

SOUTHERN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGES AND SCHOOLS

COMMISSION ON COLLEGES

1866 Southern Lane • Decatur, Georgia 30033-4097

Telephone 404/679-4500 Fax 404/679-4558

www.sacscoc.org

May 13, 2002

Dr. William V. Muse
Chancellor
East Carolina University
Fifth Street
Greenville, NC 27858-4353

Dear Dr. Muse:

I want to thank you again for all of your hospitality and helpfulness during our recent committee visit to East Carolina University. A copy of the report prepared by the Accreditation Committee is enclosed. I hope that the report will be helpful to you and the institutional community. Brenda Killingsworth and the other folks who provided information and support did a wonderful job and we are grateful.

The report includes analysis by, and judgments of, the visiting committee and is subject to review by the Committee on Criteria and Reports for Institutions. Some parts of the report are directly related to the Criteria for Accreditation, while others may represent other comment or advice offered by the visiting committee in the spirit of helpfulness. A formal recommendation is included when a visiting committee believes there is some problem with full compliance with a part of the Criteria. Committees frequently offer the institution formal suggestions and other advice which are not related to the Criteria. All recommendations and suggestions included in a visiting committee report have been adopted by the total committee.

An institution may release its visiting committee report. If excerpts from the report are to be used in institutional publications or advertising, the wording and context of the usage must receive prior approval from the Executive Director of the commission on Colleges. Quotation in institutional publications of excerpts from the visiting committee report must also be accompanied by a note stating that a copy of the entire report can be obtained from the institution.

The Commission on Colleges and its Committees on Criteria and Reports meet officially in June and in December. Final decisions will be made at each meeting with public announcements regarding official actions continuing to be made at the Annual Meeting of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. The report of the committee which visited East Carolina University will be reviewed at the December 2002 meeting. For that meeting, you should prepare a written statement of your responses to the recommendations of the committee. The written statement of your responses should include a description of any progress made since the committee was on your campus. **Guidelines for the response are enclosed and it is essential that they be followed when developing your institutional response.**

Dr. William V. Muse
May 13, 2002
Page 2

Please send five copies of your written response to my attention at the office of the Commission on Colleges no later than August 27, 2002 for consideration at the December 2002 meeting of the Commission.

As you know, institutional responses are reviewed by the visiting committee chair prior to being submitted to the Committee on Criteria and Reports. The chair's comments and recommendations will be forwarded to the Criteria and Reports Committee along with the institution's response.

The Commission on Colleges endeavors to maintain a cooperative and constructive relationship with the college systems and officials of the various states. However, because of the institutional nature of the accreditation process, it is preferable that these committee reports be furnished to the state offices by the institution rather than directly by the Commission office. Therefore, you will also find enclosed a second copy of the report which is provided for you to send to your state systems office or agency if you so desire.

Please express my sincere appreciation to all members of your faculty and staff for their cooperation and assistance during the review process. As you begin to develop your responses to the visiting committee report, I hope that you will feel free to call upon me if I can provide any help or assistance.

Sincerely,

G. Jack Allen
Associate Executive Director
Commission on Colleges

GJA:ch

**THE PREPARATION OF
RESPONSES TO VISITING COMMITTEE REPORTS,
FOLLOW-UP REPORTS, AND PROGRESS REPORTS**

- Guidelines -

In preparing responses to visiting committee reports, and in preparing follow-up reports and progress reports, please keep in mind that the readers of the institution's case will be members of the Committee on Criteria and Reports of the Commission on Colleges. These readers will be assigned several institutions in addition to yours and, for that reason, it is crucial that the responses or reports that you submit be easy to access, clear, and well-documented. The following guidelines should be followed in providing these reports to the Commission.

Title Page.

- a. Name of institution
- b. Address of institution
- c. Dates of most recent committee visit
- d. Indicate the kind of report you are submitting (Examples: Response to the Report of the Reaffirmation Committee, Response to the Report of the Special Committee, First Follow-Up Report) and date of response
- e. Name and title of person(s) preparing the response

2. Responses to Visiting Committee Reports.

- a. If your institution is asked to respond to the recommendations contained in a visiting committee report, please structure the responses to the recommendations by dealing with them in the order they appear in the report (providing the number and title of the *Criteria* section in which they occur and the number of the recommendation). Ideally, tabs should separate the individual responses.
State the recommendation exactly as it appeared in the report. Immediately following each restated recommendation, describe the visiting committee's concerns which led to the recommendation. This may be done by accurately summarizing the concerns or by inserting verbatim the complete section or sub-section of the visiting committee report containing the recommendation. Inserting verbatim might make the response lengthy if there are many recommendations and, in the case of a response to a report of a reaffirmation committee, the Commission readers will have the entire report provided to them for background. The verbatim approach may be more appropriate for later Follow-Up and Progress reports because the readers are not provided the report of the reaffirmation committee. In some cases, several recommendations within a section may be closely-related and one response might appropriately be made to those related recommendations.
- b. Provide clear and complete, yet concise, responses to the recommendations. Include documentation requested and any other documentation appropriate to demonstrating fulfillment of the recommendation. Specify actions which have been taken and provide documentation that they have been completed. The readers are looking for documentation that actions have been completed and will ask for follow-up reports on any actions that have not been completed. Avoid vague responses indicating that the institution "plans" to address a problem in the

future, If any actions remain to be accomplished, the institution should present the following: (1) an action plan, (2) a schedule for accomplishing the plan; and (3) evidence of commitment of resources for accomplishing the plan. Substantive remediation and/or responsible planning accompanied by official commitments of resources are essential elements in securing favorable action.

Provide appropriate documentation to support the response. For example, if the response indicates that a faculty member has completed coursework toward completion of eighteen graduate semester hours in a particular field, include transcripts documenting courses completed. In presenting justification in lieu of formal academic preparation for faculty, state clearly the justification and provide documentation of experiences and/or contributions to the teaching discipline. Supporting documentation for other responses might include memoranda, minutes, or excerpts from handbooks. Ideally, for ease of reading the documentation should be provided along with the response rather than in a separate document or in appendices at the end of the response. The documentation should be clearly marked with tabs clearly indicating the recommendation and section of the *Criteria* being supported. When it is necessary to include another document to support a response, the document should be clearly labeled and easily referenced.

- d. Be direct, specific, concise, clear, and complete in your responses and do not reflect a defensive posture. The institution should communicate, through its responses, a desire to demonstrate that the institution is making an effort to comply with the criteria in question rather than a desire to “refute” the visiting committee’s evaluation and subsequent recommendation. Correct any errors of fact that may have persisted in committee reports or other Commission communications.

An institution may, but is not required to, respond to the suggestions in a visiting committee report.

3. Follow-up Reports, Progress Reports, and Special Reports

- a. The basic approach to developing these reports follows the format in 2 a.-d. above. In addition to responding again to certain recommendations contained in the previous visiting committee report (you restate the recommendations and background as in 2 a.), an institution may be asked to respond to a determination that the institution is not in compliance with, or has deficiencies in regard to, certain sections of the *Criteria* (recommendations may or may not be cited). In those cases, the institution should provide a report similar to that described in 2 above, including documentation of compliance with each of the listed sections (and further responses to any recommendations that are again cited).
- b. When a follow-up or progress report is required, the institution must remember that the readers will not have a copy of the previous visiting committee report as background. It is, therefore, very important to describe completely the concerns which led to the recommendations or what concerns led to the indication that the institution was not in compliance with, or had deficiencies in regard to, certain sections of the *Criteria* (see 2 a. above).
- c. For each recommendation cited (if any), provide a brief but complete summary of the “history” of responses to the recommendation, to include (1) the original

concerns of the visiting committee which led to the recommendation (the section of the original visiting committee report may be inserted after the recommendation, as is suggested in 2 above) and (2) the institution's previous response(s) and an explanation of the need for additional follow-up or progress report(s).

If there are no recommendations cited for further action, summarize any concerns expressed in the action letter to the institution or concerns expressed in previous visiting committee reports which relate to the sections of the *Criteria* cited as being deficient or as being in non-compliance.

4. Binding Responses and Reports

If your institution's response or report requires binding beyond stapling, please **do not submit your report** in a three-ring binder. The expense of sending your material to Commission readers and for Commission storage is prohibitive.

Approved: July 1996

REAFFIRMATION COMMITTEE REPORT

for

East Carolina University

Prepared by the Visiting Committee

March 2002

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

REPORT OF THE REAFFIRMATION COMMITTEE
East Carolina University
Greenville, NC
March 24-27, 2002

Dr. Laura F. Lindsay, Chair COC Team
Manship School of Mass Communication
Louisiana State University
Baton Rouge, LA

Dr. James E. Barcus, Professor
Dept. of English
Baylor University
Waco, TX

Dr. Frank R. Baskind, Dean
School of Social Work
Virginia Commonwealth University
Richmond, VA

Dr. Robert G. Boebmer, Associate Provost
Institutional Effectiveness
University of Georgia
Athens, GA

Dr. Tom R. Bohannon, Asst. Vice President
Information Management & Testing
Services
Baylor University
Waco, TX

Ms. Jennifer S. Cargill, Dean
LSU Libraries
Louisiana State University,
Baton Rouge, LA

Dr. Darcy Hardy, Asst. Vice Chancellor for
Academic Affairs and Director, UT
Telecampus

The University of Texas System
Austin, TX
Dr. Linda Hodges, Dean
UAMS College of Nursing
University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences
Little Rock, AR

Dr. Norma MacRae, Vice Provost for Public
Services and Dean, Continuing Studies
East Tennessee State University
Johnson City, TN

Dr. Tennant S. McWilliams, Dean
School of Social and Behavioral Sciences
University of Alabama at Birmingham
Birmingham, AL

Ms. Brenda D. Melobn, Associate Vice
Chancellor for Administrative Affairs
University of Mississippi Medical Center
Jackson, MS

Dr. Gloria W. Raines, Vice Chancellor for
Student Affairs
Louisiana State University in Shreveport
Shreveport, LA

Dr. Hal Irvin, Executive Director
of Organizational Development
Georgia Institute of Technology
Atlanta, GA

Dr. William E. Lewis, Vice Provost
for Information Technology
Arizona State University
Tempe, AZ

Dr. Roderick J. McDavis, Provost
Vice President for Academic Affairs
Commonwealth University
Richmond, VA

Dr. Teresa Thompson, Director of
Admissions
Georgia Southern University
Statesboro, GA

Dr. Jon F. Wergin, Professor
Department of Educational Studies
School of Education
Richmond, VA

Dr. J. Bernard Machen, Chair NCAA Peer
Review Team and President
University of Utah
Salt Lake City, Utah

Dr. G. Jack Allen, Asst. Exec. Director
Commission on Colleges
1866 Southern Lane
Decatur, GA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction		1
Section I.	Principles and Philosophy of Accreditation	4
	1.1 Institutional Commitment and Responsibilities	7
	1.2 Application of the <i>Criteria</i>	7
	1.3 Separately Accredited Units	7
	1.4 Conditions of Eligibility	7
	1.5 Initial Membership	7
	1.6 Representation of Status	7
Section II	Institutional Purpose	8
Section III	Institutional Effectiveness	8
	3.1 Planning and Evaluation: Educational Programs	8
	3.2 Planning and Evaluation: Administrative and Educational Support Services	9
	3.3 Institutional Research	9
Section IV	Educational Programs	9
	4.1 General Requirements of the Educational Program	9
	4.2 Undergraduate Program	10
	4.3 Graduate Program	11
	4.4 Publications	12
	4.5 Distance Learning Programs	12
	4.6 Continuing Education, Outreach and Service Program	13
	4.7 Student Records	13
	4.8 Faculty	14
	4.9 Consortial Relationships and Contractual Agreements	17

Academic Area Reports	18
Section V Educational Support Services	24
5.1 Library and Other Learning Resources	24
5.2 Instructional Support	26
5.3 Information Technology Resources and Systems	27
5.4 Student Development Services	27
5.5 Intercollegiate Athletics	29
Section VI Administrative Processes	32
6.1 Organization and Administration	32
6.2 Institutional Advancement	35
6.3 Financial Resources	36
6.4 Physical Resources	38
6.5 Externally Funded Grants and Contracts	38
6.6 Related Corporate Entities	38
Commendations	39
Recommendations	39
Suggestions	40

CONSULTANTS REPORT

REPORT OF THE REAFFIRMATION COMMITTEE

EAST CAROLINA UNIVERSITY

INTRODUCTION

From March 25-27, 2002, a Reaffirmation Committee from the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (COC) visited East Carolina University (ECU). The Reaffirmation Committee received a courteous and friendly welcome to the University and the Greenville community. The Committee members appreciated the exceptional hospitality and supportive working environment provided by university officials and express a sincere thank you.

The following report reflects the Reaffirmation Committee's assessment of East Carolina University. It is hoped that the suggestions and recommendations contained herein will lead to the further strengthening of East Carolina University and the students it serves.

Overview of East Carolina University

East Carolina University, one of 16 constituent institutions of The University of North Carolina, is a public doctoral university committed to meeting the educational needs of North Carolina and the mid-Atlantic region. The University has formal authority to award degrees by its Board of Trustees, the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina, and, through the Board of Governors, by the General Assembly of North Carolina. It offers baccalaureate, master's, specialist, and doctoral degrees in the liberal arts, sciences, and professional fields, including medicine. The chief executive officer of the University is Chancellor William V. Muse, whose primary responsibility is to the university. The chancellor is nominated by the president of the University of North Carolina and is appointed by the Board of Governors. The

chancellor is responsible to the president.

The University offers bachelor's degrees in 106 program areas. The Graduate School has eighty-one master's degree program areas; two certificate of advanced study programs; two educational specialist degree programs; one Ed.D. program in the School of Education; Ph.D. programs in bioenergetics, biomedical physics, coastal resources management, communication sciences and disorders, and nursing; and six Ph.D. programs in the basic medical sciences. The M.D. degree is offered through the Brody School of Medicine. The University does not offer associate degrees. The on-campus enrollment for fall 2000 was 17,851. Of that number, 14,886 were undergraduate students, 2,666 were graduate students, and 299 were medical students. Another 1,152 students were enrolled in distance education.

Chartered by the General Assembly of North Carolina in 1907 as East Carolina Teachers Training School, East Carolina University has accomplished the transition from a normal school to East Carolina Teachers College to East Carolina College to a doctoral/research intensive university. The institution received authorization in 1929 to initiate graduate programs and conferred its first master of arts degree in 1933. The college obtained permission in May 1941 to institute liberal arts programs to augment its existing teacher education curricula.

Gathering ever increasing support from the people of eastern North Carolina, East Carolina established a record of service to the region. By the 1960s, it emerged as North Carolina's third

largest institution of higher learning. The General Assembly recognized this evolution and changed the college name to East Carolina University, effective July 1, 1967. Continuing advancement and expansion of the University's academic programs and services followed to assure its ability to meet regional and national needs.

During the 1960s, eight professional schools were established. On October 30, 1971, when the General Assembly restructured public higher education in North Carolina, the University became a constituent institution of the University of North Carolina. The initial class of the four-year medical school began its studies in the autumn of 1977. In April 1979, the development of five Ph.D. degree programs in sciences basic to medicine began, and the first Ph.D. degree was awarded in 1983. In 1987, a cooperative doctoral program in educational administration was begun with North Carolina State University. In the spring of 1990, an Ed. D. program in educational leadership was approved, with the first students enrolled in the autumn of 1990. Between 1991 and 2000, five doctoral programs were added, giving the University its present total of thirteen.

The 1990s saw other substantial growth and development. In the 1991—1992 year, for example, the Board of Governors granted permission to plan fourteen new degree programs. In 1999—2000, campus student enrollment exceeded 18,000 for the first time in the University's history. Enrollment projections indicate continuing increases in the years ahead and the need for several major facilities projects.

SECTION I PRINCIPLES AND PHILOSOPHY OF ACCREDITATION

Evaluation of the Institution's Self-Study

East Carolina University's alternative Self-Study process demonstrated commitment to an objective and effective assessment of the institution. The purpose of the ECU Self-Study was to evaluate and document compliance with the *SACS Criteria for Accreditation* and to address the strategic issues facing the institution in the areas of student enrollment and expansion of its mission, programs, and facilities.

The Self-Study was guided by a steering committee, which represented various segments of the University. Five compliance committees developed responses to the must and should statements in the 1998 *Criteria For Accreditation*. Following review and approval by the steering committee, drafts of the committee reports were disseminated to the University community for comment and feedback. The five committees which conducted the alternate portion of the study completed similar processes. ECU made extensive efforts to involve the Board of Trustees, students, alumni, and faculty in all stages of the Self-Study process. In addition, there appeared to be an unusually large percentage of the campus involved.

The five Enhancement Committees addressed the strategic issues focusing on the themes of growth and quality while excelling as an emerging doctoral institution. Each committee developed strategies through an abroad-based, participatory process. The five committees and their general focus were 1) education and research, enhancing quality undergraduate education given the expected growth in enrollment and in research and doctoral programs; 2) enrollment management, managing the

increased enrollment projected over the next decade; research management; 3) research

management, addressing changes in how scholarly activity is undertaken, how escalating research costs and library support can be addressed, and how innovative use of technologies can support research and creative activity; services and support; 4) services and support, developing information technology and processes to facilitate the provision of educational programs, student services, and administrative functions in a period of rapid enrollment growth; and, 5) technology in course delivery, ensuring effective incorporation of technology in the classroom given expected growth in enrollment and the confines of limited office and classroom space. The report was well-done and provided a useful framework for developing questions and strategies.

As result of the Self-Study process, East Carolina University conducted a thorough and effective assessment of the institution's strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats and developed a series of strategies to apply to its strategic directions related to campus expansion and research development. The Self-Study assessed the institution's compliance with the *Criteria* and identified sources of supporting documentation. It was evident to the Committee that a great deal of learning about institutional operations and functions occurred during this process. Follow-up actions to the recommendations in the Self-Study were documented. Two recommendations and fifteen suggestions were identified to strengthen procedures and processes addressed in the *Criteria*. The criterion that each recommendation or suggestion addresses as well as the persons responsible for follow up, status, and deadlines were specified. For example, a suggestion was made that the new Director of Institutional Effectiveness and the University Institutional Effectiveness Committee, in

conjunction with the Office of Planning and Institutional Research, should assist units in better defining educational goals and objectives, examining additional strategies for assessing student learning in order to select those most relevant to their respective goals, and continuing to link assessment results to programmatic changes. The responsible official was designated as the Director of Institutional Effectiveness, and a position description for the Director of Institutional Effectiveness has been developed, with a time line set for filling the position in Spring 2002.

The Committee appreciated the outstanding efforts made by the University and the Self-Study Director to provide copies of documents along with CD's and Internet access that allowed evaluation of the institution's compliance with the *Criteria for Accreditation* prior to and during its campus visit. The Committee found that it was easy to get an understanding of the university and what it is trying to do. The analysis of the *Criteria* as it applied to ECU was thorough, well-organized, succinct, and well-documented. Pertinent questions concerning interesting and compelling intellectual issues were raised, which demonstrated that the institution's constituents are aware of the complexities of the challenges facing them. As evidence to the University's commitment to provide information, when the Committee was unable to discern the courses taught by faculty in order to evaluate credentials, staff produced a special roster of faculty, courses, and credentials along with files that described exceptions to the *Criteria*. Availability of this list in the Self-Study document would have expedited this part of the Committee's work.

It is evident to the Committee that many actions have taken place to strengthen the University as a result of the Self-Study process. A planning process is evolving that includes faculty, staff, and student involvement and that ties planning goals and strategies to the budget. Progress has been made

in terms of assessment of student needs and learning outcomes. In most cases, the institution is using the results of its planning and evaluation efforts to improve programs and services and to make decisions regarding investment of University resources.

1.1 Institutional Commitment and Responsibilities in the Accreditation Process

Representatives from East Carolina University, including the Chancellor, have participated on visiting committees for the Commission on Colleges. The Committee found no evidence that the institution has dealt with its constituencies in anything less than a completely ethical manner. The Committee had free access to any information it needed to complete the visit at the institution.

1.2 Application of the *Criteria*

The Committee reviewed the major institutional changes that have occurred since the last reaffirmation and found that all changes of a substantive nature have been reported to the Commission on Colleges and have been evaluated according to the procedures of the Commission.

1.3 Separately Accredited Units

The institution has no separate autonomous units that should apply for separate accreditation.

1.4 Conditions of Eligibility

It is the judgment of the Committee that East Carolina University is in compliance with all of the Conditions of Eligibility.

1.5 Initial membership: Not Applicable

1.6 Representation of Status

The Committee reviewed institutional publications and the use of statements concerning its accredited status. In all cases where statements were made, the correct language was used.

SECTION II
INSTITUTIONAL PURPOSE

Based on the documentation provided, the Committee finds no basis for making a Recommendation for this section.

SECTION III
INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

3.1 Planning and Evaluation: Educational Programs

This section specifies the criteria related to planning and evaluation of educational programs. The criteria address educational goals; evaluation of goals, including demonstration of student achievement; and use of results to improve the educational programs, services, and operations. In the documentation provided, the Committee finds that the university processes encompass many of the components of an institutional effectiveness program. However, what the Committee found missing is the documented use of the assessment results to improve the educational programs, services, and operations. The Self-Study report, Volume 2. Excelling as an Emerging Doctorial University, also noted this lack of linkage between assessment activities and the use of these results for improvement of educational programs, services, and operations. The Committee recognizes that much effort in the past several months has been put forth to address this problem. The University is planning to establish an Office of Institutional Effectiveness to document, support, and coordinate assessment activities.

Recommendation: The Committee recommends that the institution document how results of assessment activities are used to improve services. Programs, and operations of educational

programs.

3.2 Planning and Evaluation: Administrative and Educational Support Services

This section specifies the criteria related to planning and evaluation of administrative and educational support services. The criteria address administrative and educational support services, evaluation of goals, and use of results to improve the administrative and educational support services. In the documentation provided, the Committee finds that the university processes encompass many of the components of an institutional effectiveness program. However, what the Committee found missing is the documented use of the evaluation results to improve the administrative and educational support services.

Recommendation: The Committee recommends that the institution document how results of assessment activities are used to improve administrative and educational support services.

3.3 Institutional Research

Based on the documentation provided, the Committee finds no basis for making a recommendation for this section.

SECTION IV

EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

4.1. General Requirements of the Educational Program

Based on the documentation provided, the Committee finds no basis for making a recommendation in this section.

4.2 Undergraduate Program

4.2.1 Undergraduate Admission

Based on the documentation provided, the Committee finds no basis for making a recommendation in this section.

4.2.2 Undergraduate Completion Requirements

The Committee notes that the institution strives to document student competencies in reading, writing, math, and computer literacy, but the Committee has not been able to determine similar efforts in oral communication skills.

Recommendation: The Committee recommends that the institution demonstrate that its graduates of degree programs are competent in oral communication.

4.2.3 Undergraduate Curriculum

Based on the documentation provided, the Committee finds no basis for making a recommendation in this section.

Suggestion: The Committee suggests that the institution explore ways to increase coordination of instruction and courses between the Health Sciences and Academic Affairs.

4.2.4 Undergraduate Instruction

The Committee perceives undergraduate programs of the institution as strong and urges the institution to be mindful of this strength as it develops increased doctoral programs. Based on the documentation provided, the Committee finds no basis for making a recommendation in this section.

4.2.5 Academic Advising of Undergraduate Students

Based on the documentation provided, the Committee finds no basis for making a recommendation in this section.

4.3 Graduate Program

4.3.1 Initiation, Operation, and Expansion of Graduate Programs

Based on the documentation provided, the Committee finds no basis for making a recommendation in this section

4.3.1 Graduate Admissions

Based on the documentation provided, the Committee finds no basis for making a recommendation in this section.

4.3.2 Graduate Completion Requirements

Based on the documentation provided, the Committee finds no basis for making a recommendation in this section.

4.3.4 Graduate Curriculum

Based on the documentation provided, the Committee finds no basis for making a recommendation in this section.

4.3.5 Graduate Instruction

Based on the documentation provided, the Committee finds no basis for making a recommendation in this section.

4.3.6 Academic Advising of Graduate Students

Based on the documentation provided, the Committee finds no basis for making a recommendation in this section.

4.4 Publications

The undergraduate and graduate catalogs provide little information about courses and programs available through distance education or about student services available on-line.

Recommendation: The Committee recommends that the institution revise major student publications to provide more information about distance education offerings and on-line services.

4.5 Distance Learning Programs

The Committee is concerned that the institution might not be prepared to meet its goal to “expand the educational opportunities provided on and off campus by 20 percent” through the use of distance learning. There is no centralized office charged to oversee the expansion, support services, or the quality of the institution’s distance learning programs.

Suggestion: The Committee suggests that the institution involve key distance education participants, including distance education students, to strategically plan for a significant increase in enrollments in distance education programs.

Suggestion: The Committee suggests that the institution develop policies and procedures for managing distance education programs. e.g.:

- Outline instructional goals for distance education in a manner that allows the Instructional Technology Consultants to plan accordingly:
- Require campus-wide training for faculty teaching online in order to ensure consistency of information. such as basic course design. digital copyright law, and digital library access:
- Develop an orientation for off-campus students that includes information about the support services available online:
- Monitor quality to ensure campus-wide consistency in meeting quality standards:
and
- Establish a clear line of communication between the information technology technical support (help desk) and the Instructional Technology Consultant Coordinator.

4.6 Continuing Education, Outreach and Service Programs

Based on the documentation provided, the Committee finds no basis for making a recommendation in this section.

4.7 Student Records

Based on the documentation provided, the Committee finds no basis for making a recommendation in this section.

4.8 Faculty

4.8.1 Selection of Faculty

Based on the documentation provided, the Committee finds no basis for making a recommendation in this section.

4.8.2 Academic and Professional Preparation

Based on the documentation provided, the Committee finds no basis for making a recommendation in this section.

4.8.2.1 Associate: Not Applicable.

4.8.2.2 Baccalaureate

The institution maintains a secure, centralized location for faculty records. In addition, academic units maintain separate faculty records, and the institution maintains an electronic faculty records database.

The Committee noted that records for graduate teaching assistants are not currently maintained in paper form in the centralized faculty records system, that records of adjunct faculty are not maintained completely and individually in that centralized system, that there are some inconsistencies between the paper records and the electronic database, and that certain justifications for individuals with less than 18 graduate hours in the teaching discipline are not available. This made it difficult for the Committee to make a determination concerning the institution's compliance with this section and section 4.8.2.3 of the *Criteria*.

Recommendation: The Committee recommends that the institution justify any exceptional cases on an individual basis when the teacher of record of a course leading toward a baccalaureate degree does not have at least 18 Graduate hours in the teaching discipline and a master's degree, or a master's degree with a major in the teaching discipline.

4.8.2.3 Academic and Professional Preparation (Graduate)

The Committee noted that certain individuals are teaching courses at the master's level who do not have a terminal degree in the teaching discipline or a related discipline.

Recommendation: The Committee recommends that each faculty member teaching courses at the master's level hold the terminal degree in the teaching discipline, or a related discipline, unless the standards for an exception are met and documented.

The Committee also noted that occasionally the justification for employing some faculty without the terminal degree was missing or incomplete.

Recommendation: The Committee recommends that the institution justify any cases when the teacher of record of a course leading toward a master's degree does not have a terminal degree in the discipline or a related discipline.

4.8.2.4 Distance Learning Programs /Activities (Faculty)

In talking with students, there appears to be an inconsistency in the level of interaction between students and instructors in online courses. The Committee found that some faculty

provided extensive interaction in their online courses; however, other faculty, as noted by students, provided little to no interaction in their courses.

Recommendation: The Committee recommends that the institution provide students with structured access to and interaction with full-time faculty members.

4.8.3 Part-Time Faculty

Based on the documents provided, the Committee finds no basis for making a recommendation in this section.

4.8.4 Graduate Teaching Assistants

Based on the documentation provided, the Committee finds no basis for making a recommendation in this section.

Suggestion: The Committee notes the shortage of funds for graduate assistantships and suggests that a solution to this problem be factored into plans for any new doctoral programs.

4.8.5 Faculty Compensation

Based on the documentation provided, the Committee finds no basis for making a recommendation in this section.

4.8.6 Academic Freedom and Professional Security

Based on the documentation provided, the Committee finds no basis for making a recommendation in this section.

4.8.7 Professional Growth

Based on the documentation provided, the Committee finds no basis for making a recommendation in this section.

4.8.8 The Role of the Faculty and Its Committees

Based on the documentation provided, the Committee finds no basis for making a recommendation in this section.

4.8.9 Faculty Load

Based on the documentation provided, the Committee finds no basis for making a recommendation in this section.

4.8.10 Criteria and Procedures for Evaluation

Based on the documentation provided, the Committee finds no basis for making a recommendation in this section.

4.9 Consortial Relationships and Contractual Agreements

4.9.1 Consortial Relationships

Based on the documentation provided, the Committee finds no basis for making a recommendation in this section.

4.9.2 Contractual Agreements

Based on the documentation provided, the Committee finds no basis for making a recommendation in this section.

Academic Area Reports

School of Nursing

The School of Nursing offers a baccalaureate degree in nursing with an option for a B.S.N. completion program for registered nursing students and a R.N.-Masters program for registered nurses who are diploma graduates or hold the associate degree. The registered nursing student who wishes to earn a master's degree without first earning a B.S.N. may enroll in the graduate program if they meet requirements for nursing and prerequisite courses. Also offered are master's specialties in administration in nursing services, adult health nursing, nurse midwifery, family nurse practitioner, neonatal nurse practitioner, and community health nursing. Post-master's certificates in nurse-midwifery, neonatal nurse practitioner, family nurse practitioner, and nursing education are also available for qualified master's graduates. In 2001, the School of Nursing received approval from the Board of Governors to offer the Ph.D. in Nursing. The curriculum is currently being developed and the School anticipates offering the first two courses in the program in fall 2002. Admission and progression requirements for the master's and baccalaureate programs are clearly stated in the ECU Undergraduate and Graduate Catalogs 2001-02.

Currently there are *450* undergraduate students enrolled in the baccalaureate nursing program. Of these, 100 are registered nursing students who are in the B.S.N. completion program. This program is offered on campus and also in Elizabeth City, approximately 90 miles from the ECU campus. In fall 2001, 17 R.N. students enrolled in this program and 7 remain for spring semester. The program is delivered partially by online courses and by ECU School of

Nursing faculty who commute to the area on a weekly basis. The B.S.N. completion program is also offered in Goldsboro and five students are enrolled. Funding to support these two outreach programs is provided through the 107-distance education funding initiative. In each location, the curriculum for the B.S.N. completion program is the same. The graduate student enrollment in nursing is 81 and there are 4 students enrolled in the R.N. to master's program. The R.N. to master's program has failed to meet enrollment expectations, and one student has had to drop back and complete the B.S.N. degree. Faculty stated they are re-evaluating this option to decide if it is viable. Currently there are 5 applicants for the nursing Ph.D. program for fall semester 2002. None of these potential applicants has been accepted into the program.

Currently there are 67 full- and 7 part-time faculty members in the School of Nursing. The faculty workloads are within normal requirements and the faculty are afforded opportunities for faculty development and professional travel. The entire faculty meets the requirements for appropriate credentials and has their work performance reviewed annually. A committee in the School makes recommendations for promotion and tenure to the dean. The dean reviews the recommendations and recommends faculty meeting the requirements for tenure and promotion to the vice chancellor for Health Sciences, who reviews them and forwards these to the chancellor for his review.

There are sufficient resources for classroom instruction and distance learning. The library holds an adequate selection of books, periodicals, and educational materials necessary to support the various nursing specialties and to meet national accreditation standards.

School of Education

The School of Education presented nine substantive changes for review by the Reaffirmation Committee, including three delivered entirely by Internet and six delivered primarily on-site, with some courses possibly delivered by instructional television or Internet. The substantive changes are the following:

Internet Delivery

B.S. Business Education, Information Technology

Master of Library Science

Master of Science in Instructional Media Design (Instructional Technology)

Primarily On-Site Delivery

Master of Arts in Education, Educational Supervision, Sanford

Master of School Administration, principal licensure, Weldon

Master of School Administration, principal licensure, Morehead City

Master of Arts in Education, Elementary Education, Smithfield

Master of Arts in Education, Middle Grades Education, Tarboro and Edgecombe

Master of Arts in Education, Elementary Education, Jacksonville, joint program with the University of North Carolina at Wilmington

All substantive change programs are equivalent to and, with only one exception, identical to the traditional face-to-face programs offered on campus. The courses are taught predominantly by regular faculty, with very limited use of fully-qualified part-time faculty members. Departments in the School of Education are gradually moving distance education courses from overload to in-load assignments for faculty; currently, 50-70% of distance education courses are taught as part of the faculty member's regular load.

The Master of Arts in Education, Elementary Education, at Jacksonville is a joint program with the University of North Carolina at Wilmington. Each institution offers about half the course work. The two groups of faculty spent two years planning the joint program to ensure that all goals and objectives are met and that the curriculum has no gaps or redundancies.

Faculty described multiple approaches for assessing program effectiveness, e.g., scores and subscores on professional licensure examinations, review of students' portfolios and projects, external and internal program review procedures, surveys of students and employers, and faculty observations of student performance. Faculty also described a number of changes in programs based on assessment data, with follow-up to evaluate the effectiveness of the changes.

School of Industry and Technology

The School of Industry and Technology (SIT) currently offers four programs via distance education: one master's degrees, two certificates, and one undergraduate completion program. The School is also involved in a collaborative Ph.D. program with six other universities, including Indiana State University, who awards the degree. ECU SIT is a contributing partner only and does not award the degree. All distance education courses are taught using online technology, based primarily on the Blackboard course management system but supplemented with a variety of other tools housed and served from SIT servers. Technical support is provided by ITCS (not on a 24-hour basis) and through two SIT technical staff members. These (SIT) staff members carry pagers and are notified if there are problems with the delivery of course material.

Faculty generally receive a single course release during development, but once completed, courses are taught in-load. Only full-time faculty teach SIT distance education courses, and each must team teach an online introductory course with an experienced faculty member prior to teaching online alone.

Laboratory procedures are handled in an innovative manner. Already, distance students can access the SIT network servers from a distance to perform and complete assignments in the digital communications area. In addition, students can access and control a milling machine located on campus. The School will be moving to a new building (currently under construction) that will house a "Lights Out Lab." Once completed, distance students will be able to collect and analyze data via the Web from anywhere in the world.

Distance education is a vital part of the SIT. Close to 25% of the School's budget is from distance education. The School is planning to develop a second online master's degree as well as its first online doctoral program within the next two years.

SECTION V

EDUCATIONAL SUPPORT SERVICES

To support its mission, East Carolina University offers a variety of educational support services. These include the libraries, instructional support services, information technology, student development services, and intercollegiate athletics. The institution's self-study committees conducted comprehensive assessments of these educational support services. Members of the Visiting Committee acknowledge those who prepared the analysis and wrote the reports.

5.1 Library and Other Learning Resources

5.2

5.1.1 Purpose and Scope

Library and other learning resources and services are available to all faculty and enrolled students at East Carolina University through the Joyner and Health Sciences libraries. Library services are provided in support of distance education courses. This is a period during which the nature of library services and collections is changing and a variety of information formats are being provided. The libraries undertake ongoing review of the effectiveness of their operations and their accessibility. Suggestion: The Committee suggests coordinated and appropriate evaluation instruments be incorporated into the planning process to assess the effectiveness of the Joyner and Health Sciences Libraries and their services, both electronic and traditional. A recent library committee survey revealed that many faculty are unfamiliar with the variety of services

and collections provided. Suggestion: The Committee suggests additional systematic effort be made to familiarize faculty as well as students with available library services and collection.

To facilitate the use of services and collections, and to encourage sharing of resources, Joyner and the Health Sciences libraries have created an oversight or coordination committee to enhance communication. As a result of this effort, the libraries better meet the needs of the institution. Commendation: The Committee commends the Joyner and Health Sciences libraries for their joint efforts in coordination and collaboration in providing collections and services to the academic community.

5.1.2 Services

The Joyner and Health Sciences libraries have reconfigured space, used compact shelving, combined service points, and taken other appropriate steps to effectively utilize current available space and to plan for future space needs. Space planning and projections are in place for current and future needs. Based on the documentation provided, the Committee finds no basis for making a recommendation in this section.

5.1.3 Library Collections

Through the collaboration and cooperation of the Joyner and Health Sciences libraries, there is a strong commitment to sharing resources and providing appropriate services. Based on the documentation provided, the Committee finds no basis for making a recommendation in this section.

5.1.4 Information Technology

The Faculty Senate library committee has recommended easier access to the two separate library catalogs. This will facilitate use of resources and services. Based on the documentation provided, the Committee finds no basis for making a recommendation in this section.

5.1.5 Cooperative Agreements

Based on the documentation provided, the Committee finds no basis for making a recommendation in this section.

5.1.6 Staff

Emerging technology and changes in approaches to providing services continue to impact library and information services. Identification of needed skill levels and expertise will also assist in recruitment of faculty and staff for the libraries. Suggestion: The Committee suggests ongoing systematic assessment of needed skills, resulting in the creation of a program of staff development.

5.1.7 Library/Learning Resources for Distance Learning Activities

Based on the documentation provided, the Committee finds no basis for making a recommendation in this section.

5.2 Instructional Support

Instructional support is provided. However, there are pockets of strength as well as areas where support is not as developed as desirable. Suggestion: The Committee suggests better coordination of delivery and support of instructional services.

5.3 Information Technology Resources and Systems

Based on the documentation provided, the Committee finds no basis for making a recommendation in this section.

5.4 Student Development Services

5.4.1 Scope and Accountability

Based on the documentation provided, the Committee finds no basis for making a recommendation in this section.

5.4.2 Resources

Based on the documentation provided, the Committee finds no basis for making a recommendation in this section.

5.4.3 Programs and Services

5.4.3.1 Counseling and Career Development

Based on the documentation provided, the Committee finds no basis for making a recommendation in this section.

5.4.3.2 Student Government, Student Activities and Publications

Based on the documentation provided, the Committee finds no basis for making a recommendation in this section.

5.4.3.3 Student Behavior

Based on the documentation provided, the Committee finds no basis for making a recommendation in this section.

5.4.3.4 Residence Halls

Based on the documentation provided, the Committee finds no basis for making a recommendation in this section.

5.4.3.5 Student Financial Aid

Based on the documentation provided, the Committee finds no basis for making a recommendation in this section.

5.4.3.6 Health Services

Based on the documentation provided, the Committee finds no basis for making a recommendation in this section.

5.4.3.7 Intramural Athletics

Based on the documentation provided, the Committee finds no basis for making a recommendation in this section.

Part II

5.5 Intercollegiate Athletics: Findings Pertaining Exclusively to COC Requirements

5.5.1 Purpose

The mission and goals of the athletics program support those of the institution. They also address the educational objectives, academic progress, and general welfare of student-athletes, and address issues of equitable opportunity for all students and staff, including women. Through questioning of the Self-Study steering committee and selected conversations with the university community, as well as examination of reports from various university committees, it is clear the Self-Study report had broad input in its development and wide dissemination for review and comment in its final phases. The peer-review team specifically inquired and received positive feedback relative to input from students, faculty, and governing bodies.

5.5.2 Administrative Oversight

The institution's governing board provides considerable management oversight, as well as policy formulation, for intercollegiate athletics. The chief executive officer is assigned ultimate responsibility and authority for the operation of the athletics program. Responsibility for personnel is shared by the governing board and the chief executive officer.

5.5.3 Financial Control

This review confirmed that the university approves all departmental expenditures through the university's division of administration and finance, and that the athletics department's annual

budget is subject to multiple levels of review from individuals outside the department, to include the associate vice chancellor and vice chancellor for financial services, the athletic council and final approval being provided by the institution's chancellor. The peer-review team's review confirmed that the athletics department budget process and all sources of revenue, to include self-generated funds, Pirate Club private contributions, and institutionally provided support, are managed through the university's FRS accounting system and are handled in a manner that is consistent with all other university funds and procedures. Further, audits were performed in a manner consistent with university procedures and were conducted by a qualified auditor from outside the institution.

5.5.4 Academic Program

East Carolina University has written policies pertaining to the recruitment, admission, financial aid and continuing eligibility of student-athletes. The faculty athletics representative and the director of compliance are involved in these activities on a regular basis.

Documentation and interviews confirm that the responsibility for admissions is vested in the admissions office. With the exception of student-athletes who do not meet automatic admission and NCAA partial qualifiers and non-qualifiers, student-athletes are admitted through the same process as the general student body. Students who do not meet automatic admissions, but meet qualifier status through the NCAA, are flagged as being at-risk and receive intensive intervention through the office of student development in the athletics department. Students in the general population who are not automatically admissible become a part of the campus

Academic Transition Program. Partial qualifiers and nonqualifiers are admitted with a recommendation from a coach and approval from the director of athletics, the chancellor, and the director of admissions into the chancellor's Special Talent Program, which is available to all students as well. The responsibility for certification of academic standing and evaluation of academic performance of student-athletes is vested in the registrar's office through continuing eligibility specialists and the academic counselors in the office of student development. The Committee found no differences in academic standards and policies applicable to student-athletes and what is consistent with those adopted by the institution for the student body in general.

The Committee reviewed the institution's intercollegiate athletics program against the *Criteria* and has no recommendations.

SECTION VI

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCESSES

6.1 Organization and Administration

6.1.1 Descriptive Titles and Terms

Based on the documentation provided, the Committee finds no basis for making a recommendation in this section.

6.1.2 Governing Board

As noted in the introduction of this report, the University of North Carolina Board of Governors, consisting of 16 members appointed by the General Assembly of the State of North Carolina, is legally responsible for governance of the sixteen constituent institutions. The board selects the president, to whom the chancellor of each institution reports. The Board is responsible for planning and developing a coordinated system of higher education in North Carolina and governs the general determination, control, supervision, management, and overall affairs, including setting tuition, of constituent institutions. The Board of Governors may delegate powers to the Board of Trustees, or through the president of the university system, to the chancellor.

East Carolina University also has a Board of Trustees, consisting of eight members who are appointed by the University of North Carolina Board of Governors and four who are appointed by the governor of North Carolina. The president of the student body serves as an ex-officio member. The Board of Trustees is an active, policy-making, legal body responsible for,

among other things, assuring that the financial resources of the university provide a sound educational program.

The presiding officers of the boards have no contractual, employment, or personal or familial financial interests in the institution. A majority of the board members have no contractual, employment, or personal interests in the institution. The Bylaws of the Board of Trustees specify staggered terms of four years in length and assure that the board is independent. Board members are eligible to serve two consecutive four-year terms. According to *The Code of the Board of Governors* and the *Bylaws of the Board of Trustees*, the Board of Governors can delegate certain powers to the Board of Trustees (See Delegations of Duty and Authority to the Boards of Trustees). In most cases the Board of Trustees consults with the Chancellor on issues prior to submission to the president and the Board of Governors. While the Committee has no recommendations, the information in the Self-Study and gathered through interviews with faculty and board members is somewhat confusing concerning the powers of the two boards. Suggestion: The Committee suggests that the institution make efforts to clarify the roles of the two boards with its key constituents.

The Boards have not recently dismissed members. According to the Code of the Board of Governors and the Bylaws of the Board of Trustees, only a member's absence from a specified number of meetings leads to being dropped from membership. The Committee did not find any evidence of a protocol or process for removing a governing board member for cause other than

these sequential absences. Suggestion. The Committee suggests that the two boards develop procedures for dismissing board members for cause.

Many of the institution's personnel actions must be reviewed by the Board of Trustees, then approved by both the President and the Board of Governors. Recently, steps have been taken toward decentralizing personnel matters. The Committee supports and encourages these changes.

The Committee has no recommendations.

6.1.3 Advisory Committees

Advisory committees are approved by the chancellor through written statements about the role, purpose, and membership of the committee. As apart of the self-study process, an inventory and centralized listing was prepared for the first time. The institution agreed that this process is very helpful and can be improved if it is made an annual process.

Suggestion. The Committee suggests that the university develop and update annually a centralized listing of all advisory committees (including those for fund raising).

6.1.4 Official Policies

Based on the documentation provided, the Committee finds no basis for making a recommendation in this section.

6.1.5 Administrative Organization

Currently senior academic and administrative officers of the institution do not sign a contract and serve at the discretion of the Chancellor. These are considered exempt positions in

the administrative evaluation process. Evidence indicates that written evaluations do not occur. The self-study indicated that the chancellor, the vice chancellors, and the Faculty Senate plan to develop an administrative evaluation process parallel to the current policies and procedures contained in the *Faculty Manual*. The goal of the proposed parallel process will be to assure timely, thorough, and useful evaluations of all administrators. Recommendation: The Committee recommends that the institution evaluate the effectiveness of all administrators periodically.

6.2 Institutional Advancement

6.2.1 Alumni Affairs

Based on the documentation provided, the Committee finds no basis for making a recommendation in this section.

6.2.2 Fund Raising

The institution has four major foundations established to raise, manage, and distribute private gift resources for the benefit of the University. The vice chancellor for institutional advancement serves as president for two of the foundations. The other two foundations are managed by a community board of directors and elect a president from that board. With the growing complexity of the university and accelerating needs for private resources in all areas, greater centralized coordination of university fund raising priorities is needed. An improved process will ensure fund raising goals among the various university constituencies best reflect institutional mission and priorities. Suggestion: The Committee suggests that the institution initiate a process to improve the coordination and cooperation of the four major fund-raising foundations.

6.3 Financial Resources

6.3.1 Financial Resources

Based on the documentation provided, the Committee finds no basis for making a recommendation in this section.

6.3.2 Organization for the Administration of Financial Resources

Based on the documentation provided, the Committee finds no basis for making a recommendation in this section.

6.3.3 Budget Planning

As a part of the Strategies for Distinction. Annual Report 2000-2001, the Committee noted that one of the institution's operational objectives was to implement a comprehensive five-year university budget process. The strategic objective is to develop a budget model that would integrate the operating and capital budgets with the University's strategic planning process. Progress in achieving this objective has been temporarily delayed because of the current budget uncertainties. Suggestion: The Committee suggests that the institution establish a long range budget model as planned and implement a comprehensive five-year budget process that integrates the operating and capital budgets with the institution's strategic-planning process.

6.3.4 Budget Control

The Committee finds no basis for making a recommendation in this section.

6.3.5 The Relation of an Institution to External Budgetary Control

Based on the documentation provided, the Committee finds no basis for making a recommendation in this section.

-36-

6.3.6 Accounting, Reporting and Auditing

Based on the documentation provided, the Committee finds no basis for making a recommendation in this section.

6.3.7 Purchasing and Inventory Control

Based on the documentation provided, the Committee finds no basis for making a recommendation in this section.

6.3.8 Refund Policy

Based on the documentation provided, the Committee finds no basis for making a recommendation in this section.

6.3.9 Cashiering

Based on the documentation provided, the Committee finds no basis for making a recommendation in this section.

6.3.10 Investment Management

Based on the documentation provided, the Committee finds no basis for making a recommendation in this section.

6.3.11 Risk Management and Insurance

Based on the documentation provided, the Committee finds no basis for making a recommendation in this section.

6.3.12 Auxiliary Enterprise

Based on the documentation provided, the Committee finds no basis for making a recommendation in this section.

-37-

6.4 Physical Resources

Based on the documentation provided, the Committee finds no basis for making a recommendation in this section.

6.4.1 Space Management

Based on the documentation provided, the Committee finds no basis for making a recommendation in this section.

6.4.2 Buildings, Grounds, and Equipment Maintenance

Based on the documentation provided, the Committee finds no basis for making a recommendation in this section.

6.4.3 Safety and Security

Based on the documentation provided, the Committee finds no basis for making a

recommendation in this section.

6.4.4 Facilities Master Plan

Based on the documentation provided, the Committee finds no basis for making a recommendation in this section.

6.5 Externally Funded Grants and Contracts

Based on the documentation provided, the Committee finds no basis for making a recommendation in this section.

6.6 Related Corporate Entities

Based on the documentation provided, the Committee finds no basis for making a recommendation in this section.

COMMENDATIONS

1. The Committee commends the Joyner and Health Sciences libraries for their joint efforts in coordination and collaboration in providing collections and services to the academic community.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The Committee recommends that the institution document how results of assessment activities are used to improve services, programs, and operations of educational programs.
2. The Committee recommends that the institution document how results of assessment activities are used to improve administrative and educational support services.
3. The Committee recommends that the institution demonstrate that its graduates of degree programs are competent in oral communication.
4. The Committee recommends that the institution revise major student publications to provide more information about distance education offerings and on-line services.

5. The Committee recommends that the institution justify any exceptional cases on an individual basis when the teacher of record of a course leading toward a baccalaureate degree does not have at least 18 graduate hours in the teaching discipline and a master's degree, or a master's degree with a major in the teaching discipline.

6. The Committee recommends that each faculty member teaching courses at the master's

level hold the terminal degree in the teaching discipline, or a related discipline, unless the standards for an exception are met and documented.

7. The Committee recommends that the institution justify any cases when the teacher of record of a course leading toward a master's degree does not have a terminal degree in the discipline or a related discipline.

8. The Committee recommends that the institution provide students with structured access to and interaction with full-time faculty members.

9. The Committee recommends that the institution evaluate the effectiveness of all administrators periodically.

SUGGESTIONS

1. The Committee suggests that the institution explore ways to increase coordination of instruction and courses between the Health Sciences and Academic Affairs.

2. The Committee suggests that the institution involve key distance education participants, including distance education students, to strategically plan for a significant increase in enrollments in distance education programs.

3. The Committee suggests that the institution develop policies and procedures for managing distance education programs, e.g.:

- Outline instructional goals for distance education in a manner that allows the Instructional Technology Consultants to plan accordingly;

- Require campus-wide training for faculty teaching online in order to ensure consistency of information, such as basic course design, digital copyright law, and digital library access;
- Develop an orientation for off-campus students that includes information about the support services available online
- Monitor quality to ensure campus-wide consistency in meeting quality standards; and
- Establish a clear line of communication between the information technology technical support (help desk) and the Instructional Technology Consultant Coordinator.

4. The Committee notes the shortage of funds for graduate assistantships and suggests that a solution to this problem be factored into plans for any new doctoral programs.

5. The Committee suggests coordinated and appropriate evaluation instruments be incorporated into the planning process to assess the effectiveness of the Joyner and Health Sciences Libraries and their services, both electronic and traditional.

6. The Committee suggests additional systematic effort be made to familiarize faculty as well as students with available library services and collection.

7. The Committee suggests ongoing systematic assessment of needed skills,

resulting in the creation of a program of staff development.

8. The Committee suggests better coordination of delivery and support of instructional services.

-41-

9. The Committee suggests that the institution make efforts to clarify the roles of the two boards with its key constituents.

10. The Committee suggests that the two boards develop procedures for dismissing board members for cause.

11. The Committee suggests that the university develop and update annually a centralized listing of all advisory committees (including those for fund raising).

12. The Committee suggests that the institution initiate a process to improve the coordination and cooperation of the four major fund-raising foundations.

13. The Committee suggests that the institution establish a long-range budget model as planned and implement a comprehensive five-year budget process that integrates the operating and capital budgets with the institution's strategic-planning process.