



**Southern Association of Colleges and Schools
Commission on Colleges**

REPORT OF THE REAFFIRMATION COMMITTEE

Statement Regarding the Report

The Board of Trustees of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC) is responsible for making the final determination on reaffirmation of accreditation based on the findings contained in this committee report, the institution's response to issues contained in the report, other assessments relevant to the review, and application of the Commission's policies and procedures. Final interpretation of the Principles of Accreditation and final action on the accreditation status of the institution rest with SACSCOC Board of Trustees.

Name of the Institution: Clayton State University

Date of the Review: March 25-27, 2014

COC Staff Member: Dr. Nuria M. Cuevas

Chair of the Committee: Dr. Johnson O. Akinleye
Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs
North Carolina Central University
Durham, NC

Part I. Overview and Introduction to the Institution

Clayton State University opened its doors to 942 students on September 30, 1969 as Clayton Junior College, with Dr. Harry S. Downs as the founding president. The Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia elevated the institution to baccalaureate status (as Clayton State College) in 1986, to university status (as Clayton College & State University) in 1996 and approved the present name on May 18, 2005.

Upon the retirement of Harry Downs in January 1994, Dr. Richard A. Skinner became the University's second president. In June 1999, Skinner left Clayton State to head the University System of Georgia's new distance learning initiative, Georgia GLOBE. Michael F. Vollmer, Clayton State's acting Vice President for Fiscal Affairs, served as Interim President for one year.

In April 2000, Dr. Stephen R. Portch, Chancellor of the University System of Georgia, announced that the Board of Regents had selected Dr. Thomas K. Harden as the University's new president, effective in June of that year. When President Harden was named chancellor of the University of Wisconsin Green Bay in December 2008, Dr. Thomas J. Hynes, Jr., provost of the University of West Georgia, was named interim president of Clayton State, starting in May 2009. On Feb. 9, 2010, the Board of Regents announced that Hynes' appointment as president of Clayton State had been made permanent.

In 1981, Clayton State added a technical division offering applied associate degrees and certificates in cooperation with the Georgia Department of Technical and Adult Education. Five years later Clayton State began its baccalaureate mission with programs in business administration and nursing. On November 16, 2005, Clayton State University's first graduate level program, the Master of Arts in Liberal Studies, was approved by the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia, opening the door to a whole new world of meeting the educational needs of students and citizens in metro Atlanta.

In January 1998 Clayton State became the first public university in the Southeast and one of the first in the nation to issue notebook computers to all students at all levels in all majors. This "Information Technology Project" transformed the campus and made Clayton State a national pioneer in "ubiquitous computing."

The past several years have been highlighted by the establishment of the first joint state and federal archives facilities adjacent to campus, the institution of a comprehensive strategic plan, and the reaffirmation of the University's accreditation by the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS).

Clayton State University is an NCAA Division II member, competing in one of the top conferences in the nation at that level - the Peach Belt Conference. The Clayton State Lakers have enjoyed much success in their 22-year history, capped by the women's basketball team winning the NCAA Division II national championship in March 2011.

The fall semester student headcount at Clayton State University has grown from 6,860 in 2011, to 7,140 in 2012, to 7,261 in 2013. Clayton State University currently has more than 6,600 students and is ranked by U.S. News & World Report as having the most diverse student population among comprehensive baccalaureate-level colleges and universities in the Southeastern United States.

Part II. Assessment of Compliance

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

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

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee found no evidence of a lack of integrity.

B. Assessment of Compliance with Section 2: Core Requirements

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

The institution has provided a certificate issued by the University System of Georgia specifying the degrees the institution is authorized to grant. The institution has referenced Article VIII of the Constitution of the State of Georgia and associated statutory language vesting authority within the Board of Regents for all government, control, and management of institutions within the University System of Georgia. Section 1, Paragraph 6 of the bylaws of the Board of Regents classifies the institution as a State University within the University System of Georgia.

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

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

An organization chart was not included in the institution's Compliance Certification for this Core Requirement; however, a Board of Regents Organization Chart was included in the institution's response to Core Requirement 2.3. The organization chart shows the relationship of the governing board to the institution. The institution has cited the Board of Regents' web page listing occupations, professional affiliations, and terms of office for each board member. The institution references provisions of the Constitution of the State

of Georgia and applicable statutory provisions establishing the Board of Regents as an 18-member board overseeing the system that includes the institution. These provisions—as confirmed by minutes of the Board provided by the institution—establish the Board’s active role as a policy-making body responsible for ensuring the adequacy of financial resources to provide a sound educational program. The potential for minority control and conflicts of interest is minimized by statutory provisions requiring appointment of board members by geographical region and the rotation of chairmanship duties and prohibiting transactions that might constitute a conflict of interests.

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

The institution cites Bylaw VI of the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia, which provides as follows: “The president of each institution in the University System shall be the executive head of the institution and of all its departments and shall exercise such supervision and direction as will promote the effective and efficient operation of the institution. He or she shall be responsible to the Chancellor or his/her designee for the operation and management of the institution and for the execution of all directives of the Board and the Chancellor.” Additional bylaw provisions prohibit the president from serving in another capacity with respect to the board.

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

The institution has a clearly defined mission that is published in the appropriate venues, and addresses teaching, learning, research, and service. The mission is in compliance with the University System of Georgia.

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

The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed the Mission Plan, Strategic Plan, and other documents provided by the institution, and found the institution in Compliance with the standard. The institutional effectiveness process operates at all levels of the institution, and includes a systematic review of objectives, means of assessment, and review of results. Objectives for each level of the institutional effectiveness process are tied to the mission and strategic plan. Improvements are noted for each goal of the Strategic Plan for 2011-2012 and 2012-2013

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

Clayton State was opened in 1969 as Clayton Junior College. The Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia elevated the institution to baccalaureate status in 1986 as Clayton State College. In 1996, the name was changed to Clayton College and State University and in 2005 to Clayton State University.

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

The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed documents in support of the institution's case for compliance and finds the institution in compliance with this standard. The committee has examined the Undergraduate Catalog, the Graduate Catalog and other evidence related to minimum credit hours required for a degree. A definition of the semester credit hour unit was found in the Undergraduate Catalog. Institutional publications describing the process for degree approval were not found in the documentation provided for this section but the committee did find a description of the process in 2.7.2 and 3.6.2.

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

The institution offers associate's, bachelor's and master's degrees in fields of study that are consistent with the institution's mission, which is primarily focused upon fostering learning, student engagement, and preparation for employment. The institution has in place robust processes for ensuring that degree programs have coherent sequencing, increasing complexity, and congruence with the institution's mission. The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee's review of degree requirements in the Undergraduate and Graduate Catalog and other documents provided confirms coherent plans of study with logical sequencing and increasing complexity for the degrees offered. The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee noted that the institution only addressed bachelor's and master's degrees in response to Standard #2.7.2, but review of institutional materials and responses to other components of the Compliance Certificate (c.f. 2.7.4) confirm that the institution also offers associate's degrees which are coherent, congruent with its mission, and in customary fields.

The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee noted that attachment 15 for CS 2.7.2 was blank on the pages that should have provided details of program content for the M.Ed. in Teacher Leadership (p. 88) but the necessary information was available in other documents provided.

- *2.7.3** In each undergraduate degree program, the institution requires the successful completion of a general education component at the collegiate level that (1) is a substantial component of each undergraduate degree, (2) ensures breadth of knowledge, and (3) is

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

The narrative response provided by the institution in response to 2.7.3 addresses only the general education component of the baccalaureate degrees offered by the institution. However, the institution offers a number of associate degrees.

The institution's Core Curriculum complies with the Georgia Board of Regent's policies, and constitutes a substantial component of baccalaureate degrees at the institution. The Core Curriculum is coherently organized to require students to develop competencies in areas such as writing, computation and critical thinking. Students are required to successfully complete one or more courses in each of humanities/fine arts, natural sciences, mathematics, and social/behavioral sciences. The required core curriculum can vary somewhat by major, but consistently exceeds the minimum requirements of 30 semester hours for baccalaureate degrees.

The catalog supplied by the institution (attachment 3, page 64) states that all "baccalaureate degree graduates and all A.A. and A.S. degree graduates" must complete the Core Curriculum, and the required core clearly exceeds the minimum requirement of 15 semester hours for associate degrees. However, the institution offers a number of associate degrees that are neither A.A. nor A.S. degrees, including A.A.S. degrees in Computer Networking, Medical Office Administration, and Paralegal Studies, and the A.A.S.I.T. in Information Technology. Documents provided demonstrate that students completing the A.A.S. degrees in Computer Networking and Paralegal Studies met the requirements of 2.7.3, but evidence was not provided regarding the general education components of the A.A.S. degrees in Medical Office Administration or the A.A.S.I.T. in Information Technology.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed the Georgia Board of Regents Policy Manual, Clayton State University Undergraduate Catalog, Handbook Core Curriculum Guide, Academic and Student Affairs Handbook, student advisement sheets, and other documents supplied by the institution. The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee further conducted an on-site interview with the department chair of the Information Technology program in support of the institution's case for compliance and affirms the findings of the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee.

- 2.7.4** The institution provides instruction for all course work required for at least one degree program at each level at which it awards degrees. If the institution does not provide instruction for all such course work and (1) makes arrangements for some instruction to be provided by other accredited institutions or entities through contracts or consortia or (2) uses some other alternative approach to meeting this requirement, the alternative approach must be approved by the Commission on Colleges. In both cases, the institution

demonstrates that it controls all aspects of its educational program. (*See the Commission policy "Core Requirement 2.7.4: Documenting an Alternate Approach."*) **(Course work for Degrees**

The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee's review of the Compliance Certificate, the Graduate and Undergraduate Catalogs and other materials provided confirm that the institution offers all instruction for multiple degrees at the associate's, baccalaureate, and the master's level. In addition, the institution has in place consortia relationships for provision of some instruction by other accredited institutions.

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

The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee examined the institution's Faculty Handbook and found an adequate definition of full-time faculty. The committee has also examined tables, which adequately show the number of full-time faculty, part-time faculty and the class distribution by full-time and part-time faculty. The committee also reviewed documents showing the ratio of full-time and part-time SCH generation by major, site and mode of delivery. Several degree programs (B.S. in Health and Fitness Management, B.S. degree in Psychology, B.S.I.T degree in Information Technology) show low ratios of full-time and part-time SCH generation. In addition three degree programs show high percentages of general core part-time SCH (Communication, Political Science and Music). The institution has recognized these issues and describes steps to ameliorate.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed documents such as faculty/student ratio, faculty workload policy, the Clayton State University Faculty Handbook, and the Budget Build Process and conducted an interview with the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs in support of the institution's case for compliance and affirms the findings of the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee.

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

The institution supplied an array of information on its collection and resources, resource sharing through formal arrangements with other USG libraries, electronic resources, access to physical facilities and online access to resources. Clearly described the various types of materials held within the main library. Each collection was briefly described with reference to methods of access for the materials and resources that are available in prints and electronic formats. The report identified the internal process for library acquisitions through a collection development policy, consortia and interlibrary loan arrangements. Collection assessment methods were outlined in details with reference to budgeting issues and improvement in the allocation of the budget for the collection.

The documentation described access to electronic resources that are provided for online and off-site students 24 hours a day through proxy server, via online chat, e-mail, phone

and text messages. Additional details on the online resources and access is available under 3.4.12, and 3.13.4.a.

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

The institution offers a variety of student support programs, services and activities that are consistent with its mission. These programs are provided through multiple units, including the Division of Academic Affairs and the Division of Student Affairs as well as Information Services and Business & Operations.

In the Division of Academic Affairs, much student support comes from the Center for Academic Success and the First Year Advising and Retention Center in addition to traditional areas such as the Library and the Registrar's Office. Within the Division of Student Affairs, units in Housing, Career Services, Counseling and Disability Support are evident, as are Orientation, Campus Life and Recreational Services; all contribute to student development. The HUB, which is technical support for students, faculty and staff, is the primary provider with Information Technology. Business Operations includes Public Safety and Auxiliary Services that provide support for students in their day to day experience. There is also a Distance Learning Division that supports students enrolled in online courses. This support comes through the virtual portal used by the university.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed both the Focused Report as well as institutional data such as First Year Experience Data in support of the institution's case for compliance and affirms the findings of the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee.

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

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

Clayton State University (the institution) presented a narrative and supporting documents to show evidence that a sound financial base and financial stability do exist. In the narrative the institution identified its budget process as being inclusive at the campus level, following Board of Regents (BOR) policies and procedures, and being approved by the BOR. The BOR approves tuition and fee rates, allocates state funds to campuses within the System, and sets strategic priorities of the System campuses.

Financial information was presented in the narrative and supporting documentation to demonstrate compliance with this requirement. Unrestricted net assets did decrease in 2012 to \$6,435,426 from a high in 2011 of \$9,408,010. This decrease was attributed to utilizing some of the unrestricted fund balance to complete 4 planned capital projects and lease then purchase Clayton Station, a residential apartment property. Even after the reduction in 2012, the unrestricted balance was 7.3% as compared to operating expenses for that year, which appears to be adequate. The institution did have an overall decrease in net assets of \$8,680,445 in 2012 due to expenses outpacing revenues. The institution explained that this was directly attributed to a decrease in construction work-in-progress due to completion of several projects, purchase of a student housing complex, depreciation increase, and the surplus of outdated equipment. The on-site team should determine if this negative trend continued in 2013. Also, the current ratio (current assets/current liabilities) has gone down over the years from 2.56 in 2009 to 1.97 for 2012. This ratio represents an institutions ability to cover short-term liabilities with funds readily available. Utilizing current assets to cover some of the completed capital projects and purchase of housing property could be the reason for such a decline. The ratio of 1.97 is still deemed to be adequate to meet current liabilities. Auxiliary expenses have had the largest percentage increase over this period.

Total revenue has grown from \$69,125,161 in 2009 to \$82,545,291 in 2012, a 19.4% increase. This is even with the decline in state funding of \$3.27 million over the same period. Tuition and fee increases, the ability to charge a special institutional fee, and a rise in enrollments were the main reasons for the revenue increase. Student headcount went from 6,587 in 2009 to 7,140 in 2012, a rise of 8.4%.

The institution is audited by the State of Georgia's Department of Audits and Accounts. The audit for the most recent year ended June 30, 2013 was not received by the time of the Off-Site Reaffirmation committee meeting. Therefore, the committee found the institution in non-compliance due to the fact that the accuracy of the current financial position cannot be verified. That task of assurance will be with the on-site team. The written management letter should accompany the audit. The institution is normally part of an annual statewide single audit.

Supporting documentation included the following: financial indicators for 2009-2012; annual financial reports for 2011 and 2012; audits from the Georgia Department of Audits & Accounts for 2011 and 2012; budget processes; BOR budget and tuition/fee approvals; BOR Policy and Business Procedures Manuals; various websites.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed additional documents such as the most recent Management Report for the year ended June 30, 2013, prepared by the Georgia Department of Audits and Accounts. The Committee also received and reviewed the statement of Unrestricted Net Position, Exclusive of Plant (including a reconciliation to the Management Report), and Statement of Revenue, Expenses and Changes in Unrestricted Net Position, Exclusive of Plant, documents outlining budget processes, and the 2012-13; 2014-15 FISAP Report; and conducted interviews with the Vice President for Business and Operations, the Special Assistant to the Vice President, the Director of Financial Aid, and the Assistant Vice President for Facilities Management in support of the institution's case for compliance. The institution has experienced some improvement in major financial ratios and indicators. The Primary Reserve Ratio has increased from 7.03% in 2012 to 7.56% in 2013; the Viability Ratio has increased from 8.29% in 2012 to 8.85% in 2013; the Current Ratio has increased from 1.97% in 2012 to 2.07% in 2013. These improvements in key financial indicators point to an improving financial position. Although

the institution's debt has increased in recent years, due to investments in facilities, the investments have been made in a strategic manner to sustain and increase student enrollment. Notwithstanding several years of state funding reductions, the institution's operating revenue continues on an upward trajectory, increasing from \$38,286,863 in 2011, to \$42,549,207 in 2012, to \$45,821,615 in 2013. The fall semester student headcount has grown from 6,860 in 2011, to 7,140 in 2012, to 7,261 in 2013, indicating a positive enrollment trend that should help the institution sustain its financial base and maintain financial stability to support its mission and the scope of its programs and services.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee finds that the institution has a sound financial base and demonstrated financial stability to support the mission of the institution and the scope of its programs and services.

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

The institution demonstrated that physical resources are adequate to support the mission of the institution.

The main campus has 186 acres with 38 buildings with over 700,000 gross square feet. Much of this square footage is found in 15 academic buildings, four educational support buildings, a 450 bed residential building, and 14 apartment buildings. Off-campus facilities are located at Lucy Huie Hall in Jonesboro, the Dolce Conference Center in Fayette County, the Peachtree City in Kedron, the Henry County Public Schools, and the Rockdale Career Center in Rockdale County. These off-campus facilities are mainly for special programs such as the MBA program, continuing education, and joint dual credit with the public school.

Facilities Management is charged with facilities oversight. There are three departments under Facilities Management: Business Operations, Physical Plant Operations, and Planning & Design. These departments oversee new construction, capital improvement, infrastructure, and maintenance of campus facilities and grounds.

The Planning & Design department oversees the following: facilities master plan; capital implementation plan; preventive and deferred maintenance plan; space utilization assessments; space inventory; major repair and renovation planning; campus accessibility plan; environmental and safety planning; facilities advisory committee; and campus life. The facilities master plan was developed by utilizing a consultant and committee structure of faculty, staff, students, and the local community. The plan was shared with the campus for input. The plan guides the construction of new facilities to support the mission.

An outside pilot program on space utilization, initiated by the Chancellor, was conducted on 5 campuses within the System. The institution was one of the five. The study determined that current space is adequate to add classroom sessions for the expansion of academic programs. Space Inventory Data Collection (FIDC) is conducted yearly and submitted to the Board of Regents. The report includes information on campus buildings, room use, departments occupying the space, capacity per room, and more.

Consultants conducted a facilities condition analysis to examine the institution's infrastructure needs as well as building conditions. The information is used to fix current

problems and plan for future renovations. Other studies were conducted such as parking supply, dining hall capacity analysis, and bookstore space comparison.

Supporting documentation included org charts, facilities master plan, facilities management strategic plan, deferred facilities plan, FIDC space analysis, facilities committee guidelines; dining and bookstore data, enrollment-by-major, and campus map.

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

The institution developed an acceptable QEP. See Part III for additional information.

C. Assessment of Compliance with Section 3: Comprehensive Standards

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

The institution has a clearly defined mission statement that is published in the appropriate venues. The mission statement was revised in 2006 and 2013 as part of the strategic planning process. The current version of the mission was approved by the Board of Regents in April 2013. Information presented in the narrative for Core Requirement 2.5 shows that the mission statement guides the planning and budgeting processes.

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

Minutes of the Meeting of the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia dated February 9, 2010, confirm that the Board of Regents appointed and reappointed the institution's chief executive officer pursuant to Board bylaws cited by the institution. Section 2.3 of the Board of Regents Policy Manual provides for an "ongoing process" of evaluation of the institution's president by the Chancellor of the University System of Georgia rather than an evaluation that takes place annually; however, copies of minutes and reappointment letters submitted by the institution do not indicate what process and criteria are being used by the Board of Regents in reaching their determination with regards to the effectiveness of the president's performance.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee conducted a review of the Focused Report which included the minutes of the May 14, 2013 Board of Regents meeting wherein President Hynes was reappointed as additional documentation in support of Standard 3.2.1 as does the letter from December 18, 2013 the Vice Chancellor for Legal Affairs for the Board of Regents attesting to the review of president Hynes' annual evaluation by Chancellor, Henry M. Huckaby. Upon review of the aforementioned documentation, the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee finds that the governing board of the institution is responsible for the selection and the periodic evaluation of the chief executive officer.

3.2.2 The legal authority and operating control of the institution are clearly defined for the following areas within the institution's governance structure: **(Governing board control)**

3.2.2.1 The institution's mission

The institution cites Board of Regents Policy Manual Section 2.9, which requires the institution to adopt a strategic planning process designed to identify and carry out the institution's mission. Pursuant to that policy, the institution has adopted a strategic plan stating that the institution's mission is to cultivate "an environment of engaged, experienced-based learning, enriched by active community service, that prepares students of diverse ages and backgrounds to succeed in their lives and careers."

3.2.2.2 The fiscal stability of the institution

The legal authority and process of review of fiscal stability for the University System of Georgia is set forth in Sections 7.0, 7.2.3, 7.2.4, and 7.3 of the Board of Regents Policy Manual. The conformity of the institution with these requirements is monitored by the institution's Internal Auditor and the Georgia Department of Audits and Accounts.

3.2.2.3 The institutional policy

Article V, Section 1 of the Board of Regents Bylaws establishes the responsibilities of the Board and its respective committees in the promulgation of policies for the institution. The Board of Regents Policy Manual and the institution's Faculty Bylaws delineate the respective roles of the institution's president and faculty in the promulgation of policies consistent with authority established by the Board of Regents.

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

Conflicts of interest involving members of the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia are prohibited by the Code of Ethics established under §45-10-1 through §45-10-41 of the Official Code of Georgia Annotated. In addition to these provisions, Board of Regents bylaws prohibit members from accepting gifts or compensation and from recommending persons for employment within the University System of Georgia. In 2009, the Board of Regents established a Compliance and Ethics Program. Members of the Board are required to file annual disclosure forms with the State Ethics Commission.

3.2.4 The governing board is free from undue influence from political, religious or other external bodies and protects the institution from such influence. **(External influence)**

The institution cites the Board of Regents Policy Manual, which states, "The Board of Regents is unalterably opposed to political interference or domination of any kind or character in the affairs of any institution in the University System of Georgia." Membership on the Board is geographically based, and requires appointment by the Governor and

confirmation by the Senate. Board members are required to undergo ethics training and Board meetings are subject to state open meetings laws.

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

The institution cites applicable provisions of the Official Code of Georgia Annotated and bylaws of the Board of Regents establishing the reasons and procedures necessary for the removal of a board member. The institution asserts that no member of the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia has ever been removed from office.

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

Multiple policy documents—including Board of Regents Bylaws and Policy Manual sections as well as Faculty Handbook and Faculty Bylaws—establish a clear and appropriate distinction between the roles of the institution’s president as opposed to that of the Board and the USG Chancellor within a system of shared governance. The clearly defined definitions in Faculty Handbook and Faculty Bylaws were especially helpful in assisting the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee in reaching this determination.

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

The institution has published a current fact book, which includes clearly defined organizational charts for the president’s cabinet and for the provost’s academic units. The institution has provided additional charts for other major administrative areas. The institution’s organizational structure appears to follow clear guidance prescribed in Articles I and VI of the Board of Regents bylaws and applicable provisions of the Board’s Policy Manual.

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

The institution provided an organizational chart for the senior officers of the school. Additionally, credentials were provided for these leaders that could be matched with the available position descriptions for their roles.

The Off Site Reaffirmation Committee noted that the materials submitted showed the institution has an interim Vice President for Student Affairs. This individual’s primary role is as the Associate Vice President for Student Affairs. In this latter role, an organizational chart indicated the Associate Vice President for Student Affairs was also serving as the interim Director of the Health Center. The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee should explore the status of these two interim roles.

Review of the credentials of members of Clayton State University's senior leadership affirms the institution's Compliance with Standard 3.2.8. The Off-Site team noted the interim appointment (at that time) of the Vice President for Student Affairs. The University web site now indicates that this appointment is a permanent appointment.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed both the Focused Report as well as institutional organizational chart in support of the institution's case for compliance and affirms the findings of the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee.

3.2.9 The institution publishes policies regarding appointment, employment, and evaluation of all personnel. **(Personnel appointment)**

The institution has provided evidence of compliance. Copies of validating documents have been included to verify practice of published processes. The Board of Regents procedures manual among other items document clearly what steps and rules are in place regarding appointment employment and evaluation of personnel.

These documents include the Human Resource Administrative Practice Manual, and Section 8.0 of the Board of Regency Policy Manual; the Clayton State University employee handbook, and numerous website publications the attached (7) staff evaluation samples also lend credence to the assertion that there is evidence of documentation addressing this standard.

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

The institution provided documentation that outlined the criteria by which administrators are evaluated. Performance reviews are conducted annually. At these reviews, goals and objectives are established and personnel are judged on their ability to accomplish the goals.

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

Section 2.5.1 of the Policy Manual of the Board of Regents grants broad discretionary authority to the institution's president sufficient to include oversight of intercollegiate athletics. The institution's director of intercollegiate athletics reports directly to the president and serves on the president's extended cabinet and administrative council. The institution has completed an NCAA self-study in which the institution asserts that its president has ultimate responsibility and final authority over intercollegiate athletics at the institution. The institution belongs to the Peach Belt Conference, whose bylaws require that the presidents of member institutions constitute the board of directors of the conference.

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

Section 7.4 of the Board of Regents Policy Manual for the University System of Georgia authorizes the institution's president to oversee the management of resources donated to the institution. The Memorandum of Understandings between the institution and its primary fund-raising foundations expressly subordinate the foundation's activities to the Board of Regents' policies regarding fund-raising. Fund-raising activities at the institution are assigned to the Office of Development, which reports to the Vice President of External Relations. The Vice President of External Relations reports, in turn, to the institution's president.

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

One institution-related foundation exists to assist Clayton State University (the institution) in furthering its mission. The foundation is called Clayton State University Foundation. This Foundation is designated as a cooperative organization per the Board of Regents Policy Manual. Bylaws outline the non-profits mission to support the institution. The Foundation has developed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the University System of Georgia Board of Regents on the relationships between these organizations and the institution. The MOU must be renewed every five years. Last renewal was in 2010. The MOU indicates that the organization must meet legal, fiscal, and administrative criteria and have an independent audit annually, which is reviewed by the President. The MOU explicitly states that neither entity in the MOU shall have any liability for the obligations, act or omissions of the other party. The President is involved as an ex-officio member of the board of trustees of the foundation, according to the Bylaws.

Supporting Documents are the Bylaws, Memorandums of Understanding (MOU), tax exemption information, foundation gift acceptance policy, and BOR Policy Manual on cooperative organizations.

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

The institutions' Intellectual Property Policy is in compliance with University System of Georgia Board of Regent's policy, and is available to faculty, staff and students through the institution's Faculty Handbook, the institution Human Resources Employee Handbook, and the University System of Georgia website. The policy applies to all students, faculty and staff, and provides guidance regarding definitions of intellectual property and the distinctions in ownership between the products of individual efforts, the institution-assisted efforts, the institution -assigned efforts, and Sponsor-supported efforts. The institution

policies are clear on issues of ownership of materials, compensation, copyright, and the use of revenue derived from intellectual property.

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

***3.3.1.1** educational programs, to include student learning outcomes

The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed the standard assessment template, program assessment plans and reports and found that the institution has identified learning outcomes for each of its programs as demonstrated by the program assessment plans and reports. It appears that each of the academic programs has identified assessment methods for their objectives. Differences in reporting requirements for externally accredited programs and those using the standard assessment template complicated the work of the committee in comparing assessment plans and reports between and across programs. Some programs are using indirect measures and should be encouraged to include direct measures of assessment. Most of the programs have “closed the loop” by reviewing the results of assessment and developing plans for improvements in the program. Some items listed as improvements do not appear to be actual improvements, instead focusing on continuing or maintaining current practices.

The On-site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed the Focused Report and affirms the findings of the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee.

3.3.1.2 administrative support services

The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed the assessment information provided for a sample of administrative support services units. The sample of six units provided did not represent the variety of administrative support units at the institution, nor did the units in the sample demonstrate that they are effectively assessing their operations. From the narrative, it appears that Public Safety, HUB, and Alumni Relations have identified a single outcome for their units. Outcomes for other units are not always stated in measurable terms, or do not focus on measuring the effectiveness of services provided by the unit. No specific assessment methods are provided for Budget and Finance or Facilities Management. Some of the assessment methods listed in the narrative do not appear to measure the effectiveness of services provided by the unit. For example, Alumni Relations says that it will measure attendance at events, but does not indicate that it will measure the quality or effectiveness of those events. Alumni Relations also says they will measure dues-paying memberships, but does not say that they will measure the level of member satisfaction with the services of the unit. The Library Archives record keeping form focus on keeping count of lots of items, but the unit does not seem to measure the level of patron satisfaction with the services provided by the unit. It is not clear from the narrative and documentation provided that all of the improvements provided are based on assessment results.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee should determine that all Administrative Support Services units have identified appropriate outcomes and assessment methods, and are using assessment results to make improvements.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed the Focused Report and interviewed the Dean of Assessment & Instructional Development, Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs, Vice President for Business and Operations, Vice President for External Relations and Assessment and Marketing Librarian. The institution provided plans for the Division of Business and Operations, Division of External Relations, Division of Academic Affairs and Office of Information and Technology Services. They identified expected outcomes related to University Strategic Goals and Action Steps and identified the extent to which the outcomes were achieved. Each administrative support service engages in unit level processes to establish goals and outcomes, assess progress, and improve as needed. The Focused Report documents the following: goals to be assessed, methods of assessment, including the source of data required, and evidence of how the results have been or will be used for improvements. The use of results to drive institutional improvement was evident.

The On-site Reaffirmation Committee finds that the documentation provided showed sufficient examples of improvements made or to be made based on analysis of results.

3.3.1.3 academic and student support services

The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed information provided on units in Student Affairs, Academic Affairs, and Information and Technology Services. The committee found the institution in non-compliance with the standard because they were unable to determine that all academic and student support services units have identified appropriate expected outcomes, assessed those outcomes, and made improvements in their operations based on assessment results.

The institution clearly defines the academic and student support services units, grouping them under the Divisions of Student Affairs and Academic Affairs as well as the Information and Technology Department. However, the institution lacks measurable goals that identify student learning outcomes or the criteria/tools used to assess these goals. Especially under the Division of Student Affairs, the institution relies on programmatic offerings and task accomplishment as indicators of student support. While these activities may indeed support students in some way, there is no tangible link between the activity and the support. In other words, accomplishment of the task doesn't necessarily translate to support for students.

Within Academic Affairs, data is provided and broad university outcomes (retention increase) are noted. While the data implies something positive is happening, what is unclear is the extent to which the retention increase stems from a particular initiative/program listed or the overall efforts of the institution.

Some units, like the Testing Center, provide no indication of their outcomes. Other units, like First Year Advising & Retention Center, identified a single outcome. Some outcomes appear to be stated as yearly goals rather than ongoing unit outcomes (i.e., "Coordinate GILC participants to submit and present a session at

the event"). Other outcomes do not focus on the effectiveness of a unit, but appear to be tasks related to larger goals (i.e., "Achieve 3 University press-release articles related to ISSO advocacy and positive image building"). Student learning outcomes were not presented for units for which they are appropriate. It would be reasonable to expect units such as Financial Aid, the Writer's Studio, and Center for Academic Success, Career Services, Recreation and Wellness, University Health Services, Recreation and Wellness to be involved in providing instruction, but no measurement of student learning was provided.

Many assessment methods/measures reported involve counting participants (Recreation and Wellness), individuals receiving services (University Health Services), and things (number of Textbooks in alternate media provided, Disability Resource Center). Monitoring and reporting statistics of this sort will not likely help these units pinpoint improvements needed in their operations, and are more appropriate for an "annual report" than an assessment report. A few units report using assessment methods that measure their clients' perceptions of the quality of their services, like the surveys and open ended questions used by Career Services.

Student Affairs provides a list of "accomplishments," but this list does not always reflect improvements in the operations of Student Affairs units. This listing of accomplishments would be more appropriate for an "annual report" than for a report on assessment. There is also no clear evidence that the accomplishments listed are the results of assessment methods and results. It is also impossible to establish the alignment of objectives, assessment methods, results, and improvements based on the individual reports provided. There are neither tangible measures listed nor any evidence of assessment on these measures. Rather, it is a listing of "things" they do instead of a goal they strive to accomplish, a measurable method for assessing if it has been accomplished, or a tool for measuring it.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee should determine that all Academic and Student Support Services units have identified appropriate outcomes and assessment methods, and are using assessment results to make improvements.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed the Focused Report as well as interviewed several administrators including the Director of the First-Year Advising & Retention Center in the Divisions of Academic Affairs and the Director of Campus Life, AmeriCorps Program Coordinator, the Leadership and Service Coordinator, and Assistant Vice President in the Division of Student Affairs. The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee also reviewed additional documents on-site, including the First-Year Advising & Retention Center Fall 2013 Semester Report and Department of Campus Life & Student Activities Center End of Year Report 2012-2013 Academic Year.

The First-Year Academic Advising Program provided outstanding data collection and analysis of results, linking these results to improvements. Follow up and action plans (analysis) do seem to be directly related to the assessment results (i.e. data collected). The units within the Department of Campus Life & Student Activities Center have established six distinctive outcomes, assessed progress, and developed plan(s) for improvement based on results.

3.3.1.4 research within its mission, if appropriate

The institution indicated that this standard was “not applicable,” and provided no narrative for the standard. However, the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee found that the narratives provided by the institution in 2.4, 2.5, and 3.1.1 clearly indicated that research is a part of the mission of the institution. Research and scholarship are also included in the expectations for graduate faculty in 3.6.2, and used to demonstrate the rigor of the graduate programs in 3.6.1. Additionally, research and scholarship are included in the institution's current Strategic Plan (see Values Statement 2; Goal A, Action Steps III, VI, VIII; Goal C, XII; and Goal E, Action IV, VI). The institution should note that research within an institution's mission normally includes: (1) research units, research centers, institutes, etc.; (2) sponsored research programs, usually with defined areas of research; and (3) degree programs and courses where research is an expected outcome.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee should determine that appropriate research units and programs with research outcomes at the institution have identified outcomes and assessment methods, and are using assessment results to make improvements.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed the Focused Report. The institution reported that its recently revised mission statement (April, 2013 approval) does not specifically indicate research. However, the University System of Georgia Policy of Institutional Mission emphasizes basic research activity and a focus on institutional and/or applied research for state universities, such as Clayton State University. The institution provided data on faculty scholarship, i.e. publications, presentations, grants and contracts, copyrights and patents from 2004 through 2013. Extensive listing of faculty research-related accomplishments by college, consistent with the institution's mission, was provided. Additionally, the institution provided sufficient evidence of applied research and scholarship related undergraduate and graduate course work.

3.3.1.5 community/public service within its mission, if appropriate

The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed the narrative, the Strategic Plan, Campus Life Goals for 2012-2013 End-of-Year Report, and other documentation provided by the institution. The committee found the institution in non-compliance because they were unable to identify the institution's definition of community and public service, and because they were unable to determine that all units involved in community/public service have identified appropriate expected outcomes, assessed those outcomes, and made improvements in their operations based on assessment results.

Community and public service are clearly addressed in the Mission and Strategic Plan. The narrative for this standard focused almost exclusively on student involvement in community service. The Campus Life Goals for 2012-2013 End-of-Year Report was provided as evidence for assessment activities of community/public service activities. Some outcomes provided in this report are stated as tasks and not ongoing outcomes (e.g. “Track volunteer hours and students that are volunteering”). This report provides a list of “accomplishments,”

but this list does not always reflect improvements in the operations of these units. This report also did not provide assessment methods used, so it was impossible for the committee to determine the alignment of assessment methods with outcomes and assessment methods.

Assessment of non-credit and continuing education programs should be addressed in this narrative, but they are not mentioned. Assessment information for the continuing education/service programs referenced in 3.4.2 should be provided in the narrative for 3.3.1.5.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee should determine that community/public service units and programs have identified outcomes and assessment methods, and are using assessment results to make improvements.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed the Focused Report and support documentation provided. The Focused Report indicates that since the off-site report, the University has developed a definition of community/public service as a part of the recently approved revised mission statement and in the development of the QEP. The institution used nationally normed surveys (NSSE and FSSE) to measure student and faculty engagement in community service projects for two years (2010 and 2011). The data were presented and compared to southern institutional peers both in chart and narrative forms. The analysis of the data was thorough and provided insight into the implementation processes occurring at the institution, especially in the development of the QEP.

Based on the review of additional documentation presented, the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee found that Clayton State University identifies expected outcomes, assesses the extent to which it achieves these outcomes, and provides evidence of improvement based on analysis of the results in community/public service within its mission.

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

The institution satisfactorily addressed all components of this standard. See Part III for additional information.

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

The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee examined the forms associated with course modification, new course, degree modification and new program processes. Appropriate forms and approval processes were found except for on-campus new degree program approval. The form referenced in the report was a system wide approval form and did not

indicate on-campus approval levels. The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee should verify that internal processes for new degree approval exist.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee examined the forms associated with course modification, new course, degree modification and new program processes. Appropriate forms and approval processes were found. Interviews with the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs and a review of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committee, and the Graduate Affairs Committee website confirm the internal processes associated with new degree and program proposals.

Based on this review of documents and the conversation with the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs, the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee verifies and confirms that Clayton State University demonstrates that each educational program for which academic credit is awarded is approved by the faculty and the administration.

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

The institution has numerous activities that support compliance. There is evidence of "regional responsiveness" marked by the instructional sites in Jonesboro, Henry County, Fayetteville and Peachtree city. These centers provide numerous choices for continuing education. A collaborative career resource center serves individuals in Clayton, Henry and Fayette Counties.

Activities in career services, Small Business Development Center, the Dental Hygiene clinic as well as the Summer Entrepreneurship and Business Academy suggest a broad and active involvement with the community (nominal fees seem to apply in most of the outreach programs, and public facilities access).

VITA (Volunteer Income Tax Assistance); visual and performance arts theatrical performance; and the three major civic engagement activities attest to Institutions mission of encouraging social and civic responsibility, community leadership and service to the society.

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

The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee found that the institution publishes admissions criteria and these appear to be consistent with its mission. Information is listed on the respective websites for undergraduate and graduate students.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed the Focused Report in support of the institution's case for compliance and affirms the findings of the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee.

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

Transfer students comprise a large proportion of new admissions to the institution each year, and the institution has in place well-defined procedures for determining transfer of credit from other accredited educational institutions, in accordance with the University System of Georgia Board of Regents Policy. The institution procedures ensure that all credit awarded is congruent with the institution's mission, and represents collegiate-level work comparable to that earned by students in courses offered by the institution. Transfer policies and procedures are readily available to students on the Registrar's website, as are tables of transfer equivalencies. The institution also has in place robust, clearly defined policies and procedures for awarding credit by examination through standard methods such as Advanced Placement, CLEP, International Baccalaureate, FLATS foreign language testing, and Defense Activity DANTES examinations. Procedures are congruent with standard practices and credit recommendations from the American Council on Education, but finding the level of achievement necessary to earn credit for some exams (such as FLATS) may be difficult for students.

The institution is currently in the process of exploring expanding Prior Learning Assessments (PLAs) in accordance with the University System's Complete College Georgia Plan. This plan is anticipated to include standardized PLA options (such as CLEP and AP credit) as well as options for earning credit by portfolio and locally developed challenge exams. However, materials provided do not indicate that the institution currently awards credit for non-academic experiential learning or life experience, other than through standardized examination or credit for experience and specialty certification in nursing. Awarding credit for specialty certification is a common practice for RN to BSN programs. No examples were provided to the Committee of locally developed examinations for credit, although the narrative for CS 3.4.6 and associated documents state that credit may be awarded for "in some cases, special examinations developed by the University." It is not clear if such examinations have actually been developed or used by the University.

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

The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee examined the Mission Statement, the by-laws of the University System of Georgia, the institution Faculty Handbook, the institution Faculty Bylaws, and other relevant documents. These documents describe procedures and policies that meet the generally expected standards for academic policies. The committees involved in the approval process reflect an appropriate balance of faculty and administration input.

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

The institution follows guidelines and policies established by the University System of Georgia and the Board of Regents in defining a semester and a credit hour for distance education, independent study, and face to face education. The institution has sound practices for awarding credit for a wide variety of learning experiences consistent with its mission, including internships, fieldwork, study abroad, and clinical learning experiences. The level of credit for coursework is determined by subject-area faculty with approval of the Undergraduate Curriculum Committees or Graduate Council.

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

The institution provided the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee with a narrative and copies of signed contracts and consortial agreements. These included:

11/7/08 - ARCHE, Atlanta Regional Council for higher Ed. Educational exchange agreement with Georgia American Vs. Tblisi Rep. of GA. Agreement of International University Cooperation with 3/30/2011.

University of CAEN lower-Normandy France (Found no date on exchange as was the case in other documents.)

2010 e-Core affiliate letter of intent and commitment Agreement MOU signed and stamped in for legal compliance 4/5/10. (May 4, 2010).

Dual Degree Engineering program with Georgia Institute of Technology dated for 5/13/09.

The institution indicated that it regularly evaluates the consortial relationships against the mission of the university.

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

The institution does not award academic credit for course work taken on a non-credit basis. Additional narrative and referenced documentation indicated well-established transfer of credit policies.

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

The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed documents provided in the institution's Compliance Certification and found targeted services are available to assist freshmen students while broader support is available to any graduate or undergraduate student. Services include tutoring, supplemental instruction, writing labs and an early alert system. Additional support is available through transition programs, counseling services, and Operation Study, an institution wide initiative supporting high academic achievement.

Support is also readily available to faculty members in their efforts. A number of technology-based workshops are accessible. Additionally, through the Engaged Learning Initiative Academy, faculty can participate in an AAC&U High Impact Practices Initiative.

As noted in 3.13.4a, the various academic disciplines are responsible for offering support to the limited number of distance education students that are taking a course through the university.

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

There is clear evidence that the institution places responsibility for the content, quality, and effectiveness of its curriculum with its faculty. The institution provided numerous references in support of compliance including the Clayton State University Faculty Handbook (approved May 4, 2011), Clayton State University Faculty Bylaws of April 2011, Academic Affairs undergraduate committee policy documents and the Board of Regents Guidelines and Policies.

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

The institution states that each degree program, concentration, major and minor has a designated, academically qualified program coordinator who is responsible for leadership in all aspects of program coordination, implementation, and review; and that appointments as program coordinator are approved by the department chair or dean. Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee review of the roster of program coordinators, narrative and supporting materials confirms that faculty has been designated for each curricular offering except the RN to MSN program. Separate coordinators are listed for the RN to BSN and the MSN degrees in nursing, but no mention is made of coordination of the RN to MSN option (which is listed as a program offered in the catalog, on the websites, in supporting documentation to CS 2.7.2). It is not clear if coordination for the RN to MSN option is shared between the BSN and MSN program coordinators, or accomplished in some other way. The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee also noted that the website, catalog and documentation supporting CS 2.7.2 indicate that the institution offers a BAS in Technology Management, but this program is not listed in roster of program coordinators. However, the faculty member listed as coordinator of the BAS in Computer Networking Concentration also has coordination of the BAS in Technology Management reported as one of his responsibilities on his Qualifications sheet.

The Committee also noted that the rank of designated program coordinators ranges from lecturer to professor, and it is not clear how more junior faculty *members* (such as lecturers and assistant professors) are guaranteed the authority necessary to provide adequate academic oversight and leadership. However, the academic credentials of the programs coordinators represent appropriate qualifications: most program directors listed by the institution hold doctoral degrees in appropriate fields; the remainder (c.f. MAS Archival Studies, BBA Accounting), hold master's degrees in appropriate fields. Certifications and experiential qualifications listed are also appropriate. In some cases program directors hold additional administrative roles, such as department chair or associate dean; and in some cases the same individual directs multiple programs. In cases where one individual directs multiple programs, they are either closely related (such as BS in Computer Science and AASIT in Information Technology) or are different levels within the same discipline (such as BA and MAT in English).

A list of Academic Program Coordinators was provided for review to the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee, including the terminal degree(s) for each that was determined to satisfy the unit's academic credentialing requirement. In addition, professional qualification statements were provided which were structured in such a way as to enable further clarification of degrees, experience, research and publications related to the programmatic field.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee conducted interviews with the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs and concluded that the additional information provided by the Chief Academic Officer sufficiently documents the existence and qualifications of all program coordinators including the RN to MSN program. The program for the RN to MSN program is listed on the faculty page of the School of Nursing webpage.

Based on the presented documentation and interviews, the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee affirms the findings of the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee.

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

The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee found that the institution provided substantive information on the technology support for students and faculty, offering a variety of hardware, software and training that supports students, faculty and staff. The report also outlines the availability of technology to enhance students learning in various colleges, and supports for specific discipline. Access and support of technology for online students are comparable to those provided for face-to-face students, and access is provided through secure web access network. Faculty and students technology training is supported by the Center for Instructional Development. The institution recently established Information Technology Task Force to study current practices and develop a plan to meet the technology needs of students and faculty to enhance the teaching and learning process. Verification of student identification in distance education is described in the Distance Education Policies and Procedures document.

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

The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee found that the institution provided information describing appropriate competencies associated with the core curriculum. The institution has also provided appropriate justification that the competencies are at the appropriate level. Longitudinally, the institution gives an example of using the assessment data to drive modifications to the curriculum (writing class example). The institution uses the ETS exam at the freshman and senior level to measure the overall attainment of core related competencies. However, the institution has not provided information related to setting an acceptable benchmark for student attainment of these competencies.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed the Focused Report and supporting documentation and affirms that the institution has provided sufficient evidence related to setting an acceptable benchmark for student attainment of General Education competencies. The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee found the institution identifies college-level general education competencies and the extent to which students have attained them.

- 3.5.2** At least 25 percent of the credit hours required for the degree are earned through instruction offered by the institution awarding the degree. (*See the Commission policy "Agreements Involving Joint and Dual Academic Awards: Policy and Procedures."*) **(Institutional credits for a degree).**

The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee examined policy manuals, the institution's Undergraduate Catalog, and several policies and procedures. Sample transcripts were examined also. All associate degrees examined were in compliance. The institution requires 30 SCH in residence for baccalaureate degree programs. For baccalaureate degree programs that require more than 120 SCH (e.g. Music (124 SCH) and Music Education (129 SCH), and Middle Level Education (122) the required 30 SCH is less than 25%, therefore the institution is in non-compliance.

The most relevant documentation that supports compliance with this standard is found in both the Undergraduate Catalog 2011-2013, and the Academic Affairs policies related to undergraduate graduation requirements. The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee conducted interviews with the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs and obtained additional documentation located in the Clayton State University Academic Undergraduate Catalog and finds at least 25 percent of the credit hours required for the degree, including those in Music, Music Education, and Middle Level Education are earned through instruction offered by the institution awarding the degree.

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

The institution has published the requirements for its undergraduate programs, including its general education component which is defined by the University System of Georgia's Core Curriculum, on the website and in the Undergraduate Academic Catalog. These requirements are consistent with commonly accepted standards and practices for the undergraduate degrees offered. The institution follows University System of Georgia

procedures and institution-specific processes for ensuring congruence of program requirements with accepted standards and practices. These processes include appropriate involvement of faculty in ensuring the rigor and coherence of undergraduate programs of study.

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

The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee review of the Compliance Certification and supporting materials confirms that at least 25 percent of the course hours in each major at the baccalaureate level are taught by the faculty members holding appropriate terminal degrees. This is supported for programs offered on the main campus (where most programs are offered), at the Fayette County site and through distance learning. The only non-doctoral degree presented as a terminal degree was the MFA. Two of the programs offered, the BALS and the BA in Integrative Studies, allow use of courses from multiple other disciplines with great flexibility in course selection, so the exact proportion of hours taught by faculty with terminal degrees cannot be determined, and the appropriate terminal degrees of the faculty are linked to their discipline, rather than to Liberal or Integrative Studies. The high proportions of courses taught by faculty with appropriate terminal degrees within the other undergraduate majors at the institution virtually ensure that students in the BALS and BA in Integrative Studies programs will receive over 25% of their instruction from faculty holding appropriate terminal degrees for the courses they are teaching, although this proportion will vary from student to student, depending on his/her course selection.

- 3.6.1** The institution's post-baccalaureate professional degree programs, and its master's and doctoral degree programs, are progressively more advanced in academic content than its undergraduate programs. **(Post-baccalaureate program rigor)**

The institution has several publications that differentiate between undergraduate and post baccalaureate degree programs. An exhaustive list of the publications on these programs, points to policy positions on set rules and processes regarding this standard. Minutes of relevant meetings reflect the on-going conversation and content, its application and the intended outcomes. Course syllabi are attached to demonstrate compliance with required content rigor. There are charts and other references to documents, delineated by degrees that attest to the rigor of their graduate programs.

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

The institution states that it uses a system of internal processes to ensure that graduate curricula include knowledge of the literature in the discipline and ensure ongoing student engagement in research or appropriate professional practice. Although the institution provides a list of thesis titles (attachment 11) and course descriptions, no course syllabi or student work products are provided in evidence for 3.6.2 to allow the Off-Site

Reaffirmation Committee to validate this conclusion. Two syllabi for graduate courses are provided in support for 3.6.1, and both indicate that students are required to complete a "research paper on a topic;" however, no directions or guidelines for the paper are provided, so it is not possible to determine if development of the paper requires accessing the literature in the discipline.

The institution indicates that it restricts service on the Graduate Council, and chairing of theses and certain other graduate-level work to faculty members who hold full graduate faculty status, and such graduate faculty status requires appropriate scholarly and leadership activities within the discipline. The Graduate Council regularly reviews graduate courses and programs. Where appropriate, specialty accreditation standards are also used in determination of the appropriate skills and knowledge for graduate students. Some programs use capstone courses to ensure that students achieve these competencies, while other use theses or practicum experiences. In the narrative for C.S. 3.6.2, the sample courses were organized by departmental prefix, rather than by graduate degree offered. However, integrating the information provided by the institution in response to C.S. #3.6.2 with that provided for C.S #2.7.2, the Committee was not able to determine that, for each graduate degree offered, the published program of study requires that students have contact with disciplinary literature and engagement in research or professional practice. For the MALS degree, the disciplinary knowledge is in one of five areas of focus, and students complete a thesis or non-thesis capstone.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed documentation from the institution which provides evidence from each graduate program such as program guidelines, sample course assignments, and sample student work to demonstrate graduate curricula include knowledge of the literature of the discipline and ongoing student engagement or research and/or appropriate professional practice and training experiences. The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee also interviewed the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs and Dean of Graduate Studies and reviewed the Clayton State University Graduate Catalog information regarding Graduation Requirements for the School of Graduate Students and found that the graduate curricula includes knowledge of the literature of the discipline and ongoing student engagement in research and/or appropriate professional practice and training experiences.

Based on the review of presented documentation and interviews, the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee finds that the institution structures its graduate curricula to include knowledge of the literature of the discipline and to ensure ongoing student engagement in research and/or appropriate professional practice and training experiences.

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

The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee examined the graduate catalog and policies exist which require that all graduate degrees require that at least 1/3 of the credits must be earned at the institution. An example form needed for transfer credit from the graduate school was provided.

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

The institution clearly defines and publishes requirements for each graduate and post baccalaureate program. The links to the websites are easy to follow and copious attempts have been made to establish clear statements of graduation or completion requirements.

There is a well-established process for determining the course work to be included in the program. The institution makes effort to ensure its coursework conforms to commonly accepted standard and there is evidence of multi-level faculty and committee approval processes as demonstrated in the evidentiary documents provided.

- 3.7.1** The institution employs competent faculty members qualified to accomplish the mission and goals of the institution. When determining acceptable qualifications of its faculty, an institution gives primary consideration to the highest earned degree in the discipline. The institution also considers competence, effectiveness, and capacity, including, as appropriate, undergraduate and graduate degrees, related work experiences in the field, professional licensure and certifications, honors and awards, continuous documented excellence in teaching, or other demonstrated competencies and achievements that contribute to effective teaching and student learning outcomes. For all cases, the institution is responsible for justifying and documenting the qualifications of its faculty. *(See Commission guidelines "Faculty Credentials.")* **(Faculty competence)**

The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee found that the institution has an appropriate form for evaluating questionable faculty. In addition they specify in their Faculty Credentials Hiring Guide that "...each department chair, program coordinator, or dean must make a compelling case to support a faculty hire..." They self-identified 70 faculties that had been reviewed under column four of the Faculty Credentials Worksheet regarding other qualifications. However, the aforementioned form has no place for approval signatures and it is not all clear that is making the judgment as to other qualifications. In addition, the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee identified 19 faculty members who appeared not to meet qualifications and/or questions concerning their academic qualifications have not been sufficiently addressed (see Faculty Credentials Worksheet). In addition, all off the Social Sciences Faculty appear to be missing column four of the Faculty Credentials Worksheet data regarding other qualifications.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed materials pertaining to the institution's policies and procedures related to faculty hiring and determination of credentials appropriate to the educational mission. The institution uses the highest education credential earned as the primary qualification and considers additional evidence such as professional experience in the field, appropriate courses in related fields, and other demonstrated competencies in the field to determine faculty qualifications for teaching undergraduate and graduate courses. The institution creates a Faculty Credentials Worksheet for all full and part-time faculty teaching in each program. For faculty with a degree(s) in a related field(s), a Transcript Review and Justification Sheet signed by the college dean and provost/vice president for academic affairs is used to document evidence of appropriate competencies to teach specific courses.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed the revised justifications for faculty, the social sciences faculty roster, and the replacement faculty roster submitted with the Focused Report and finds evidence of procedures for verification of faculty credentials and competences for teaching assignments. The transcript review procedure identifies the faculty member's highest credential and, if necessary, graduate level course work earned in related disciplines. Also considered is documented evidence of additional certification relevant to the field of teaching and/or work experience to justify competence in the teaching discipline. The institution refers to its Faculty Credentials and Hiring Guide Appendix A and B that identifies "Qualifying Fields" considered to be related to the Clayton State University Course CIP Code as a guide in determining related fields of study.

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

The institution provided written evaluation of each member of the faculty annually, as required by its Board of Regents. Criteria, policies and procedures for faculty evaluation are accessible through the Faculty Handbook. Examples of de-identified faculty evaluations support the conclusion that evaluations are provided annually without regard to contractual or tenure status.

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

The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee examined the materials associated with faculty professional development and found that the institution has many activities to assist faculty with professional development. Institutional funds are committed to assist faculty in attending professional meetings. The Center for Instructional Development supports faculty in developing effective teaching practices. Information about professional development opportunities is widely disseminated.

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

The institution provides a definition of academic freedom. Institutional policies are clear, and they include procedures for safeguarding and protecting academic freedom of the faculty. The institution has publications not limited to the faculty Handbook (approved May 1 2012) but also include BOR manuals. The Board of Regents of the University system of Georgia manuals specifically includes sections addressing academic freedom. The board in its August 2008 meeting has explicit mention of these freedoms in context and addressed the issue.

The institution appears to also adopt the language of the AAUP 1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure.

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

The institution has published policies on the role of faculty in academics and governance on the website of the Provost and in the online Faculty Handbook and Faculty Bylaws. The responsibility and authority of faculty in academic and governance matters is established through the faculty governance process, and actualization of these roles is supported by Faculty Senate Minutes and faculty committee charges.

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

The Compliance Certification Report includes narrative concerning the physical facilities with information about seating, services and number of collection in various formats and equipment. The mission statement and floor plans of the building are included. The documentation describes access to resources provided to online and off-site programs including online information resources through the institution and Georgia library consortium GALILEO. Students' survey result indicated request for increased space for both individual and group studies, more seating options and for more computer equipment. The institution proposed plans to include a greater variety of seating and 120 computer stations.

3.8.2 The institution ensures that users have access to regular and timely instruction in the use of the library and other learning/information resources. **(Instruction of library use)**

The institution offers information literacy through formal and informal instruction programs. Library instruction is scheduled for two courses and faculty can request instruction through an online request form. In support of distance learning the library offers virtual reference assistance via online chat, e-mail and text messages in addition to online research subject guides.

Printed materials and web pages reflect communication methods with faculty and students to inform them regarding the services available. The library is also proposing a credit-bearing information literacy course. Information literacy learning outcome is also documented. The array of documentation supplements the statistics and survey results, which indicate the institution provides a multifaceted library instruction program, assess the program, and makes improvements to support student learning and information access and utilization.

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

The institution Compliance Report indicates that librarians are required to hold a master's degree granted by an institution accredited by the American Library Association. The librarians' roster indicates educational credentials for library and outlines the professional experiences for each individual. The library cites data from 2010 Academic Library Survey regarding the ratio of librarians to number of FTE students and provides ranking data. The

library reports recent efforts on staffing efficiencies, and indicates recently-approved a librarian position. List of organizations librarians are members is provided.

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

The institution publishes an appropriate statement of student rights & responsibilities and disseminates the statement to the campus community. The Student Code of Conduct and Disciplinary Procedures are included in the Student Resource Handbook; they are also available on-line. Additionally, emails are sent to all students regarding conduct regulations and procedures. Finally, new students receive their personal hard copy version of the information during orientation.

3.9.2 The institution protects the security, confidentiality, and integrity of its student records and maintains security measures to protect and back up data. **(Student records).**

The institution has established policies and procedures that comply with the confidentiality and security requirements. The Registrar has primary responsibility for student academic records and uses Banner as its record system. Access to student records is controlled and protected based on the sensitivity, the format of the record, and the need to know.

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

The institution has a sufficient number of qualified staff who possesses the appropriate education or experience in student affairs to accomplish the mission of the institution. The institution uses CAS standards and NASPA guidelines to appropriately identify the number of staff needed.

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

The institution demonstrated financial stability through the comparison of financial information for the years 2009 through 2012. During this period overall revenue increased from \$69,125,151 in 2009 to \$82,545,591 in 2012, representing a 19.4% increase. This increase occurred at the time when state support was on the decline. Positive impacts on the upsurge in revenue include yearly increases in tuition and fee rates, a special institutional fee being added in 2009, and increased enrollments. The special institutional fee generated \$4,101,923 in 2012.

On the downside, net assets decreased dramatically from 2011 to 2012 by \$8,680,445 to \$59,637,388 in 2012. The explanation given for the decrease in net assets was that accumulated depreciation was incorrectly reported and therefore a correction was made, there was an increase in depreciation, and taking a large amount of surplus equipment off-line. Unrestricted net assets also saw a decline from 2011 to 2012 of \$2,973,584 to

\$6,435,426 in 2012. As stated in 2.11.1, the decline in unrestricted net assets was attributed to utilizing some of the unrestricted funds to complete 4 planned capital projects and an increase in lease obligations. There seems to be some discrepancies between 2.11.1 and 3.10.1 when explaining why the decreases occurred from 2011 to 2012. This does not appear to be an effort to mislead the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee but the fact that 3.10.1 needed additional proof reading.

During this same time period student enrollment went from 6,587 in 2009 to 7,140 in 2012. In the period from 2002 to 2012, enrollment rose by 1,928 students, a 37% increase. There appears to be a trend to add residential housing in support of the upward growth in student enrollments.

The annual budget process is based on a conservative approach of allocation of resources to departments and schools. As stated in 2.11.1, the budget process is broad based on campus, follows the Board of Regents (BOR) policies, and is approved by the Board of Regents.

Supporting documentation was the following: BOR policy and business procedures manuals; annual the institution financial reports for 2011 and 2012; State Appropriations Bill for 2013; endowment returns; and various external documents. Qualifications and experience of individuals who manage and sustain the institution's financial stability were found in 3.10.3.

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

The State of Georgia's Department of Audits and Accounts (DOCC) conducts an annual state-wide audit of the federal and state awards programs for all state agencies and state universities. Federal audit work concerning financial aid is based on federal OMB Circular A-133. State-wide single audit reports for the years 2009 through 2011 were presented as supporting documentation. The 2012 state-wide audit was found in section 2.11.1. These state-wide audits do not represent an audit opinion solely for the Clayton State University but do indicate if any findings on financial aid occurred. The state-wide audits also determine if adequate financial controls are in place. After examining the state-wide audits for 2009 through 2012, the institution was not listed as having findings or weak internal controls in its financial aid.

Supporting documents were the State Single Audit Reports for 2009-2012 and the 2013 SACSCOC Financial Profile.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed documents such as Single Audit Reports for 2009 through 2012 and the 2013 SACSCOC Financial Profile, and conducted interviews with the Vice President for Business and Operations, and the Director of Financial Aid in support of the institution's case for compliance and affirms the findings of the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee.

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

Evidence was provided to indicate that appropriate control over financial resources is sufficient. Controls were found by examining the organizational structure, policies and procedures of both the Board of Regents and institution, and controls within the automated software for financial, human resources, and student activities.

The Vice President of Business and Operations (VPBO) provides operational oversight of the financial operations and ensures that policies and procedures are established, communicated, and implemented to safeguard financial resources. Each head of an organizational unit is responsible for fiscal administration of all accounts and expenditures in their area of supervision.

Controls over financial resources are regularly monitored through the Institution's Internal Audit Department, the Board of Regents Audit Department, and external auditors from the State.

The following software systems are being utilized: PeopleSoft Financial System (PS) for accounting/finance; Banner for student system; and ADP Payroll for HR/Payroll. There are also software systems for student housing, fixed asset, and continuing education. All software systems integrate with PeopleSoft general ledger. These systems control access through log-in procedures and have separate authority for approval processes.

The institution has general liability insurance for property claims. Fidelity Bond coverage protects against losses due to dishonest acts of its employees.

The Assistant Vice President of Budget & Finance/Controller is responsible for accountability of the institution's resources, accounting and procurement operations, financial reporting, and student financial services.

The Planning and Budget Advisory Council (PBAC), headed by the President, meets quarterly to discuss budget development, strategic expenditures, and fiscal and control issues of importance.

A reporting hotline is in place and run by an external company to provide a way for someone to report any type of compliance issues.

The Vice President of Business and Operation and AVP of Budget & Finance/Controller appeared to be qualified for their positions. The VP has a Juris Doctorate and 15+ years of higher education experience. The Controller has a Master's of Science in Accounting and 30+ years of higher education experience.

Supporting documents are as follows: organizational charts, VPBO and Controller resumes; various financial guidelines and procedures; various websites; various manuals; Ethics hotline; the institution Annual Financial Reports for 2011 and 2012; PBAC Agendas in 2012 and 2013.

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

The University utilizes the Office of Grants and Contract Programs (GCP) for identifying funding opportunities, writing grant applications, preparing budgets, managing external funds, and maintaining program requirements for federal, state and other type of grants. The GCP is also responsible for compliance with University and System policies and

procedures. The Grants Accounting and Compliance Office oversee budget development and financial reporting on post-award grants. This Office is responsible for maintaining financial control over sponsored program accounts.

The institution uses a Preliminary Proposal Approval Sheet to facilitate the approval process on grant proposals with approval signatures from the Department Chair, Dean, and Provost, VP for Business and Operations, and President.

External audits are conducted for compliance with state and federal regulations under the state-wide single audit by the State of Georgia's Department of Audits and Accounts. No findings were noted for this institution in the state-wide audit for the years 2010 through 2012.

Supporting documentation included the following: various internal web sites; organizational charts; the Preliminary Proposal Approval Form; OMB Circulars A-21, A-110, and A-133; the institution Business Procedures Manual; State-wide audits for 2010-2012; grants SAS 112 Checklists.

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

The institution indicated that the Facilities Management Department controls the university's physical resources - property, assets, and utilities - by utilizing the following control systems, processes, or instruments: a building, land, lease inventory of property; building inspections; contract management; deferred maintenance plans; campus master keying system; due diligence procedures in acquisition and demolition; energy inventory reports; facilities advisory committee; facilities and technology design standards; facilities condition analysis; facilities inventory data collection; facilities performance indicators; facilities policies and procedures; institutional surveys; yearly major repairs and renovation justification to BOR; semester readiness; surplus and inventory control; and work request management. The institution explained in detail each of these control systems, processes, or instruments.

Auxiliary and Administrative Services ensures that security of all computer and network resources are in place per Board of Regents and the institution policies and regulations. Passwords are analyzed for password strength and required to be changed on a regular basis. User logins restrict the level of system access based on user function or role within a department. Internet equipment is protected through use of firewalls.

Based on the number of control elements, the institution appears to have the tools in place to control physical resources.

Supporting documentation is as follows: master plan; policies and procedures; asset management; each of the control systems, processes, instruments listed above; and fleet management.

3.11.2 The institution takes reasonable steps to provide a healthy, safe, and secure environment for all members of the campus community. (Institutional environment)

The Offices of Environmental Health and Safety, Public Safety, The institution Police Department, Auxiliary Services, Campus Life, Student Affairs Counseling Services, Housing offices and Residence Life, University Health Services, and Facilities Management all play a role to ensure a healthy, safe, and secure environment.

The Office of Environmental Health and Safety promotes environmental stewardship, safety and health throughout the campus. The goal is to foster a safe work environment. This Department works to prevent accidents through safe usage of hazardous materials. Other programs administered by this Department include a comprehensive loss control program, environmental management system, property risk management, spill prevention control plan, and universal waste management. The Department also ensures compliance with all Occupational Health and Safety regulations. The institution also has an Environmental Advisory Committee, a safety committee, and policies and procedures to evaluate the best methods to handle risk through risk avoidance and prevention.

Within Public Safety is the University Police Department, a full-service police department, which provides security for the campus. Public Safety conducts safety and crime prevention programs periodically and when requested. Active shooter training exercises and fire alarm drills are two such programs. This Office also oversees the Emergency Preparedness and Response Plan.

Auxiliary Services oversees dining, the bookstore, and retail operations. This department monitors the cleanliness and safety in these retail areas.

The Office of Student services is responsible for student activities, including the student resource handbook, which includes the code of student conduct. Housing and Residential Life oversee the safety of students in on-campus housing.

Facilities Management is entrusted to provide a safe physical environment for study and work. This department follows federal and state environmental regulation.

The institution made reference to business continuity plans in the supporting documentation but there were none when opening the supporting document link.

Supporting documents are as follows: various websites; policies and procedures; safety and emergency plans; safety training programs; inspection sheets; emergency building contacts; environmental management system (EMS) manual; campus map; and student, staff, and faculty handbooks.

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

By analyzing both narratives for 2.11.2 and 3.11.3 collectively, the reviewer could determine that the institution demonstrated that physical facilities are operated and maintained to appropriately support the mission-related activities.

Core requirement 2.11.2 outlines the campus acreage and the number of buildings on the main campus. Off-campus facilities are also identified in 2.11.2.

Facilities Management is charged with facilities oversight on the main campus. There are three departments under Facilities Management: Business Operations; Physical Plant Operations; and Planning & Design. These departments oversee new construction, capital improvement, infrastructure, and maintenance of campus facilities and grounds. The 3.11.3 narrative goes into detail on the duties of each of these three units in support of the operation and maintenance of the campus.

The off-site locations are leased properties and the lessor is responsible for proper maintenance. Periodic inspections are conducted by the institution at off-campus sites to verify that proper maintenance is being done.

The planning and operation of the campus is guided by the Campus Master Plan, which addresses the issues for space to meet the short-term needs and in long-range planning. The Facilities Master Planning Committee oversees the development and updating of the Campus Master Plan. This committee has representation from faculty, staff and students. As indicated in 2.11.2, other plans also are utilized to insure that physical facilities are adequately maintained. These are as following: facilities master plan; capital implementation plan; preventive and deferred maintenance plan; space utilization assessments; space inventory; major repair and renovation plan; campus accessibility plan; and environmental and safety plan.

The Office of Information Technology and Services oversees technological infrastructure, including the Banner Student Information System, networks, and information security systems. The IT Strategic Plan guides the technology needs.

As noted in 2.11.2, consultants conducted a facilities condition analysis to examine the institution's infrastructure needs as well as building conditions. The information is used to fix current problems and plan for future renovations. Other studies were conducted such as parking supply, dining hall capacity analysis, and bookstore space comparison.

Supporting documentation included the campus master plan, the facilities master plan and website, other websites, campus maps, policies and procedures, asset and fleet management, major repair and renovation, and surplus and inventory control.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed documents such as campus master plan, facilities master plan, campus maps, and facilities policies and procedures, and conducted interviews with the Vice President for Business and Operations, and the Assistant Vice President for Facilities Management in support of the institution's case for compliance and affirms the findings of the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee.

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

Clayton State University notifies the Commission of substantive changes in accordance with Commission policy. The institution provided a list of substantive changes they have submitted to the Commission since the university's last reaffirmation in 2004.

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

***3.13.1. “Accrediting Decisions of Other Agencies”**

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

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

The single institution-wide accreditation held by the Clayton State University is the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC). The institution provided a list of discipline-specific accrediting bodies that they have received accreditation from:

American Dental Association, Commission on Dental Accreditation (ADA)
Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE)
National Association of Schools of Music (NASM)
National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE)

The university did not indicate in the narrative but indicated in both its undergraduate and graduate catalogs that it had accreditation for its School of Business with the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB).

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed the undergraduate and graduate catalogues and determined that the institution listed (1) federally recognized agencies that currently accredit the institution or any of its programs, (2) provided the date of the most recent review by each agency and examined copies of statements used to describe itself for each accreditation, and the date. The committee verified that there were no terminated accreditations. As a result, the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee affirms the findings of the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee.

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

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

the integrity of the collaborative academic arrangements, (2) the quality of credits recorded on their transcripts, and (3) compliance with accreditation requirements.

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

The institution has collaborative academic arrangements for three programs: eCore (University System of Georgia Core Curriculum), WebBSIT (with 5 other USG schools), and the Dual Degree Engineering Programs (with Georgia Institute of Technology). The arrangement for each of the three programs is in accordance with Board of Regents and SACSCOC policies. The institution also has contractual agreement with Atlanta Regional Council for Higher Education for cross-registration across 20 member schools. The institution reports processes to ensure integrity of the collaborative arrangements, quality of credits accepted, and compliance with accreditation requirements. Signed final copies of the agreements governing these relationships are provided with the Compliance Certificate, but the institution provides no documentation that these agreements were reported to SACSCOC as Substantive Changes.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed agreements pertaining to the institution's participation in three collaborative academic arrangements (eCore; WebBSIT; and the Dual Degree Engineering Program) and reviewed documentation pertaining to the notification to and acknowledgement from the Commission on Colleges about the arrangements in support of its evidence for compliance. The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee finds evidence that the institution has reported to the Commission all collaborative academic arrangements.

***3.13.3 "Complaint Procedures Against the Commission or Its Accredited Institutions"**

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

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

The institution complies with the Commission requirements on complaint procedures. They have well documented procedures in specific categories such as student conduct, academic progress appeals, ADA grievances, and sexual harassment. Moreover, the

institution provides an avenue through which students may file a general student complaint that may not fit into one of the more specific categories. The institution provided a record log showing general complaints and referrals.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee found that the institution has documented procedures in specific categories such as student conduct, academic progress appeals, ADA grievances, and sexual harassment. Moreover, the institution provides an avenue through which students may file a general student complaint that may not fit into one of the more specific categories. The institution provided a record log showing general complaints and referrals. The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee examined the log provided by the institution in support of the institution's case for compliance and affirms the findings of the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee.

***3.13.4 "Reaffirmation of Accreditation and Subsequent Reports"**

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

The institution offers a limited number of distance programs, therefore oversight of distance programs resided primarily with the academic disciplines and distance education is not specifically addressed in the institution's mission. The institution ensures that distance programs comply with the Principles of Accreditation. The institution confirms that distance programs are comparable in quality and student outcomes to campus-based programs through institutional effectiveness and assessment processes. The institution provides technology, training, and faculty development that support distance education, and appropriate support services for distance learning students. Adequate processes are in place to protect the privacy of student information and to confirm the identity of distance students.

The On-site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed the Focused Report and other institutional documentation provided by Clayton State University and affirms the findings of the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee.

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

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

Comment: Clayton State University is a component university of the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia (USG). The USG and its Board of Regents were created in 1931 within the Constitution of the State of Georgia. Component universities are expected to operate within five core characteristics set by the BOR. Each component has its own mission statement.

The BOR is responsible for developing policies for the components of the system and setting budgets. The System chancellor and the chief executive officers of the components within the system implement the BOR budget and policy decisions. Variations of institutional purposes make for the distinction of the campuses within the University System of Georgia. All state appropriations go to the BOR for reallocation to each component institution as the BOR directs. The BOR has the authority to hold, sell, and convey public property for the component campuses. The Board also accepts donations, grants, and transfers of land and buildings on behalf of the university system and components.

Supporting Documentation are as follows: BOR Bylaws; BOR web site; Constitution of the State of Georgia, Article VIII, Section IV, Paragraph 1(b); BOR Vision, Mission and Goals Statement; BOR Policy Manual; University System of Georgia Core Mission Statement; and BOR Organization Chart.

***3.13.5 “Separate Accreditation for Units of a Member Institution”**

***3.13.5.a. Applicable Policy Statement.** All branch campuses related to the parent campus through corporate or administrative control (1) include the name of the parent campus and make it clear that its accreditation is dependent on the continued accreditation of the parent campus and (2) are evaluated during reviews for institutions seeking candidacy, initial membership, or reaffirmation of accreditation. All other extended units under the accreditation of the parent campus are also evaluated during such reviews.

Documentation: For institutions with branch campuses: (1) the name of each branch campus must include the name of the parent campus—the SACSCOC accredited entity. The institution should provide evidence of this for each of its branch campuses. (2) The institution should incorporate the review of its branch campuses, as well as other extended units under the parent campus, into its comprehensive self-assessment and its determination of compliance with the standards, and indicate the procedure for doing so.

Clayton State University indicated this was not applicable because they do not have branch campuses. The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee concurs that this is not applicable.

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

Implementation: If, during its review of the institution, the Commission determines that an extended unit is sufficiently autonomous to the extent that the parent campus has little

or no control, the Commission will use this policy to recommend separate accreditation of the extended unit. **No response required by the institution.**

Clayton State University has no extended unit.

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

Clayton State University represents its accredited status accurately and in accordance with Commission requirements and federal policy. The institution provided copies of the Undergraduate and Graduate Catalogs that correctly showed its accredited status.

D. Assessment of Compliance with Section 4: Federal Requirements

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

The institution routinely reports on grades by major/course prefix, course completion rates, employer data, licensure, graduation, course completion rates, graduation rates, retention rates, degrees conferred, total enrollment, and credit hour production. The narrative and documentation do not provide clear information concerning the institution's threshold of achievement used to determine student achievement. They do provide comparison groups for the National Survey of Student Engagement, but it is not clear from the narrative that these groups are used as benchmarks for the institution.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee should look for evident of the institution's criteria and threshold of achievement used to determine student achievement.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed the Focused Report and support documentation. The Focused Report provided sufficient evident that Clayton State University has set criteria or benchmarks for student achievement in at least four areas: (1) course completion rates by establishing a target DFW rate by course prefix be less than or equal to 5%, (2) average retention and graduation rates from the regional universities as a benchmark, (3) benchmarks for the first-time NCLEX pass rate and Dental Hygiene pass rate at 90% and Teacher Education at 80%, and (4) the University uses the scores from either Selected Peers (2007), Georgia System Schools (2008, 2011) and Southeast Public Schools (2009, 2010) as the benchmark comparison groups for the NSSE survey. The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee finds the institution evaluates success with respect to student achievement consistent with its mission.

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

The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee examined the materials associated with the institutional curriculum. All existing academic programs are consistent with the mission

statement. The curricula as examined in the undergraduate and graduate handbooks are appropriate for the various degrees and certificates offered.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee examined the materials associated with the institutional curriculum and confirmed that all existing academic programs are consistent with the mission statement. The curricula as examined in the undergraduate and graduate catalogues are also appropriate for the various degrees and certificates offered. Based on the documentation, the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee affirms the findings of the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee

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

The institution through various pages on its website as well as the undergraduate and graduate catalogs makes available academic calendars and grading and refund policies.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee has determined that the institution makes all students aware of the grading and refund policies via various pages on its website as well as through printed copies of the undergraduate and graduate catalogues. Further, the university makes available academic calendars, grading and refund policies. Based on this review, the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee verifies and affirms the findings of the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee.

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

The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee examined the materials associated with program length and finds the institution in non-compliance with this standard. After examining the undergraduate catalog, the graduate catalog and other documentation, the committee finds the associate degrees to be in compliance. All bachelor's degrees are in compliance except the BA in Music (insufficient in upper division hours), BS in Legal Studies (insufficient in upper division major hours), and the BSPS in Paralegal Studies which did not list the upper division hours. These three are in non-compliance. There is one area of concern. At the Master's level 4 degrees exceed the Georgia Board of Regents maximum of 36 credit hours; therefore these 4 degrees are in non-compliance. Appropriate documentation of Board of Regents approval of these degrees exists, but the minutes of the Board meeting does not address the appropriate waiver in all cases. The footnote referencing system is very difficult to follow.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee examined the undergraduate catalog, the graduate catalog and other documentation and found the program length for all degrees to be appropriate including the BA in Music which requires a minimum of 39 hours of upper division hours and BS in Legal Studies 43 hours of upper division courses. The BSPS in Paralegal Studies program has been eliminated and is no longer offered as a major at the University. The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee was provided with a letter from the Georgia Board of Regents authorizing deactivation of this program. Based on this review, the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee verifies and confirms that the institution's program length is appropriate for each of its educational programs.

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

The institution has well documented procedures in specific categories such as student conduct, academic progress appeals, ADA grievances, and sexual harassment. The institution also identified ways in which appeals can be made for readmission to the school, parking issues, and FERPA, with the latter directing students how to appeal to the US DOE. Moreover, the institution provides an avenue through which students may file a general student complaint that may not fit into one of the more specific categories. The institution provided a record log showing general complaints and referrals. Logs are maintained by Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, and Assessment and Instruction.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed both the Focused Report as well as institutional data such as the Student Code of Conduct and Disciplinary Procedures and Financial Aid Appeal in support of the institution's case for compliance and affirms the findings of the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee.

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

The institution's recruitment materials accurately represent the institution's practices and policies. These materials include print advertisements, website information, brochures, and catalog information, although electronic information is the most widely used.

The institution maintains a checks and balance system to assure that the information provided to prospective students and parents is accurate. All publications listing majors, courses, and degree requirements for undergraduate programs undergo a thorough review by Academic Affairs and materials related to graduate programs are reviewed by the Graduate School, Division heads, department chairs, and directors who are responsible for information relating to their respective areas. They also collaborate with Marketing and Communications to ensure all publications are accurate, consistent in tone and image, and contain required design elements.

The On-Site Reaffirmation committee reviewed the Focused Report as well as institutional data such as High School Check List, and Fast Facts for High School and Transfer Students in support of the institution's case for compliance and affirms the findings of the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee.

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

The U. S. Department of Education's Eligibility and Certification Approval Report authorizes the institution to participate in Title IV financial aid programs. The U. S. Department of Education's Program Participation Agreement indicates which federal

programs the institution is eligible to participate in. Notification by letter was sent to the Clayton State University President dated November 11, 2010 indicating that the University did meet the minimum requirements of institutional eligibility from the U. S. Department of Education. The institution has demonstrated that it is in good standing with the U. S. Department of Education. The Institution is certified to participate in Title IV, HEA programs until December 31, 2015.

The state-wide audits did not indicate any financial aid findings for this institution for the years 2009-2012.

Supporting documentation are as follows: PPA Recertification Approval Letter; Updated PPA Approval Notice; FISAP 2011-2012/2013-2014; FY09 Final Report-State Scholarship and Grant Program.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed documents such as Program Participation Agreements (PPA), PPA Recertification Approval Letter, PPA approval notice, Fiscal Operation Report and Application to Participate (FISAP) 2011-12/2013-14, and Single Audit Reports for 2009 through 2012, and conducted interviews with the Vice President for Business and Operations, and the Director of Financial Aid in support of the institution's case for compliance and affirms the findings of the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee.

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

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

The institution uses multiple methods to insure student identity accurately. Methods include the use of unique student IDs and passwords, which must be changed regularly, and required proctored exams. Additionally, the institution uses teaching tools such as video chats to help ensure identity.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed the Distance Education Policies and Procedures and interviewed the Associate Vice President for Extended Programs in support of the institution's case for compliance and affirms the finding of the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee.

***4.8.2** the institution has a written procedure for protecting the privacy of student enrolled in distance and correspondence education courses or programs.

The institution clearly articulates its policies with regard to protecting the privacy of students. FERPA is protected and exceptions to it are outlined for students. In cases where student identity may be revealed as a result of a pedagogical approach (on-line chat rooms), faculty are directed to inform students based on guidance provided on the Distance Learning website and the Distance Education Policies and Procedures Guide.

The On-site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed the Focused Report and other institutional documentation and affirms the findings of the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee.

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

The Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee examined the materials associated with distance education identity, privacy, and cost and finds the institution in compliance with this standard. The university has policies and procedures related to identity in on-line courses. With regard to identity (4.8.1) and privacy (4.8.2) and cost notification (4.8.3) the institution is in compliance. There are currently no specific charges associated with identity verification at the institution.

The institution does not currently have additional fees associated with the verification of student identity for distance education students. However, it does have a policy requiring the Bursar to notify students if fees are established.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed documents such as the policy related to identity in online courses, and conducted an interview with the Vice President for Business and Operations in support of the institution's case for compliance and affirms the findings of the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee.

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

The institution follows the stipulations of the board of Regents of the university System of GA in defining and determining one or more credit hours. There is also evidence of conversion of hours and units to credit hours where necessary. Policies to this effect are well documented. The Calibration of learning is supported by charts which unambiguously represent the varying degrees of clock (minutes) usage in class scheduling to ensure the integrity of the credit hour. Several tables point to specific content practices with respect to determining credits that are consistent with standard practices of academia.

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee reviewed the Georgia Board of Regents Policy Manual, Section 3.4.1, the Clayton State University Credit Hour Policy, and the Clayton State University Guidelines to Designating a Course a Fully Online (F), Partially Online (P) and Hybrid (H) for Banner Coding as well as examples of class schedules, and interviewed the Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs in support of the institution's case for compliance and affirms the findings of the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee.

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

The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee wishes to express a sincere gratitude to the president and the entire faculty, staff, and students of Clayton State University for their hospitality and the warm reception extended to the committee during the visit.

Part III. Assessment of the Quality Enhancement Plan

Assessment of the Quality Enhancement Plan: Clayton State University

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

Clayton State University's Quality Enhancement Plan (Partnering Academics and Community Engagement) focuses on student engagement through course-based community projects and activities that are designed to enhance learning for students and positively influence their community partners. The QEP is based on a solid foundation of internal self-study and a robust body of external literature from the fields of higher education student engagement (Kuh, 2008) and community-engaged approaches (Bringle & Hatcher, 2009; Conway, Amel, & Gerwien, 2009; Ash & Clayton, 2004). The greater intention of the QEP is to cultivate an "environment of engaged, experience-based learning, enriched by active community service, that prepares students of diverse ages and backgrounds to succeed in their lives and careers". At the core of QEP is a pedagogy that focuses on "intentional efforts within courses to engage students in planned and purposeful learning related to service experiences within the community to impact student learning outcomes including critical thinking, problem solving, and communication". It is important to note that this pedagogy can fundamentally shift the way a majority of Clayton State university courses are facilitated and taught; therefore, widespread adoption and support is imperative. This approach to teaching and learning will align with three primary goals addressed in the new Strategic Plan:

1. Create an outstanding educational experience that stimulates intellectual curiosity, critical thinking, and innovation.
2. Engender a spirit of openness, understanding, collaboration, and mutual respect throughout the University.
3. Foster learning that engages students, faculty, staff, alumni, and the greater community.

The QEP seems to align the curriculum-based processes of teaching, learning, and serving with the needs and issues of Clayton State University's community (both local and global). If organized, planned, and supported appropriately, the QEP may serve as a road map and compass for guiding the institution on a pathway to higher retention and graduation rates, increase stimulation of intellectual curiosity, critical thinking, and innovation, and develop stronger influential community relationships.

B. Analysis of the Acceptability of the Quality Enhancement Plan

B1. *Institutional Process*. The institution uses an institutional process for identifying key issues emerging from institutional assessment.

The entire QEP document seems to be underpinned by an institutional-wide process that clearly demonstrates wide-acceptance of the community engagement focus. Meaning, from the nascent stages of establishing Clayton State University's new Strategic Plan in fall 2011, to the preliminary steps into the QEP preparation with the steering committee, and from the thorough self-study that illuminated the key focus of QEP (e.g., "... what was agreed upon was the potential for community engagement/service-partnerships for supporting students' learning, and the necessity for attention to flexibility, coordination, and partnerships both across campus and between the campus and community"), to the well-developed 5-year implementation plan, Clayton State University's QEP has been built on a foundation operationalized

by a robust process that has identified the key issues emerging from institutional assessment mechanisms.

The QEP committee started their process by identifying five potential themes based on analysis of the Clayton State University's Strategic Plan, Complete College Georgia, High Impact Practices, Faculty Survey of Student Engagement and National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) information. The institution received 410 responses from Clayton State University administrators, faculty, staff, undergraduate students and graduate students on a survey designed to rank the five potential themes. With this being noted, it is important to recognize the relatively small sample size (n=410 of over 10,000 students, faculty, and staff included in the population) that actually seemed to serve as a primary data source for determining the theme that serves as the heart of the QEP – Community Engagement/Service-Learning. Survey results indicated community engagement/service-learning ranked the highest for improving students' learning which supports the Clayton State University's mission and the Strategic Plan goal to foster learning that engages students, faculty, staff, alumni and the greater community.

Granted, the clearly identifiable discussions of this benchmark from the perspectives of all stakeholders (including faculty, staff, and students, **but did not seem to include any data collected from community partners or members**) further supports the direction of the QEP. The support garnered from a thorough and transparent process is clear in the document. The On-Site Review Committee met with community representatives and determined their awareness of and participation in Clayton State University's efforts to be sufficient.

B2. Focus of the Plan. The institution identifies a significant issue(s) related to student learning and justifies its use for the QEP.

Clayton State University identified key issues that emerged from its institutional assessment and have developed their QEP based on the University's mission, analysis of the Strategic Plan, the student success data (i.e. retention rates, graduation rates, etc.), Complete College Georgia Initiative, High Impact Practices, and the results of the NSSE administrations. QEP is a concerted initiative designed to engage students in "planned and purposeful learning related to service experiences within the community to affect student-learning outcomes including critical thinking, problem solving, and communication".

The primary focus of the QEP is student engagement through community projects that enhance learning. The plan proposes to have faculty operationalize service learning/community engagement pedagogy into current courses. To accomplish this, a workshop series (the Community Engagement Academy) was designed to develop and prepare selected faculty in community engagement pedagogy. Based on the QEP Steering Committee's research suggesting that inclusion of service-learning is more effective when introduced early in the curriculum, several faculty teaching the University Foundations course (Clayton State University 1022) were selected for the Community Engagement Academy, which entailed four sessions focused on the following elements of community engagement in the classroom:

1. Pedagogy (Designing for Community Engagement)
2. Pedagogy (Designing and Assessing Service-Learning)
3. Building Partnerships (Defining Service-Learning)
4. Building Partnerships (Preparing Projects)

B3. Institutional Capability for the Initiation and Continuation of the Plan. The institution provides evidence that it has sufficient resources to implement, sustain, and complete the QEP.

As noted in the description of the QEP, this approach to teaching and learning can fundamentally shift the way courses are taught. While Clayton State University faculty currently report high levels of perceived "importance" associated with community engagement and service-learning as a pedagogy (52% of lower division and 78% of upper division), the use and potential of this approach is relatively untapped in application (10% of lower division and 20% of upper division).

Granted, there are a few examples of community engagement and service-learning being used in courses within certain departments/programs (Social Science: SOSC; Education: EDUC; Language Arts: LART). These areas report at least 46% of their courses having a moderate level (>25%) of community engagement included in the coursework. These "moderately to highly" engaged departments/programs will be very important in the goal of increasing the quantity and quality of community engagement and service-learning courses being offered.

On the co-curricular side, the Campus Life and Student Activities Center Office will also serve as an essential resource for helping faculty understand the practical aspects of setting up long-term/sustainable partnerships with the community and many of the other logistical issues that this approach to teaching and learning brings with it (e.g., renting vans, marketing, liability issues, reflection methods, project management and evaluation, student development outcomes, etc.).

One area of concern identified by the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee focuses on the budget. The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee invites the institution to examine the resources dedicated to ensure successful implementation of the QEP.

B4. Broad Based Involvement of the Community. The institution demonstrates that all aspects of its community were involved in the development of the Plan.

The QEP indicates the plan was developed through a process involving university stakeholder groups representing a broad perspective.

The QEP Steering Committee established the Literature Review Subcommittee, the Program Development Subcommittee, the Assessment Subcommittee, the Pilot Subcommittee, and the QEP Executive Committee to develop QEP-related tasks. Committee membership consisted of faculty, staff, student, and administrator members from various units of the Clayton State University campus-community who volunteered or were selected in order to ensure all areas of the university were represented.

The QEP Steering Committee Chair held discussions with academic and non-academic campus departments, student groups and the Faculty Senate to gather additional input for the QEP Committee to consider in its final decision to focus on student engagement through community projects that enhance learning. Additional input about the inclusion of community engagement within courses was gathered via a faculty survey. The student body was surveyed regarding scheduling and access to community locations. In addition, Clayton State University conducted a Community Engagement Academy as a pilot study with students and four faculty members to test the impact of community engagement.

Clayton State University broadened the base of participants when it solicited input for the title and brand for the QEP and received over 900 responses from representatives of the campus-community, alumni, and Foundation Board of Trustees. Still, there was no sign of community partner engagement with the overall selection, development, or testing of the QEP.

Three groups will be involved with organization, implementation, and collection of data on QEP activities:
1) The QEP Implementation Committee comprised of the QEP Director, Associate Vice President for

Academic Affairs, QEP Director, faculty representatives, representatives from Student Affairs and Student Government Association; 2) the Data Committee comprised of representatives from each academic college, the Division of Student Affairs, Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness, the Division of Academic Affairs and other areas; and 3) the Advisory Board will include the QEP Director, members from each academic college; the Division of Student Affairs, the Provost's Office, the student body and community members. The QEP clearly outlines Personnel Roles and Responsibilities for the Clayton State University President, Vice Presidents, Deans, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, QEP Director, Dean for Assessment and Instructional Development, Office of Institutional Research, QEP Implementation Committee, Data Committee and Advisory Board. In addition, a marketing and communication plan/newsletter will also serve to keep the campus community informed about QEP activities and student and faculty successes in community engagement.

There was a reasonable effort on the part of the QEP Steering and Assessment Committee to include a number of perspectives with regard to selected the QEP focus area, goals, program and learning outcomes, and action plan.

Finally, one area or stakeholder group that is imperative to include is the community partners potentially associated with the QEP. While the QEP document did not include perspectives of local community partners, the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee met with community representatives and determined their awareness of and participation in Clayton State University efforts to be sufficient.

B5. Assessment of the Plan. The institution demonstrates that it has the means for determining the success of its QEP.

PACE focuses on student engagement through community projects that enhance learning. The QEP focuses on three (3) program outcomes and four (4) student-learning outcomes.

Program Outcomes:

1. Students' successful course completion rates will increase in PACE courses.
2. Instructors will increase their use of community-engagement pedagogy.
3. Student engagement with course material and the community will increase.

Student Learning Outcomes:

1. Students will be able to communicate effectively.
2. Students will be able to think critically.
3. Students will be able to work in teams or individually to solve community-related problems or issues.
4. Students will be able to apply course content to community issues/problems.

The PACE assessment will include "...multiple assessments such as the ETS Proficiency Profile, the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), course-embedded assessments, and measures of student perceptions of community service, as well as additional tracking of both student and faculty academic community engagement activities will be utilized during the project to gauge achievement of both student and program outcomes and to guide project development". Beyond these measurement mechanisms, the assessment plan includes the followings: course completion rates; Community Engagement Academy, Faculty Survey of Student Engagement, Faculty annual reviews, and other metrics.

The Strategic Plan, Complete College Georgia Initiative, and High Impact Practices were the focus of the analysis to identify general themes that could serve as starting points for eventual topic selection by the university community. Additionally, data from recent administrations of the NSSE were analyzed by

highlighting response data that was related to areas of the Strategic Plan. These data sources were evident components of the process for determining the QEP's direction.

C. Analysis and Comments for Strengthening the QEP

The On-Site Review Committee learned that the purpose of the QEP is not to create a "culture of community engagement." It seems as if that culture already exists on campus. The QEP director and steering committee have the task of organizing and structuring that culture to include the programs and mechanisms necessary to implement the QEP. In this section a review of strengths and considerations will be presented.

Beyond the highlighted strengths that have been listed to address each of the previous areas, additional mentioning of the following strengths is necessary:

- **Community Engagement Academy** – Having this initiative developed and piloted serves as core strength of the QEP. The scalability of faculty engagement (from four sections of one course to many sections of many different courses across the disciplines) is essential to the QEP's success. Faculty must have a common understanding of what Community Engagement is and how it (in its many approaches/forms) can be used in the classroom.
- **Campus Life/Student Activities Center** – The Campus Life/Student Activities Center has an established foundation of community engaged work with a range of partners in the Morrow and greater-Atlanta community. Moreover, the student response to the opportunities provided by this unit on campus was resoundingly positive and demonstrated a clear effort from the professional staff on connecting service experiences with learning outcomes.
- **PACE Inventory Process** – This can be a real strength in determining where CLAYTON STATE UNIVERSITY currently is with regard to community engagement and established partnerships. Determine where you are before moving too fast and far ahead. This will serve the story of community engagement at Clayton State University well.
- **Buy-In** – This particular strength has been thoroughly addressed in the B1 and B4.

While the QEP is a strong, well-crafted document, there are a few considerations to address as the Director and steering committee move forward. They are as follows:

Budget Issues – The On-Site Reaffirmation Committee invites the institution to examine the resources dedicated to ensure successful implementation of the QEP.

- **Including Community Partners in the Process & Managing those Relationships** – Community representatives associated with partner organizations or important community-based issues must be formally included in the implementation of the QEP. Sustained relationships, needs assessments, and open communication must be evident. This can be handled in a range of practical ways (e.g., QEP Inaugural Awards Banquet; advisory committee that includes community representatives; evaluation instruments measuring components of the university to campus relationship). The AmeriCorps Program Coordinator currently maintains a number of community partnerships.

- **Institutional Research (assessment)** – With the adoption of the QEP and the integration of Digital Measures, an opportunity to streamline the data collection “system” associated with Clayton State University’s faculty community engagement profile (e.g., curricular, co-curricular, scholarly outputs/modes, partnership, internal/external grants, etc.) can be simplified.
- **Institutional Review Board** – While this may seem to be an ancillary issue, considering Clayton State University’s focus (QEP), it is important to have systems in place that can support the scholarship on community engagement (e.g., SoTL as the influence of community engagement on retention) and community-engaged scholarship (e.g., erosion of rivers in the community). With appropriate IRB processes in place, the highest quality of work done at the undergraduate level can potentially be published.
- **Current Assessment Schedule** - Continually evaluate the PACE assessment schedule.

Part IV. Third-Party Comments

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

The Committee should check one of the following:

No Third-Party Comments submitted.

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

APPENDIX A

Roster of the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee	Roster of the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee
<p>Dr. Duane J. Rosa -- CHAIR Professor of Economics West Texas A&M University Canyon, TX</p>	<p>Dr. Johnson O. Akinleye - Chair Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs North Carolina Central University Durham, NC</p>
<p>Mr. Wayne B. Beran * Vice President for Administration and Finance University of Houston - Victoria Victoria, TX</p>	<p>Mr. Kevin E. Appleton Vice President for Finance and Business Affairs Southern University and A&M College System Baton Rouge, LA</p>
<p>Dr. Rex F. Gandy Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs Texas A&M University-Kingsville Kingsville, TX</p>	<p>Dr. Jeanne M. Daboval Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs McNeese State University Lake Charles, LA</p>
<p>Dr. Kevin M. Hughes Dean of Students Christopher Newport University Newport News, VA</p>	<p>Dr. G. Pamela Burch-Sims Dir. of IE & Research, Title III Tennessee State University Nashville, TN</p>
<p>Dr. Larry J. King Director of Student Learning/Institutional Assessment Stephen F. Austin State University Nacogdoches, TX</p>	<p>Dr. David A. DeCenzo President Coastal Carolina University Conway, SC</p>
<p>Mr. Chinedu G. Okala Professor and Chairman, Department of Fine Arts Norfolk State University Norfolk, VA</p>	<p>Dr. Charles A. Love Former Dean, School of Education Charlotte, NC</p>
<p>Dr. Farzaneh Razzaghi Dean of the University Library The University of Texas - Pan American Edinburg, TX</p>	<p><u>Lead QEP</u> Dr. Lane Perry Director, Center for Service Learning Western Carolina University Cullowhee, NC</p>
<p>Dr. Anita S. Tesh Associate Dean/Director of Undergraduate Education University of North Carolina - Greensboro Greensboro, NC</p>	<p>Dr. Cecilia Anaya - Observer Academic Vice President Universidad de las Américas Puebla San Andrés Cholula, Puebla México</p>
<p>Dr. Philip Williams President McNeese State University Lake Charles, LA</p>	<p><u>STAFF REPRESENTATIVE</u> Nuria M. Cuevas, Ph.D. Vice President Commission on Colleges Decatur, GA</p>
<p><u>SACSCOC Staff Coordinator</u> Dr. Nuria M. Cuevas Vice President SACS Commission on Colleges Decatur, GA</p>	

APPENDIX B

Off-Campus Sites or Distance Learning Programs Reviewed

Institution: Clayton State University

Off-Campus Location (name, street, city, state, zip code): Fayette Instructional Site

100 World Drive, Peachtree City, GA 30269

Date Off-Campus Site Established: 2007

Number of students enrolled: 404 unduplicated head count
(unduplicated headcount or FTE and quarter/semester or academic year data represents)

List of all educational programs offered at the site*:

The Fayette Instructional Site provides general education core curriculum courses for dual-enrollment high school students, which represent the majority of students utilizing this instructional site. The site is approved to offer several degree programs. The Site is approved to offer Bachelor's degrees, two are online degrees and two have not met the threshold of student demand to offer the upper division courses. The Bachelor's degrees in Integrative Studies and Administrator Technology Management are offered online, but student may take courses at the Fayette site, if the student numbers meet the predetermined threshold for demand. The other degrees (BS Psychology and Human Service and BBA General Business) are approved for some upper division courses to be offered at Fayette; however, the student demand has not been met. The MBA degree is available in a cohort format, however, the most current cohort completed in spring 2012 and a new cohort has not been implemented to-date.

Report Narrative Notes

Overview Paragraph:

Fayette Institutional Site is located at 100 World Drive, Peachtree City, GA and is approximately 40 miles from Clayton State University. The instruction at Fayette Instructional Site is delivered traditional, online, and hybrid. Courses offered during AY 2013-2014 include: General Education Core curriculum courses (i.e. English, History, Astronomy, and Freshman Orientation).

Narrative:

Qualified faculty, employed by Clayton State University, provide instruction on the main campus or at the Fayette Institutional site. Teaching at this site is a part of a regular Faculty workload. For example, the one English faculty member's contract stipulated he would teach sections of the same course on the main campus and the Fayette Instructional Site. Faculty utilize the same syllabi, text books, instructional materials and methodology at both sites. The numbers of sections of core courses at Fayette and faculty needs are driven by student demand. (CR 2.8, CS 3.5.3, CS 3.7.1, CS 3.7.2)

The administration staff is adequate to operate the site. The full-time staff consists of the Director and Student Counselor (Academic Advisor). The AVP for Extended Education also maintains an office on site. (CS 3.2.8, CS 3.2.10, CS 3.4.11, CS 3.9.3)

The 10,500 square foot facility houses five (5) technology enhanced classrooms, seven (7) faculty/staff offices, a testing facility (assessment center), conference room and student lounge area. The facilities are more than adequate, with room for expansion. Parking availability is also more than adequate for the number of students, faculty and staff utilizing the facility. (CS 3.11.1, CS 3.11.2, CS 3.11.3).

Library resources are available to students on the main campus, via an intra-library loan system, a courier book delivery service from the main camp library and via the internet. The library personnel provide orientation within the Freshman Orientation course Clayton State University 1022. CR 2.9, CS 3.8.1, CS 3.8.2, CS 3.8.3)

Technology resources for the Fayette Instructional site are adequate. IT personnel support the site weekly. The IT framework is sufficient to support the classroom technology (i.e. projectors, Wi-Fi, interactive classroom connectivity, etc.) and programmatic essentials. The Wi-Fi allows students, faculty and staff full access to the University's IT infrastructure (i.e. D2L, GA view, Clayton State University network, etc.) (CS 3.4.12)

The budget is adequate to operate the facility. (CR 2.11.1)

Some Student support services are available weekly, others on-demand. All procedures and policies regarding complaints are addressed as indicated in the Student handbook and other appropriate University documents. (CR 2.10, CS 3.4.9, CS 3.13.3, FR 4.3, FR 4.5)

The institutional effectiveness of this instructional site is inextricably linked to all IE at Clayton State University. The site does not have a distinctive set of outcomes, therefore the general education core curriculum outcomes are reported in an aggregate manner, not by instructional site. (CS 3.3.1, CS 3.5.1, FR 4.1)

Currently, there is only one program entirely offered at the Fayette Instructional Site. The MBA courses are delivered as weekend and/or 5 day intensive courses. The curriculum implemented as a cohort format, occurs appropriate every two years, based on demand. The most recent cohort was completed in spring 2012. Although the Site is approved to offer two Bachelor's degrees, two are online degrees and two have not met the threshold of student demand to offer the upper division courses (CR 2.7.1, CS 3.4.6, FR 4.4, FR 4.9)

APPENDIX C

List of Recommendations Cited in the Report of the Reaffirmation Committee

The Committee made no recommendations.