

USGFC Meeting Minutes – April 20th, 2013

- I. Meeting was called to order by Doug Moodie at 10:05am
- II. Introductions – all present introduced themselves and indicated which institution they represent
- III. Meeting minutes from October 27th, 2012 meeting were presented for approval – meeting minutes were unanimously approved (moved by David Hunter and seconded by Wendy Turner)
- IV. Discussion of motion by Meg Dillon related to use of student success rates as a measure of teaching effectiveness. Discussion ensued on this topic and items discussed included: Should student success rates be a part of a faculty member's review? How does this impact SACS accreditation? How does the push for increased completion rates relate to this? Is DFW rate an effective measure of teaching effectiveness? Should this be up to individual campuses? How does this relate to use and evaluation of adjuncts? More discussion of this topic continued in break-out sessions during lunch and a resolution was presented and approved. The resolutions are included at the end of the minutes.
- V. Skype call with Dr. Houston Davis – Executive Vice Chancellor for the USG
 - A. Dr. Davis presented the major topic areas that the USG is focusing on at the current time
 1. Complete College Georgia (CCG) – Dr. Davis reported that CCG continues to be a major focus of the USG and that each institution has submitted their plans and are in the process of implementing the plans. This will be a major factor in the support and evaluation of each institution. How can each institution and the USG as a whole reach more individuals and get these individuals some type of credential?
 2. Academic excellence – The system is focused on academic excellence. How can each institution be unique in their academic programming while maintaining academic excellence? Academic program livelihood needs to be a focus for each institution and we need to be careful with overlapping of programs so as not to put the livelihood of programs in jeopardy.
 3. Relationship of research functions and instructional delivery models – Where does each institution and each level of institution (research, regional, etc.) needs to have their focus? There should be some research/service focus on regional economic development so how can campuses be involved? How does this relate to new delivery models of instruction (online, mixed models, MOOCs, etc.)?
 4. Innovations – How can institutions utilize resources for innovative purposes? Are there ways institutions can use this to increase visibility, funding, etc. and how does this relate to institutional focus/function?

All of these will have implications for funding, approval of academic programming, building opportunities, etc.

B. Dr. Davis then opened up the floor for questions from the group

Question 1 – What do you mean by institutional focus?

Answer – It could relate to program offerings, level of doctoral expansion, level of graduate/master's offerings, mix of undergraduate and graduate programs, affordability of

programs, more selective enrollments for certain levels of institutions, etc. Each institution needs to have some discussion with regard to their focus.

Question 2 – There is some concern over increased access with regard to whether students are ready to be there and can be successful. There is a shock to many students transferring from one level of institution to another – How do we deal with this without lowering expectations?

Answer – We have to do a better job of working together with all types of institutions (technical colleges, different levels of universities) so the students are more prepared to succeed, again we need to look at whether different delivery models can reach more students, reaching out to students who are not succeeding, etc.

Question 3 – What is the latest on consolidations? Are there more planned, etc.?

Answer – The current consolidations have been viewed as a success. There has been a cost savings to these institutions that can be allocated for other purposes. There are no more being discussed at the current time but more are possible in the future depending on a variety of factors.

Question 4 – Program duplication – What is the latest on institutions adding programs that overlap/duplicate existing programs at other institutions?

Answer – It depends on need but we need to be careful to not impact successful programs. If there is significant justification it should be viewed favorably.

Question 5 – First, thanks for the efforts to keep weapons off campus. What is the latest on the new funding formula for institutions?

Answer – We are moving from a formula of just counting enrollment to counting productive enrollment – examples: how many students are completing degrees or getting certificates, etc., how many are getting to 30 hours, 60 hours, etc., CCG will be a factor. Please have these conversations with the USG and Chancellor, not the Legislature – let the Chancellor and USG deal with the Legislature.

Question 6 – If that is going to be the funding formula, does that lead to problems with grade inflation?

Answer – The faculty have to be the gatekeepers. You must not lower expectations but there are ways to engage students and help them succeed without lowering expectations. Nobody is asking faculty to lower expectations or inflate grades.

Question 7 – Issues typically come from the USGFC to the Vice Chancellor/Chancellor/USG – What do you want from us/what issues do you have for us?

Answer – Messaging on CCG – this can be a very good thing for GA but we need faculty helping with this initiative and have a positive attitude. We would like the USGFC to be more involved with academic programming, discussion of MOOCs and other delivery models, what are our ideas on how to increase completion rates.

Question 8 – There has been talk about an expansion of the BOR – can you comment on this?

Answer – There is no expansion at the current time.

VI. Break-out groups for lunch discussion – There were three break-out groups for lunch – group 1 – discussion of evaluating effectiveness of teaching and service, group 2 – discussion about the

push to allow weapons on campus, group 3 – discussion of the positives and negatives of consolidations.

VII. Where does the USGFC go from here?

- a. Suggestion that we ask the Chancellor to attend a meeting in the fall so we can continue to engage him in discussions related to faculty issues.
- b. We need two meetings per semester – conclusion was to have one meeting per semester on a campus site and on per semester at the system office so the Chancellor and Executive Vice Chancellor can attend.
- c. Allow a conference call/skype/etc. option for those who cannot attend in person.
- d. Take resolutions/discussion points back to Senate bodies at each institution for discussion so that a broader field of view can be brought back for discussion in USGFC.
- e. Possibility of a joint USGFC and Provosts meeting next year.
- f. Sally Robertson was elected chair-elect for next year.

VIII. Resolutions

a. Resolutions related to weapons on campus:

1. The USGFC supports the current law pertaining to weapons at USG institutions (**O.C.G.A. § 16-11-127.1**).
2. The USGFC requests that the Chancellor ensures adequate resources are provided to USG institutions to address campus safety. This includes but is not limited to door locks, security personnel, training, lighting, counseling, communication, phones in classrooms, etc.
3. The USGFC is willing to assist in future deliberation on the issue of campus safety.
4. The USGFC suggests that all faculty communicate with their local legislators to express their opinions as private citizens on the issue of campus safety. Refrain from using school email accounts, phones, and other college resources so as to avoid any conflict of interest concerns.
5. Homework - Encourage discussion by your home institution's faculty governance body and its general faculty.

b. Resolution related to student success rates as a measure of teaching effectiveness

1. The USGFC discourages the use of "student success rates" as a primary measure of teaching effectiveness in evaluating individual instructors, courses, and departments in the USG. In the current climate, the use of "student success rates" presents further pressure on instructors and institutions in the University System to lower standards to increase student graduation rate.

It is recommended that USG allow the USGFC to select a faculty task force to define teaching effectiveness. This USGFC task force will also develop metrics to evaluate teaching effectiveness.

IX. Meeting adjourned