable to determine from the documentation provided if records of the various types of written complaints are maintained, and, if so, where they are housed. In the absence of evidence of the assimilation of student grievance records, the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee is unable to determine the process by which the institution identifies patterns of student grievances.

**Institution Response**

The Off-Site Review Committee noted four possible areas to be addressed by the institution for Requirement 12.4:

- “The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee noted that the majority of the complaints did not provide requested contact information, and the majority were anonymous. Thus, no follow-up with the complainant was possible.”
- “The institution did not provide logs of any other type of written grievance or identify the elements retained in each record.”
- “Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee was unable to determine from the documentation provided if records of the various types of written complaints are maintained, and, if so, where they are housed.”

### **EGSC Definition of “Student Complaints”**

EGSC defines “student complaints” broadly to include any student concern which the student wishes to bring to the attention of the institution with the intent to seek improvement or resolution of the situation giving rise to the student concern. As described more fully below, the college has a series of policies which provide avenues for resolution of specific categories of commonly recognized student complaints (e.g., sexual harassment). In addition, EGSC recognizes that students may need direction to the appropriate policy for their specific complaint; and that certain types of complaints may not fall neatly into one of these avenues for resolution. Accordingly, the Bobcat Growl system is in place and publicized to direct students to the appropriate policy; and to create an avenue for resolution of complaints not fitting neatly into one of the commonly recognized categories.

This combination of avenues for resolution of commonly recognized categories of complaints with the Bobcat Growl system creates a robust and comprehensive complaint mechanism that is administered by professional, high-level staff members within the responsible departments. The current approach has policies in place on the easy to access Student Complaint Mechanisms webpage found under the Student Life tab from the EGSC Homepage. The policies explain and instruct students on what department oversees the different types of complaints and the steps to file the complaint. Students have multiple channels in place where they can submit complaints and the back-up system of the Bobcat Growl for when they do not understand what department to file a complaint with, the complaint does not fall under any specific complaint policy, or it is directly related to on-campus Housing. The published EGSC Student Handbook makes reference to this system as an opportunity to share concerns and/or complaints they may have. The Bobcat Growl system is a fail-safe system monitored by the College's Legal Counsel who can direct the complaint to the correct department in a timely fashion.

### **Acceptance of Anonymous Written Student Complaints and Follow-ups**

A majority of all the student complaint mechanisms require that the complainant/grievant report his/her identity when filed directly with the appropriate department in order to allow appropriate conflict resolution. The Bobcat Growl reporting system allows for students to make either an anonymous complaint or to list their contact information. When contact information is provided, the department assigned to handle the complaint will follow up with the complainant to ensure a satisfactory outcome is reached. The majority of complaints submitted through Bobcat Growl are anonymous by student choice, which does prevent follow-up with the complainant from occurring. Despite this, in the two housing examples cited in the Compliance Certification, the institution successfully followed up with other students in campus housing who were the alleged sources of the noise complaints. Getting back with the complainants could not be done because of their anonymity. Admittedly, anonymous complaints do not carry as much weight or accountability as complaints made by identified students. However, the College wants to give students the option to report any complaints in a manner in which they are most comfortable. When using the back-up system of Bobcat Growl a majority of our students feel more comfortable making anonymous complaints versus when they file a complaint directly with the department. These anonymous complaints give the institution an attempt at complaint resolution that would not be the case if a complaint was not

submitted and not brought to the attention of the administration at all.

**Logs and Records of Complaints and Grievances**

The department that is responsible for handling the student complaint is also responsible for maintaining logs of important elements to the complaints such as date, student, and contact information. Examples of the unit logs of written student complaints from different campus departments are included below and serve as evidence that such logs are being kept.

- Registrar Academic Exclusion Appeal Log
- Student Conduct Log
- Bobcat Growl Log

**Keepers of Student Complaint Records and the Offices Where They are Housed**

Records of written student complaints are housed in the departments responsible for handling the different types of complaints. For instance, if a student files a Title IX complaint, then the records associated with that complaint are kept locked in the Title IX Coordinator’s office. The Student Conduct records are kept both electronically in Simplicity/Advocate and physical copies are kept locked in the Student Conduct office. Below is a chart showing which department is responsible for each type of complaint as well as how and where the complaint records are kept.















<b>Type of Complaint/ Policy</b>	<b>Responsible Administrator(s)</b>	<b>Office Location of Log/Records</b>	<b>How Records are Stored</b>
Academic Exclusion Appeal	Registrar	Registrar	Digitally scanned files in a secure database management system
Academic Grievance	Department Chair; Academic Dean	Department Chair/Dean Office	Record saved with Department Chair/Dean
Academic Honesty	Director of Student Conduct	Student Conduct	Digitally scanned files in a secure database management system
ADA Grievance	Director of Counseling and Disability Services	Counseling and Disability Services	Hard copy files in a secure cabinet/office
Amorous Relationships	Chief Human Resource Officer	Human Resource	Digitally scanned files in a secure office computer; Hard copy files in a secure cabinet/office
Behavioral Complaint	Director of Counseling and Disability Services	Counseling and Disability Services	Hard copy files in a secure cabinet/office
Bobcat Growl/ General Complaints	Legal Affairs; VPASA	Legal Affairs; VPASA	Digitally scanned files in a secure office computer
Conflict Resolution	Chief Human Resource Officer	Human Resource	Digitally scanned files in a secure office computer; Hard copy files in a secure cabinet/office
Ethics Hotline/Other	Legal Counsel	Legal Affairs	Digitally scanned files in a secure office computer



















Final Course Grade Appeal	Instructor; Dean; VPASA; President	Instructor; Dean; VPASA; President	Depends how far the appeal goes
Housing Incident: Bobcat Growl	Director of Housing; Director of Student Conduct	Housing; Student Conduct	Digitally scanned files in a secure database management system
Non-Discrimination & Anti-Harassment	Title IX Coordinator	Title IX	Hard copy files in a secure cabinet/office
Parking Ticket	VP for Business Affairs or Designee	Business Affairs	Digitally scanned files in a secure office computer
Sexual Misconduct	Title IX Coordinator	Title IX	Hard copy files in a secure cabinet/office
Student Conduct Code & Disciplinary	Director of Student Conduct	Student Conduct	Digitally scanned files in a secure database management system; Hard copy files in a secure cabinet/office

**CONCLUSION**

EGSC (a) publishes appropriate and clear procedures for addressing written student complaints, (b) demonstrates that it follows the procedures when resolving them, and (c) maintains a record of student complaints that can be accessed upon request by SACSCOC.

**Sources**

-  EGSC Academic Honesty Policy
-  EGSC Academic Student Grievance Policy
-  EGSC Amorous Relationships Policy
-  EGSC Behavioral Recommendation Team Manual
-  EGSC Bobcat Growl Complaint System
-  EGSC Conflict Resolution Policy
-  EGSC Ethics Hotline Procedures
-  EGSC Final Course Grade Appeal Policy and Procedure
-  EGSC Non-discrimination and Anti-harassment Policy
-  EGSC Parking and Transportation Policy
-  EGSC Sexual Misconduct Policy
-  EGSC Student ADA Grievance Policy
-  EGSC Student Appeals Process Following Academic Exclusion
-  EGSC Student Conduct Code and Disciplinary Procedure

-  EGSC Student Conduct Incident Log
-  EGSC Student Handbook 01-10-2020 (Page 7)
-  Example Academic Exclusion Letter of Appeal
-  Example Academic Honesty
-  Example Conflict Resolution
-  Example Counseling Intake
-  Example Final Course Grade Appeal
-  Example Hotline Complaint- Academic Affairs
-  Example Hotline Complaint- Dining Services
-  Example Housing Complaint
-  Example Non-Discrimination Anti-Harassment
-  Example Student ADA Grievance Appeal 6-20-2016
-  Example Student Academic Grievance
-  Example Student Conduct Complaint
-  Example Student Parking Violation Appeal 8-24-15
-  Example Title IX Incident
-  Examples Bobcat Growl Student Complaint System Redacted
-  Registrar Academic Exclusion Appeal Log