



# 1990-92 SACS Self-Study Newsletter

James LeRoy Smith, Director

Emily S. Boyce, Assistant

Vol. 2 No. 3

March, 1991

**Report on Observing the University of Georgia SACS Visitation:** The twenty-five visiting committee members spent a very thorough four days on the University of Georgia campus February 18-22nd. Each of the visiting committee members conducted interviews each hour from 8AM-4PM each day. These interviews were scheduled by the committee members who were responsible for and had studied respective sections of the Georgia Self-Study Report. The committee met each day from 4-7PM to discuss the self-study sections in conjunction with their interview findings. Thus, over 500 separate interviews were conducted within the four-day period and every aspect of the self-study report was evaluated, corroborated, and discussed! As an observer, I accompanied different committee members on about twenty separate interviews and sat in on the twelve hours of committee discussion. I left the campus convinced that I knew more about the University of Georgia than I ever imagined I could learn in five days! Moreover, watching the visitation unfold and speaking with both the SACS liaison officer and the self-study director gave me dozens of insights about the logistics of the four-day visit. We have encouraged the SACS Commission on Colleges to continue and even broaden this opportunity for other self-study directors. We will of course apply the insights gained to our own work, as the next section of this newsletter indicates.

**Applications to East Carolina from the University of Georgia Visit:** These are some of the possible problem areas to which the visiting committee gave special attention at the University of Georgia:

- Each academic department must have a written statement of expected educational, research, and service results and written statements of methods of evaluating how well those results are being achieved. Additionally, each department must show that the results of these evaluations are used to improve educational, research, and service activities. These requirements are the same as those used for reporting on assessment to the General Administration.
- Support offices have a similar obligation to state their expected support results, methods for evaluating how well those results are being achieved, and use of results of those evaluations.
- Each university office must show how budget allocations are tied to planning efforts at that office level.
- Curriculum review across the University must be tied to the results discussed in the first point above.
- Each academic department must show that multiple means of evaluating instructional effectiveness are used.

**Requests to the Working Committees:** We ask that the working committees keep the points made in the above section in mind as they draft their reports. Also: (1) Please present for each criterion assigned to your committee or subcommittee a summary description, your committee's evaluations, and your recommendations (if any). You might combine them and/or add an executive summary if you wish, but the key is for the visiting committee (or any self-study report reader) to be able to find the discussion of each criterion. (2) Please give descriptive summaries, evaluations, and recommendations even where the information in the office self-study reports is sketchy or incomplete. Consult whatever other materials you deem relevant.