

Attending: Mary McLaughlin, Michael Black, Sabrina Thompson, Loraine Phillips,

Catherine Jenks, Bryan Davis, Barbara Brown, Danielle Buehrer, Jill Lane, Darby Sewell, Sabrina Thompson, John Fuchko

Absent: Allan Aycock

1. Approved minutes from the February 11, 2021 (Regular Executive Committee Meeting): Loraine Phillips presented the minutes from February 11, 2021. The executive committee approved.

Treasurer's Report—Michael Black
 Treasurer's Balance for RACEA is \$8,641.39 No transactions since March 25, 2020.

3. Committee Updates:

- **Program Review Committee:** Lane— There is a meeting convened by the USG to discuss the upcoming changes in Comprehensive Program Review Reporting.
- Update Accreditation Intelligence (AI) Committee: Buehrer— A small group is discussing WebMBA to ensure common understanding across the system and the Provosts. Side note: Jill Lane mentioned a developing issue related to RN to BSN courses being offered via eMajor. Cathy Jenks also heard of this. Mary made a note that the USG wants RACEA to weigh in on the GFA MOU as it will be a template for FinTech, eCore, and eMajor. USG is seeking the accreditation perspective from RACEA. See Appendix A.
- 4. Discuss GFA MOU— Mary sent RACEA the DRAFT GFA MOU that RACEA is expected to review and provide feedback. John Fuchko noted that they wanted feedback and will allow an appropriate amount of time to provide it. For context for what institutions are experiencing with SACSCOC, Bryan Davis noted that he sent a FinTech notification to SACSCOC and is now expected to submit a prospectus. Notification alone was not sufficient for SACSCOC. Cathy noted she also submitted FinTech as a non-Title IV entity. To further understand SACSCOC expectations and standards, the System had an initial meeting with SACSCOC some time ago, but has not since and likely will not due to the counter-intuitiveness of what is and is not a consortium under the USG in terms of ownership. The USG seeks to ensure that all system schools explain MOU's, such as the GFA, in the same way in the best interest of all USG schools.

Previously, Bryan Davis suggested to Jon Sizemore that getting some feedback from SACSCOC a bit earlier might strengthen the MOU and help USG institutions. However, perhaps an institution should seek feedback from SACSCOC as a member of the consortium as opposed the System seeking such feedback, which seems as if the USG is leading the charge, which is less desirable. John Fuchko agreed that there is value to that.



In terms of applying other SACSCOC standards to implement an MOU, USG institutions need to consider how their participation is described to our accreditor. Many SACSCOC Standards are at play for an institution to implement a consortial MOU.

Jill Lane pointed out that GFA is restricted to continuing education at her institution in part because of the changing nature of the MOU. Steve Sheeley at SACSCOC believed that GFA was a non-Title IV entity as described because GFA drives the curriculum.

To lessen the complexity of the numerous MOU's being initiated at the System, a template for a consortial MOU would help provide consistency and clear expectations. John Fuchko noted that a template would be helpful so that new censortial agreements would be more standardized and follow a common path within the USG.

Danielle pointed out via an analysis of GFA syllabi that she is attempting to reconcile their credit/contact hours with her institution's definition of credit hours. It is not clear at this time and requires further exploration.

John Fuchko noted that GFA faculty should be housed at institutions. GFA coursework should be represented in the catalogs and schedules of USG participating schools, and some schools are already doing this.

Jill noted that future MOU's related to GFA should not front the GFA academy and instead should discuss the GFA as courses that are a collection among USG schools, owned by USG schools.

A suggestion was made that perhaps the future GFA agreements might have two versions, one for continuing education and one for university credit. Many agreed with this idea as a path forward for GFA.

Because these consortial agreements are growing via the USG, the USG is seeking an avenue within their organization where all consortial agreements would have a consistent path with consistent staff review. Jon Sizemore of the USG has picked up some of this, but at this time it his portfolio does not cover all of these consortial arrangements, i.e. nursing.

Mary noted that the committee may want a meeting to discuss this topic separately. The committee agreed. Mary will circulate dates for the committee to reconvene and discuss.

- 5. **Spring Meeting Webinar Update**: Darby Sewell and Danielle Buehrer—
 Darby sent dates and May 6 at 1:30 was determined as the best date for the Spring Meeting. Soon an email will be sent to RACEA membership to register and attend the professional development. The topic will be aligning implementation fidelity with assessment for implementing institutional initiatives. Some title clarification discussions will be forthcoming. Terri Flateby will present the Webinar for RACEA this spring.
- 6. **Election Plan for Executive Committee positions** It may make more sense to have a separate meeting of voting members to determine the officers for the 2021-2022 AY. Nominations will be made



separately from the Spring meeting and voting members will be requested to vote. This worked well last year during COVID-19 and is worth repeating.

7. **Other Business**: Gen Ed Redesign is on indefinite hold. The Council on General Education is reviewing proposals, but has posted a note that any changes made to Gen Ed at an institution may not be fruitful in the long term.

A Chancellor search is underway. More information can be found here: https://www.usg.edu/chancellor_search/. A search timeline is published. The hope is to announce a new Chancellor in May 2021.

RACEA Committee make up should also be considered. There's a difference between task forces and standing committees and Chair terms should be clarified. Minutes will likely need to be updated on the RACEA Web site. Mary will help the group move forward with this.

- 8. Next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, April 8, 2021 at 9:00.
- 9. Meeting adjourned at 10:15 a.m.

Appendix A

From: Kevin Demmitt < KevinDemmitt@clayton.edu>

Sent: Wednesday, March 3, 2021 3:45 PM

To: Mary L McLaughlin mmclaughlin@gsu.edu Cc: Jon Sizemore Jon.Sizemore@usg.edu Subject: SACS and the GFA Consortium

Good afternoon,

I am the Chair of the RAC for the Georgia Film Academy. I met today with Jon Sizemore and others who work with this consortium to discuss concerns that have been raised by SACS with regard to GFA consortium. Essentially, they are interpreting some of the documents and agreements to imply that these consortiums are actually stand-alone entities. As such, institutions must submit substantive change documents for partnering with a non-Title IV educational partner.

The BOR staff has been working on the MOU to make it more clear that these are consortial agreements within the USG and TCSG. I will be sharing these concerns with the member institutions of the GFA. However, I know that most of the representatives on the GFA RAC will ultimately go to their SACS liaisons for a review of the updated agreements. Rather than working through multiple intermediaries, I thought it would be more efficient if RACEA, or a subgroup thereof, could review the agreements and



ensure that all of the concerns have been addressed. Once completed, we will want all of the member institutions to sign an updated MOU as soon as possible.

Would you be available to meet next week with myself and members of the BOR staff to discuss a plan for moving forward in a timely manner?

Thank you,

Kevin

Kevin Demmitt Provost and VPAA Clayton State University