Regent's Advisory Committee on Institutional Effectiveness (RACIE)

Subcommittee on purpose and organization of RACIE

Agenda

Telephone Conference, Monday, 12/01/2008 2:30- 4pm

I. *Introductions*:
    a. Susan Bello
    b. Bob Boehmer
    c. Kristina Cragg
    d. Cathie Mayes Hudson
    e. Juliana Lancaster
    f. Ed Rugg

II. *Purpose of this meeting* – Adopt a final recommendation to the full committee for an updated purpose and structure of RACIE. This update is intended to respond to current needs of USG and its member institutions. The goal is to send this out to the full current membership of RACIE in December 2008 and to discuss this at a meeting of the full committee in January 2009.

III. *Review of the proposal discussed during our last meeting* (11/12/2008)(see attached proposal submitted by Ed Rugg and comments submitted by Susan Bello and Kristina Cragg)

IV. *Areas for discussion today (note: this is largely the same as the last meeting – however, we have a concrete proposal in front of us and the goal of today's meeting is to reach consensus about each of these elements and adopt of concrete recommendation for a new structure)*

    a. **Vision and purpose**
    b. **New name** for RACIE? Regents Administrative Committee on Effectiveness and Accreditation?
    c. **Membership**
    d. **Operations**
        i. **Executive Committee**
        ii. **Task forces**
        iii. **Annual Meeting**

V. **Scheduling of Next Meeting**
    a. **Phone conference**
    b. **Clarify purpose of next meeting of full committee**

Suggested New Directions for RACIE

(by Ed Rugg as of 11/08)

New Name: **RACEA**

Regents Administrative Committee on Effectiveness & Accreditation

Vision Statement: Establish the University System of Georgia as a model and

recognized leader in key areas of institutional effectiveness and regional accreditation, including quality enhancement, student learning outcomes, comprehensive program review, assessment practices, continuous improvement, accreditation compliance, and public accountability.

Purpose Statement: Provide a system-wide network of professional specialists and resources

for promoting success in the interrelated areas of institutional effectiveness and regional accreditation through shared information, mutual support, expert assistance, and emulation of best practices and for recommending improvements in related USG policies and procedures that reinforce success in these areas.

Membership: USG presidents would annually appoint their institutional representative to

RACEA from the ranks of institutional effectiveness directors, SACS accreditation liaisons, assessment coordinators and Quality Enhancement Plan directors. In keeping with RACEA's vision and purpose, other institutional colleagues with related interests are invited to affiliate with RACEA, attend annual meetings, and participate in the Committee's task forces, professional development programs, and USG initiatives.

Task Forces: RACEA's annual plan of work will revolve largely around the annual

goals, initiatives, and accomplishments of its five standing task forces on:

1. Institutional Effectiveness & Program Evaluation
Focused on: interpreting the distinctive requirements of CR 2.5 and CS 3.3.1; comprehensive program review of degree programs and general education; articulating, assessing, and improving expected outcomes for programs and support services; planning and evaluation strategies and systems; assessing attainment of institutional missions and strategic goals; comparative assessment methods; best practices; successful models, regional and national developments, etc.

2. Student Learning Outcomes Assessment
Focused on: interpreting the different meanings of student learning outcomes (CS 3.3.1.1), the college-level competencies of graduates (CS 3.5.1), course-level learning outcomes, and "expected outcomes" for programs and services; articulating assessing, and improving student learning outcomes and college-level competencies; comparative assessment methods; best practices; successful models; regional and national developments, etc.

3. Quality Enhancement and Continuous Improvement
Focused on: identifying expectations for an acceptable and successful Quality Enhancement Plan (CR 2.12); demonstrating the use of assessment results for improvement; comparative strategies and systems for advancing quality assurance; continuous improvement and public accountability; best practices; successful models and sample QEPs; regional and national developments, etc.

4. Current Issues in Regional Accreditation
Focused on: SACS-COC compliance reports, focused and follow-up reports, substantive change reporting, fifth-year reports, off-site and on-site evaluation processes; demonstrating and documenting compliance with accreditation requirements; Commission policies and guidelines affecting distance learning, transfer of credit, joint curricular ventures; Federal intervention into accreditation policies and practices; comparative analysis of regional accreditors and program accreditors at the national level; best practices and successful models for achieving accreditation; regional and national developments, etc.

5. RACEA Resource Center
Focused on: constructing and maintaining the RACEA Web site on Shared Resources and Best Practices, the content for which comes from the other four

Task Forces and RACEA's membership (this will require USG budget and technical support); coordination of consulting assistance from the RACEA network for mock team reviews of accreditation reports, trouble-shooting institutional problems in achieving compliance, and interpreting accreditation requirements and standards.

These task forces will be composed of RACEA members as well as affiliated colleagues with expertise and interest in the focal area. They will work and meet as needed throughout the year and will actively communicate with the RACEA membership on issues and developments of mutual interest as they arise. Each task force will also prepare an annual presentation of their accomplishments, including an assessment of goal attainment and plans for improvement in the coming year, that will be subject to critical review by the full membership of RACIE at the annual meeting.

Annual Meeting

Agenda

RACEA will meet annually for a two-day retreat scheduled in January or February soon after the SACS-COC Annual Meeting and will follow a standing agenda that will include:

1. Status reports from member institutions undergoing SACS-COC reaffirmation of accreditation, follow-up reviews, substantive change approvals, fifth-year reporting and resolution of sanctions or compliance issues with a concluding focus on RACEA's plans for providing support and consulting assistance from the membership as needed

2. Annual presentations on the accomplishments and goal attainment assessments for each of RACEA's five standing task forces, followed by a critical review of each presentation by the RACEA membership that results in recommendations for the adjustment of task force goals and action plans for the coming year as needed.

3. The membership completes its annual assessment of the extent to which RACEA is achieving its purpose and realizing its vision and takes action as needed to improve its effectiveness in the coming year.

4. Results from the recently held election are announced for a new Chair-Elect for RACEA. The past year's Chair-Elect becomes the Chair, and the past year's Chair becomes the Immediate Past Chair at the end of the annual meeting.

5. On a rotating basis every five years, each of RACEA's task forces organizes and sponsors a half-day professional development workshop on a topic in the focal area that will be of general interest to the RACEA membership and affiliated colleagues.

RACEA

Executive

Committee

The RACEA Executive Committee will coordinate the business and activities of RACEA and its Task Forces throughout the year between Annual Meetings of the membership. The Executive Committee's

membership will include the Chair, Chair-Elect, Immediate Past Chair, the Task Force Chair responsible for the upcoming annual professional development workshop, and RACEA's liaison from the USG administration.

Susan Bello's Input 11/24/2008

Ed and Colleagues,

I think I speak for all of us in expressing great thanks for your taking the lead by drafting the well-thought out draft of our new organization! It certainly captures many of the key elements of what we discussed. I offer these thoughts for your consideration:

-Membership- some institutions where more than one person holds that basic responsibilities of assessment and accreditation may find it difficult to not have both areas represented. Even with this just one per institution member, it is quite a large committee and with the broad scope of responsibilities indicated, I wonder how effective such a group can be meeting only once per year for the retreat. Perhaps we could consider a "one per sector" appointment to make a more manageable overall committee and then add members to the subgroups as needed. With a smaller overall committee, the work can be done without having to form an executive committee. The idea of allowing other USG paticipants in the task forces (sub-commitees) is a good one. This also allows us to keep the main committee smaller and meet less often.

-Task forces (or sub-committees) We all seemed to like the idea of smaller groups due to the different focus of accreditation and assessment. Though related , should we perhaps simplify by just having two separate committees to deal with each topic? If we go toward the structure of many committees, as you propose, I would suggest that the Program Evaluation and Institutional Level Assessment have separate committees and they are quite different functions.

Broader Application- As this is a Board of Regents committee, I would suggest that in creating defintion of the different levels of assessment, it is essential that we move away from defing the committees exclusively to SACS requirements and define them more broadly by function instead. Another important function the committee could take on is assisting in the alignment between BOR and SACS requirements, especially with regard to assessment. This helps institutions avoid duplication of effort, and makes common efforts more effective.

Kristina Cragg's Input as of 11/24/2008

Team,

Here is a possible purpose statement: Serve as a resource of expertise and a clearing house for best practices in quality enhancement, student learning outcomes, accreditation, and institutional effectiveness for decision making to the Board of Regents and USG institutions. [The list in yellow could be our taskforces/subcommittees … whatever "areas" that need additional research.

I'd like to echo the comments from the call to be inclusive with reps from each institution. If we are discussing taskforces/subcommittees … surely there is enough work and opportunities to go around ☺