<div style="border:1px solid black">

PRELIMINARY REPORT OF THE REAFFIRMATION COMMITTEE

</div>

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: **Georgia Institute of Technology**

Date of the Review: **November 6-7, 2014**

COC Staff Member: **Dr. Cheryl D. Cardell**

Chair of the Committee: **Dr. Maurice R. Eftink
Associate Provost
University of Mississippi
University, MS**

Part I. Overview and Introduction to the Institution

Part II. Assessment of Compliance

Sections A thru E to be completed by the Off-Site Review Committee and the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee. An asterisk before the standard indicates that it will be reviewed by the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee even if the off-site review determines compliance.

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

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

Compliance

The Off-Site Committee found no evidence of a lack of integrity. The institution's self-assessment provided evidence of timely and accurate information, and communication with the Commission and the public. A statement attesting to compliance was provided, signed by the Accreditation Liaison and the Chief Executive Officer of the institution.

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)**

Compliance

The institution is part of a state system and grants degrees under the authority of the Board of Regents which is created under the Constitution of the State of Georgia and whose members are appointed by the Governor.

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.

Form edited July 2014

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)**

Compliance

The Georgia Board of Regents is comprised of 18 members appointed by the Governor under authority of the Georgia Constitution. The institution has published regulations and by-laws to ensure that the Board exercises broad policymaking power and provides that financial resources are used to support a sound educational program. The Board's decisions are taken in public meetings where a majority of regents must reach agreement. The Board has a clear and adequate policy governing conflicts of interest.

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)**

Compliance

The Board of Regents elects each campus president, and the institutional president's position and responsibilities are distinct and separate from those of the Chair of the Board of Regents.

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)**

Compliance

The mission statement of the Georgia Institute of Technology is clear in its definition and addresses teaching and learning, research, and outreach. The committee's review of the supplementary information provided confirmed that the institution's mission statement is specific to the institution and is sufficiently comprehensive to reflect the University System of Georgia Board of Regents' designation of Georgia Institute of Technology as a "Research University Institution." The mission statement identifies the geographic area served by Georgia Institute of Technology as "Georgia, the United States and around the globe."

In addition, the committee reviewed the minutes from the University System of Georgia Board of Regents' March 2014 meeting which confirmed that the mission statement is

appropriate for higher education. A review of the institution's strategic plan, catalog, and factbook confirmed that the mission statement is published.

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)**

Non-Compliance

In 2010, the institution completed an extensive revision to the strategic plan that included a revised mission statement, five goals, 16 strategies and ten Institute-wide objectives; 11 additional objectives or initiatives were added at a later date. The plan was developed using a considerable volume of data as well as input from the entire Georgia Tech community. The process described evidenced that the institution incorporated a systematic review of institutional mission and goals. The institution asserts that this document is used to initiate projects designed to improve institutional quality.

The 21 objectives or initiatives served as a guide for implementation and investment in various projects as evidenced by the implementation updates from the provost and the executive vice president for research. While these updates were very process oriented, the reports only occasionally discussed outcomes and the linkage between the individual projects and improvements in overall institutional quality was weak.

The narrative indicates that at the college and division levels, progress towards achieving the goals outlined in the strategic plan are documented in updates and progress reports. Examples were provided for two colleges, two schools contained within one of the two colleges, two divisions and as mentioned before, the office of the provost and the office of the executive vice president for research. The plans presented aligned well with the institution's strategic plan and articulated measures for the each college. Subsequent reports to constituent groups contained limited information or data related to those measures. Based on these limited examples, the committee did not find evidence that the results from the colleges and divisions were "rolled" up to produce institution-wide evidence of improvement of institutional quality. In addition the institution did not provide rationale for the limited number of samples provided. Furthermore, the lack of measures at the institutional level does not support that the institution's evaluation processes demonstrate that the institution is effectively accomplishing its mission.

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

Compliance

The institution presents evidence of continuous enrollment via archived Fact Books available on its Institutional Research web site. Archived Fact Books on this site date back to 1979. The institution states that it has been in continuous operation since 1888

as Georgia School of Technology, being renamed as Georgia Institute of Technology in 1948.

A table of enrollment in various bachelors, masters, and doctoral degree programs is also presented. The total fall 2013 enrollment was 21,471. These types of evidence are sufficient to satisfy this principle.

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)**

Compliance

Baccalaureate degrees at Georgia Tech require a minimum of 120 semester hours credit and post-baccalaureate degree require a minimum of 30 semester hours credit. Many require more. Degree requirements are detailed in the 2014-2015 catalog. Programs of study in business, architecture, computer science, history, chemistry, and electrical and computer engineering at the baccalaureate, masters and doctoral levels were examined to confirm compliance.

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)**

Compliance

The Institution's motto is "progress and service" which is to be achieved by effective and innovative teaching, research and entrepreneurship in all sector of society. Its mission is for technological change that is fundamental to the advancement of the human condition. Concentrating on science, technology and innovation, the Institution has set up Colleges of Architecture, Business, Computing, Engineering and Sciences, offering both B.S as well as M.S and Ph. D degrees. There are well established course sequences within the degree programs to achieve a coherent sequence of material and complexity. There is a strong focus on interdisciplinary studies as seen in the MS program for Music Technology where a student must combine music, computing and engineering. The institution was also one of the first in the world to offer a Ph.D. in Digital Media. To ensure a coherent course of study, there are appropriate committees and chain of command as found in other institutions. Distance learning, through on-line and overseas, are governed by the main campus' regulations to ensure that they are in-line with the Institution's mission.

*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)**

Compliance

Georgia Tech requires 45 hours of general education coursework in the areas of humanities/fine arts, social/behavioral sciences, and natural science/mathematics. There is also an attempt to broaden student horizons in critical thinking both from U.S and global perspectives. All general education requirements are outlined in the Georgia Tech Catalog and on the registrar's office website, and students are made aware of General Education Core Curriculum requirements through the Catalog (which lists specific courses that satisfy each core area) and at new student orientation. Georgia Tech also uses DegreeWorks, an online degree audit tool. Tech's learning outcomes for the core areas demonstrate what students are expected to be able to do, or to know, after successful completion of courses in the core areas. The learning outcomes are listed on the registrar's website. New courses seeking approval for inclusion in the core curriculum list directly on the syllabi the relevant student learning outcomes associated with general education and state them on the new course-approval request form. The Institute Undergraduate Curriculum Committee (IUCC), a standing committee of the faculty, approves all new course proposals. Instructors of existing, approved courses may petition the General Education Subcommittee (GES) of the IUCC for further approval to fulfill general education requirements with those courses. The USG Core Curriculum Policy and Georgia Tech's General Education Mission Statement provide a broad rationale that guides the General Education Subcommittee and IUCC in evaluating courses for inclusion in the core curriculum. Application of the rationale also ensures that the general education curriculum consists of courses that do not narrowly focus on skills, techniques, and procedures specific to particular occupations or professions. Exceptions to the policy are made only when the student completes a petition to the faculty that is submitted to and approved by the major school and then to the Institute Undergraduate Curriculum 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)**

Form edited July 2014

Compliance

The institution offers degrees at the bachelor's, master's, and doctoral levels and provides instruction for all coursework required for each degree program at each of these levels with the exception of joint and dual degrees. The Georgia Tech academic faculty is responsible for developing, delivering, and assessing its coursework and academic programs. Dual and joint degree programs are approved through their faculty governance process. International dual degree programs were reported to SACSCOC as a substantive change.

*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)**

Compliance

The institution defines its mission in terms of teaching, research and service. Sufficient numbers of faculty appear to be available to address all three areas, with the one concern being the lack of evidence of full time faculty serving the international delivery locations.

The total number of full time faculty number is 2,738, which includes 998 tenured/tenure track faculty and 1,547 research faculty. The student faculty ratio of 18:1 is similar to peer institutions. According to the Table of Credit Hours Generated by Course Code, in 2013-14 over 65% of all credit hours were taught by tenure/tenure track faculty, although there was a high degree of variability. Responsibility for the remaining credit hours taught was distributed among full and part time lecturers/instructors, other faculty and non-faculty. Full time faculty approve programs and modifications to programs and use written student teaching evaluations, and in some cases, peer evaluations, to improve teaching effectiveness.

The Carnegie Foundation classifies Georgia Tech as a research university with very high research activity, based on extramural research funding and doctoral productivity. Over 1,500 research faculty members are employed in the colleges or specialized research units. The research portfolio also provides opportunities for students to engage in experiential learning as well as supporting the work of graduate students.

As stated in the policy on promotion and tenure, the faculty members of Georgia Tech are also evaluated for contributions to service to the institution, students, and the public and professional organizations. Service by faculty on 18 academic journal editorial boards was cited as an example of service to the profession. Websites illustrating several examples of large-scale contributions to the community were also cited as faculty commitment to service.

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)**

Compliance

The library provides access to physical and online collections in support of the university's mission. Physical collections in excess of one million titles are housed in four facilities, and plans are under way to relocate some materials to a joint high-density storage facility on the campus of Emory University (along with appropriate retrieval services). At this point the bulk of the collections budget is dedicated to electronic resources, and the library participates in several consortia and initiatives that focus on preserving and enhancing access to electronic resources.

The main library is open 24 hours a day for much of the week, and the library has implemented several tools to provide efficient access to its collections (an online catalog with sophisticated search capabilities, QuikSearch for seeking resources across multiple electronic collections, and lists of electronic databases and journals).

Services help students navigate both the physical and digital environments. Students have access to wireless networks, technology, and software, and they are encouraged to seek assistance from staff (online or in person) in locating resources and information. A document delivery services has been established for faculty, staff, and graduate students. The library provides a multi-faceted instruction program, technology support, and print/electronic course reserve materials.

Users can obtain resources not owned by the library through interlibrary loan, through a patron-initiated request system that encompasses 31 libraries in the University System of George (USG), or by in-person borrowing from other USG libraries and academic libraries in the Atlanta area.

The library has a department that manages the collection budget, oversees the activities of subject experts in this area, and is responsible for developing collection policies. Subject experts work closely with academic units, and the library analyzes data from a variety of sources in making decisions about the collection (use statistics, interlibrary loan requests, advisory boards, requests from users, vendor-supplied data, etc.).

The library has conducted several LibQUAL surveys over the past decade in which students and faculty have expressed concerns about the adequacy of collections. This perception is not unusual among other members of the Association of Research Libraries, especially given the pressures on collections budgets in recent years. That being said, the library's strategies of moving aggressively from print to electronic resources and adjusting services accordingly, for participating in strong consortia to obtain resources not owned by the institution, and for engaging in just-in-time purchases have resulted in collections and services that are sufficient to meet the needs of the university.

For further comments about library spaces, see Comprehensive Standard 3.8.1; instruction, Comprehensive Standard 3.8.2; and staffing, Comprehensive Standard 3.8.3.

Form edited July 2014

*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)**

Compliance

The institution provides a wide range of programs, services, and activities including campus recreation, counseling services, disability services, leadership programs, new student and sophomore programs, student diversity programs, student media and publications, resources for veterans, a resource center for women, support for the Greek community, a resource center for LBGTQIA students, and an Office for the Arts.

Georgia Institute of Technology also provides a number of campus services to support students including housing, Barnes and Noble Bookstore, health services, dining services, student center and student commons area, transportation services, support services for information technology, and student employment assistance. Student support services also include academic advising, academic coaching, financial aid counseling, support services for international students, and mentoring programs. Students are also offered support to apply for prestigious fellowships.

Support staff on the Georgia Tech Atlanta campus work collaboratively with the support staff at Georgia Tech – Lorraine to provide bookstore services, online resources, career guidance, counseling, disability services, and mental health services to students in Metz, France. Additionally, the GT Professional Education office provides assistance to online learners in both graduate and undergraduate courses and programs.

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 systemwide 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 and stability)**

Non-Compliance

The Georgia Institute of Technology operates on a fiscal year ending June 30. The State of Georgia Department of Audits and Accounts ("Department") audits the Institute's financial statements as a unit of the University System of Georgia, which is an organizational unit of the State of Georgia. The Department conducts the audit in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America

and the standards applicable to financial audits contained in the Government Auditing Standards, issued by the Comptroller General of the United States. The FY 2013-14 audit report was not available at the time of the off-site committee review.

The Institute provided a Statement of Financial Position of Unrestricted Net Assets for five of the last six years. Per the statement, the Institute's unrestricted net assets, exclusive of plant assets and plant related-debt, increased by $97.3 million to $116.4 million from July 1, 2008 to June 30, 2013. The institution did not provide such a statement for the most recently completed fiscal year (FY 2013-14).

As evidenced by the audited financial statements and recent bond rating reports, the Institute has sustained revenue growth despite reduced state funding. Net tuition revenue increased 78.9 percent from FY 2008-09 to FY 2012-13. Total full-time equivalent enrollment increased by 7.5 percent from 19,868 FTE students in fall 2009 to 21,354 FTE students in fall 2013. In addition, the Institute has a history of strong philanthropic support.

The Institute has a comprehensive budget development process as evidenced by the *Outline of Georgia Tech's Budget Process*. The process reflects the coordinated responsibilities of the Institute, the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia, the Governor and General Assembly. The Board of Regents approves the annual budget in May, preceding the start of the new fiscal year.

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)**

Compliance

The Committee's review of the comparison of the quantity of space (based on number of students and instructional staff) to peer institutions and the other four research universities in the University System of Georgia corroborates the assertion that the Institute has sufficient net assignable square feet (NASF). The Institute has an impressive record of regularly renovating existing facilities and constructing new buildings to provide sufficient quality and suitability of space for its programs and services. As of 2013, 33 percent of campus facilities were less than 25 years old.

Since 2005, the Institute has added approximately 88,626 net assignable square feet (NASF) of instructional space to the campus. The Institute has also added approximately 235,360 NASF of research space to support and expand its research efforts.

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)**

Not Applicable

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)**.

Compliance

The mission statement of the Georgia Institute of Technology is clear in its definition and addresses teaching and learning, research, and outreach. The committee's review of the supplementary information supplied in the narrative response to Core Requirement 2.4 confirmed that the institution's mission statement is sufficiently comprehensive to reflect the University System of Georgia Board of Regents' designation of Georgia Institute of Technology as a "Research University Institution." The mission statement identifies the geographic area served by Georgia Institute of Technology as "Georgia, the United States and around the globe."

In addition, the committee reviewed the minutes from the University System of Georgia Board of Regents' March 2014 meeting which confirmed that the mission statement is current and has been approved by the appropriate governing board -- the University System of Georgia Board of Regents. The institution provided a detailed timeline and supporting documentation demonstrating that the mission statement is periodically reviewed. A review of the documentation and a comparison of the 2005 mission statement with the current mission statement provide sufficient evidence that the mission statement is periodically updated.

The mission statement guides the operations of the institution as it was developed as part of the institution's strategic plan and served as a guiding principle in the development of strategic goals. Additional evidence of the key role the mission statement plays in guiding the institution was found in the institution's response to Core Requirement 2.5. The mission is communicated to the institution's constituencies appropriately through publication as noted in Core Requirement 2.4.

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)**

Compliance

The Board of Regents appoints the campus president for a one-year term. Board of Regents' policy also calls for an assessment of each president on an ongoing basis, a process "... which consists of open communication between the Chancellor or the president's supervisor and the president on both individual and institutional goals and objectives as well as on the methods and processes used to achieve them." The policy further states that "[e]valuations will be factored into the annual appointment renewal for each president."

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

Compliance

Final authority for governance, control, and management of each institution in the University System rests with the Board of Regents. This authority is assigned to the board in both the constitution of the state of Georgia and the official code of the state of Georgia. The function and mission of each institution in the university system is determined by the Board of Regents, and any change in institutional function and mission must be approved by the board. The mission of the Georgia Institute of Technology was last reviewed and approved by the Board of Regents Committee on Academic Affairs on March 18, 2014.

3.2.2.2 the fiscal stability of the institution

Compliance

The institution documents that its Board of Regents is authorized to allocate and distribute state allocations among the institutions under its control in such a way and manner and in such amounts as will further an efficient and economical administration of each institution within the university system. The Board of Regents is charged with approving the budgets for each institution in the system, including the Georgia Institute of Technology. System institutions are directed to prepare operating budgets for review by the Board of Regents and the chancellor of the university system and are allowed to amend budgets excepting amendments that both exceed $1 million and involve state general fund appropriations. Budgets must be reported quarterly to the system chief financial officer. As a part of its annual report, the institution provides an annual financial report to the Board of Regents. All institutions within the system are audited by the state of Georgia Department of Audits and Accounts. The president of each system institution and the system chief fiscal officer are required to make available all information to the State Auditing Department so that such an audit may be made. The audited financial report is provided to the Board of Regents and published upon completion of the annual audit.

3.2.2.3 institutional policy

Compliance

The institution documents that policies of the Board of Regents applicable to institutions in the university system, including the Georgia Institute of Technology, are clearly set forth in the Board of Regents Policy Manual and related policy and procedure documents. The Board of Regents in turn relies on the chancellor, the presidents of institutions within the system, and their deans and faculties to develop, adopt, and administer academic methods and procedures. Subject to the approval of the president of the institution, the General Faculty Assembly and the Academic Senate are authorized to make statutes, rules, and regulations for its governance and for that of the students. The Georgia Tech Faculty Handbook sets out the principles, policies, and procedures relevant to the functions of the faculty of the Georgia Institute

of Technology, subject to the official policies of the Board of Regents. Principles, policies, and procedures relevant to those aspects of student life that relate to the educational process are set forth in the Georgia Tech Catalog. The Georgia Institute of Technology Policy on Institute Policies provides a common, consistent, and transparent process for Institute policies to be thoroughly reviewed, maintained, and made available to the campus community. Institute policies that establish and align administrative operations, set behavioral expectations across the Institute, and communicate multiple division, department, or office roles and responsibilities are considered administrative policies, which are approved by the president following a campus review process. All institute policies are subject to approval by the president in his capacity as the CEO of the Institute.

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

Compliance

The institution documents that all members of the Board of Regents are subject to the University System of Georgia Ethics Policy, which requires that improper conflicts of interest be disclosed and avoided. These policies apply not only to the actions of the regents individually, but also to the actions of the board as a whole. Members of the Board of Regents are also public officials, who are subject to the state of Georgia Ethics in Government Act. The code of ethics for members of boards, commissions, and authorities precludes members of the board from engaging "in any business with the government, either directly or indirectly, which is inconsistent with the conscientious performance of his governmental duties; or taking any official action with regard to any matter under circumstances in which he knows or should know that he has a direct or indirect monetary interest in the subject matter of such matter or in the outcome of such official action." In addition, Georgia law prohibits members of the Board of Regents from transacting business with the Institute, subject to limited exceptions set forth in the statute. Members of the Board of Regents who have any business transactions with the state are required to file an annual business transaction disclosure.

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)**

Compliance

Comment: The institution documents that by policy, the Board of Regents is "unalterably opposed to political interference or domination of any kind or character in the affairs of any USG institution." All members of the Board of Regents are subject to the University System of Georgia Ethics Policy and its Code of Conduct, which requires that the Board "uphold the highest standards of intellectual honesty and integrity in the conduct of teaching, research, service, and grants administration." Members of the board periodically certify their knowledge of and compliance with the University System of Georgia Ethics Policy. The Office of Internal Audit and Compliance of the Board of Regents monitors compliance with the Ethics Policy and assists members of the Board of Regents in managing conflicts of interest resulting from their service on the board.

Members of the Board of Regents who violate the Ethics Policy are subject to removal; however, there is no known instance in which a member of the board has been removed.

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)**

Compliance

The membership of the Board of Regents is established by the constitution of the state of Georgia and includes one member from each of the 13 congressional districts of Georgia, along with five members representing the state at large. All members are appointed by the governor (who cannot also be a member) and confirmed by the state Senate for seven-year terms. Members of the Board of Regents may be removed if they fail to attend three consecutive meetings of the board without good cause. Georgia law also provides grounds for removing officers of any state board or agency, including the Board of Regents, and provides for notice and appeal in the event that any public official is removed from office. These requirements are implemented and enforced through communication to members of the board regarding their obligations. The secretary to the Board of Regents, Vice Chancellor Burns Newsome, has provided in an attached letter to the institution's Compliance Certification an example of the reasons for which a board member may be dismissed and the process for removal.

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)**

Compliance

By constitutional language, statutory references, and related documents, the institution demonstrates that final authority for governance, control, and management of each institution in the university system rests with the Board of Regents. This authority is designated to the board in both the constitution of the state of Georgia and the Official Code of the state of Georgia. The function and mission of each institution in the University System of is determined by the Board of Regents, and any change in institutional function and mission must be approved by the board. The Board of Regents has delegated the legal authority for implementation of policy and governance of the Institute to the president of the institute. This delegation provides the president with broad discretion to exercise his or her responsibility as chief executive officer. The president is designated as the intermediary between the faculty and the chancellor and the Board of Regents. The Board of Regents relies on the chancellor, the president, and the deans and faculty to develop, adopt, and administer the most effective academic methods and procedures. The faculty, subject to the approval of the president, is responsible for the maintenance of high academic standards and those aspects of student life that relate to the educational process. The Georgia Tech Faculty Handbook describes faculty responsibilities for institutional governance. Specifically, the academic faculty is empowered to develop educational policies and establish

Institute-wide policies on academic matters. It also considers regulations governing student conduct and all phases of student life and student activities.

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

Compliance

The institution's Compliance Certificate demonstrates that Georgia Tech's organizational charts are regularly maintained and updated by the Office of Institutional Research and Planning and published online. This information is also published on an annual basis in Georgia Tech's *Fact Book*. The placement of the Georgia Tech president at the head of the organizational chart is consistent with Section VI of the Board of Regents bylaws assigning the president of each institution as the "executive head of the institution and of all its departments..." Additionally, the Georgia Institute of Technology *Faculty Handbook* acknowledges the authority of the president in the operation and management of the institute, as well as the role of the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia in providing ultimate authority and governance. The organizational charts clearly demonstrate the reporting structure and delineation of responsibility for the administration of policies into three major decision areas within Georgia Tech: the provost and executive vice president for Academic Affairs, representing the academic function; the executive vice president, Administration and Finance, representing the administrative function; and the executive vice president, Research, representing the research function. Additionally, each executive vice president's area publishes a list of subordinate reporting units that communicates each unit's major responsibilities and operations in a way that is clear and easily accessible. The president's cabinet includes the heads of all of the three major decision areas, as well as representation from Institute Communications, Government and Community Relations, and Legal Affairs and Risk Management.

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

Compliance

The Committee's review of the educational and professional qualifications, including curriculum vitae and biographies of the President's Cabinet as well as deans of Georgia Tech's academic units suggests the administrative and academic officers are qualified to carry out their responsibilities. All of the administrative and academic officers have extensive experience in academia and in many cases outside the academy as well and have received numerous honors and awards. They have extensive experience writing for publications in refereed journals and they have been or are currently editors of professional journals. They have authored and co-authored many books and contributed to chapters in several books. These administrative and academic officers have been conveners of symposiums and workshops in addition to being invited lecturers for various short courses and symposium presentations. Additionally, they have been principal and co-principal investigators for a number of grants and contracts.

Form edited July 2014

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

Non-Compliance

The institution publishes policies regarding appointments, employment, and evaluations on its electronic policy library webpage and in the Faculty Handbook. The Office of Faculty Affairs maintains institute records pertaining to faculty employment. The Office of Human Resources maintains institute records pertaining to staff employment. The evaluation process for each employee category occurs annually. The University identifies dates for completion of the process.

However, the review committee was not able to find evidence of implementation of the process of evaluating personnel.

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

Compliance

Comment: The Committee's review of the University System of Georgia, Board of Regents Policy Manual Sections 8.3.5.3, 2.5, and 2.3 that addresses evaluation of personnel senior administrators, presidents authority and responsibilities, and assessment of presidents processes as well as a review of Georgia Tech's Performance Management Policy from the Office of Human Resources indicate that the institution has established a process to evaluate the effectiveness of administrative staff on a periodic basis. The Human Resource policy establishes an annual performance system that applies to all staff positions both administrative and executive. The system has a four phase Performance Management Cycle: planning, managing, reviewing, and rewarding performance. Sample evaluations of key administrative staff were provided. Goals, accomplishments and future goals were submitted to the supervisor, a meeting timeline was established, and a written letter to each direct report regarding their performance along with a recommendation for merit increase (if applicable) was given.

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)**

Compliance

Comment: The SACS Compliance Certificate demonstrates that Georgia Tech's intercollegiate athletic programs are conducted through the Georgia Tech Athletic Association, a nonprofit corporation that, by state law, is legally separate from the institution. The institution is a member of the Atlantic Coast Conference. The most recent compliance review, conducted by the conference in December 2008, concluded that "The organization is structured in such a way that the president has ultimate authority in matters involving the Athletics Association." The Athletic Association is

controlled by a Board of Trustees, which includes the president and the executive vice president for Administration and Finance of Georgia Tech, 11 members appointed by the president (eight faculty and three alumni), and three students. The three students include a representative student-athlete and the undergraduate and graduate student government presidents. The president of Georgia Tech serves as chair of the Board of Trustees of the Athletic Association. As chair of the Athletics Association Board of Trustees, the president has ultimate responsibility and authority for the operations and personnel of the athletics program as they relate to the National Collegiate Athletics Association (NCAA) and the Atlantic Coast Conference. The faculty athletics representative is appointed by the president in consultation with the Executive Board of the faculty. The faculty athletics representative meets annually with the Academic Senate to make a presentation on the state of the intercollegiate athletics programs, including contributions to the education mission of the Institute; statistical information on the academic performance of the participants in the programs; compliance with all institutional, conference, and NCAA regulations; and other matters of concern in the planning and implementation of the programs. At the direction of the president, oversight of the compliance and academic advising functions within athletics is shared between the director of Athletics and other institutional officials. The associate athletic director for compliance has secondary responsibility to the vice president for Legal Affairs and Risk Management and is expected to collaborate closely with the vice president and consult with him on compliance office policy, operations, and related substantive issues. The associate athletic director for Student Services has secondary responsibility to the vice provost for Undergraduate Education and is expected to consult with the vice provost on Academic Support services policy, operations, and related substantive issues. Operationally, while the director of Athletics is hired with the approval of and responsible to the Board of Trustees of the Athletic Association, he is an Institute employee who reports directly to the president and is responsible for planning, developing, administering, and advancing the Institute's intercollegiate athletic programs.

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

Compliance

The president (chief executive officer) supervises the vice president for Development, who oversees the Office of Development. The Institute has a written policy for fundraising. The policy was revised August 2012 and is scheduled for review August 2015. The policy states that
"The Office of Development is charged to secure private support to meet the Institute's strategic goals and objectives. All Vice Presidents, Deans, School Chairs, Department Directors, faculty, and staff initiating efforts to obtain gifts or private, non-contractual grants must coordinate their efforts with the Office of Development through their respective assigned Development Officer…"

As stated in the Institute policy, the Office of Development is charged with the principal role of private sector fundraising and seeking the understanding and support of the Institute and its programs. The office directs the efforts of central, unit, international, and athletics development, including the solicitation of private gifts and commitments from individuals and organizations such as corporations and foundations and

coordinates each of the institutional unit's goals to ensure 1) consistency with the Institute's mission and priorities as dictated by the president of the Institute and 2) the viability of the goals, taking into consideration each unit's fundraising history, prospect pool, and available resources to be applied to the fundraising enterprise. The vice president presents the goals to the president and executive leadership team of the Institute for their review and input. The Alexander-Tharpe Fund Board is the fundraising advisory board for the Georgia Tech Athletic Association but does not have any fundraising responsibility. The Institute president is an ex-officio president and voting member of the Alexander-Tharpe Fund Board and chair and voting member of the Georgia Tech Athletic Association. The vice president for Development is secretary of the Alexander-Tharpe Fund Board. The Georgia Tech Foundation is the 501(c) 3 organization that receives funds on behalf of the Georgia Institute of Technology but does not have any direct fundraising responsibilities.

3.2.13 For any entity organized separately form 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)**

Compliance

Georgia Tech has 12 cooperative organizations that are separately organized and subject to this comprehensive standard. These entities exist pursuant to the University System of Georgia Board of Regents *Policy of Manual, Section 12.5.* The Committee examined the evidence presented for each organization including but not limited to the Bylaws, Articles of Incorporation, and the current Memorandum of Understanding. As listed below, the Committee found that the documentation substantiated the Institute's compliance with the standard for each entity.

	Legal Authority and Operating Control Clearly Defined	*Relationship and Liability Clearly Described in Formal Written Manner*	*Demonstrate Control of Fund-Raising Efforts or Defined in Formal Written Manner*
Georgia Tech Alumni Association	Yes, Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws, and Executed Memorandum of Agreement	Yes, Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws, and Executed Memorandum of Agreement	Yes, Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws, and Executed Memorandum of Agreement
Georgia Tech Athletic Association	Yes, Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws, and Executed Memorandum of Agreement	Yes, Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws, and Executed Memorandum of Agreement	Yes, Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws, and Executed Memorandum of Agreement

Georgia Tech Research Corporation	Yes, Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws, and Executed Memorandum of Agreement	Yes, Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws, and Executed Memorandum of Agreement	Yes, Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws, and Executed Memorandum of Agreement
Georgia Tech Applied Research Corporation	Yes, Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws, and Executed Memorandum of Agreement	Yes, Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws, and Executed Memorandum of Agreement	Yes, Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws, and Executed Memorandum of Agreement
Georgia Tech Foundation, Inc.	Yes, Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws, and Executed Memorandum of Agreement	Yes, Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws, and Executed Memorandum of Agreement	Yes, Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws, and Executed Memorandum of Agreement
Georgia Advanced Technology Ventures, Inc.	Yes, Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws, and Executed Memorandum of Agreement	Yes, Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws, and Executed Memorandum of Agreement	Yes, Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws, and Executed Memorandum of Agreement
Georgia Tech Facilities, Inc.	Yes, Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws, and Executed Memorandum of Agreement	Yes, Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws, and Executed Memorandum of Agreement	Yes, Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws, and Executed Memorandum of Agreement
Georgia Tech Global, Inc.	Yes, Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws, and Executed Memorandum of Agreement	Yes, Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws, and Executed Memorandum of Agreement	Yes, Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws, and Executed Memorandum of Agreement
The Global Center for Medical Innovation, Inc.	Yes, Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws, and Executed Memorandum of Agreement	Yes, Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws, and Executed Memorandum of Agreement	Yes, Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws, and Executed Memorandum of Agreement
Southern Light Rail, Inc.	Yes, Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws, and Executed Memorandum of Agreement	Yes, Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws, and Executed Memorandum of Agreement	Yes, Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws, and Executed Memorandum of Agreement
Home Park Learning Center, Inc.	Yes, Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws, and Executed Memorandum of Agreement	Yes, Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws, and Executed Memorandum of Agreement	Yes, Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws, and Executed Memorandum of Agreement
Georgia Tech Lorraine	Yes, Articles of Local Civil Code currently applied in the Department of Moselle as introduced by the	Yes, Articles of Local Civil Code currently applied in the Department of Moselle as introduced by the	Yes, Articles of Local Civil Code currently applied in the Department of Moselle as introduced by the French Civil Code

Form edited July 2014

	French Civil Code of June 1st, 1924, Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws, and Executed Memorandum of Agreement	French Civil Code of June 1st, 1924, Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws, and Executed Memorandum of Agreement	of June 1st, 1924, Articles of Incorporation, Bylaws, and Executed Memorandum of Agreement

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)**

Compliance

The institution maintains extensive policies concerning ownership of intellectual property. These policies meet the requirements of the Board of Regents of the University system and apply to students, faculty, and staff. The policies are readily accessible online, and several units on campus provide training and guidance on the subject. As a condition of employment, faculty, staff, and any students working on externally funded research projects must execute an agreement that assigns intellectual property rights in accordance with university policies. The university proactively assists employees with commercialization of intellectual properties.

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

Non-Compliance

The institution addresses the documentation of institutional effectiveness through the Online Assessment Tracking System (OATS), the Academic Program Review system, or through Specialized Accreditation Review. Programs with specialized accreditation by ABET submit an alternative reporting template to OATS. Nearly all of the 127 Bachelor's, Master's, or Doctoral degree programs listed on the Institutional Summary Form were represented in the OATS. Beginning with the 2006 report, the institution requires updates to the assessment reports every two years. Prior to 2006, assessment reports were updated annually. Assessment reports covering 2001 – 2013 were available for review and suggested a mature assessment process that has evolved with institutional needs over time. With respect to student learning outcomes, the committee found that much of the information on Institutional Effectiveness contained within the 2013-14 Academic Program Review Self-Studies seemed to be largely a re-statement of the information in OATS

The Committee's review of 2013-14 program assessment reports tracked through the OATS, revealed that in general, expected outcomes were clearly identified and

specified the knowledge or skills that students were expected to attain in each program. However, multiple outcomes were nearly always compacted within a single objective and the measures often did not address the individual outcomes suggesting a level of inadequacy among the measures of assessment. Notable exceptions to this statement pertain to programs using the ABET-mandated program outcomes. Furthermore, the committee found that many programs relied heavily on student perceptions of teaching effectiveness through exit surveys and alumni surveys rather than on more direct measures of student learning.

The committee found only occasional evidence of definitions of "success" or acceptable levels of attainment in achieving expected outcomes thus, hampering the institution's ability to assess the "extent" to which the outcomes were achieved. Program assessments following the ABET program outcomes comprised the majority of the programs that had defined acceptable levels of attainment. Most programs presented some data, but often, the data were presented with limited detail and with little comparative data. The institution indicated that some comparative data were available through the ADORS system. However, most data within the ADORS were student perception data.

Within the 2013-14 assessment reports, the committee noted that improvement plans often centered on further discussions with the faculty to determine the actual changes to take place, focused on changing the assessment tool, or lacked specificity with statements such as "…deficiency in the area of Sustainability .. must be addressed." Again, the evidence that improvements were planned or had occurred based on analysis of assessment results varied considerably among the programs and ranged from demonstrating a strong link between assessment and changes made or being made to improve student learning to not demonstrating that such a link exists.

Educational programs offered off-site of through online options have the same student learning outcomes as their on-campus counterparts. The institution has an appropriate process for monitoring differences in achievement levels between the distance program and the on-campus program.

3.3.1.2 administrative support services

Non-Compliance

The institution's definition of administrative support services was restricted to services provided by units within the Division of Administration and Finance, as well as select units reporting to the Office of the President or the Office of the Provost.

The institution asserts that administrative units outside of the Division of Administration and Finance began using the OATS to track outcomes and assessment activity in AY 2013-2014. The committee did not find any reference to assessment efforts that may have been in effect prior to 2013. Three units were listed for the Office of the President. Within the narrative, one example was provided for each of two units. The examples presented goals of completing action items and did not indicate that the units identify expected outcomes, assess the extent to which those outcomes were achieved, or implement changes for improvement based on the analysis of results. The committee reviewed the reports for the three units in the OATS. These reports were

more complete than the examples provided in the narrative and demonstrated that these three units were beginning to identify expected outcomes, assess the extent to which those outcomes were achieved, or implement changes for improvement based on the analysis of results. The Office of Development presented action plans that were largely restatements of the goal. The Office of Institute Communications provided a plan articulating strategies and metrics for measuring the extent to which the outcomes of the measures had progressed, but few analyses or resulting action/improvement plans were found.

Five units within the Office of the Provost were identified as administrative services units. One outcome from one unit (the Office of Assessment) was presented along with assessment results, improvement actions and subsequent assessment of the outcome. The committee also reviewed the five assessment plans housed within the OATS for the administrative services units within the Office of the Provost. The quality of the five reports varied considerably. One plan was very strong while the other four demonstrated difficulty in defining expected outcomes in measurable terms.

The division of administration and finance comprises six business units covering 19 functions. Information on institutional effectiveness was provided for five of the six units (Campus Services, Legal Affairs and Risk Management, Institute Planning and Resource Management, Facilities Management, Information Technology). The institution noted that each unit within the unit had developed their own methods for planning and assessment that made tracking and reporting progress difficult. A new, standardized process and report is being implemented in 2014/15.

The committee reviewed business plans for the Campus Services units. Each plan covered five years and listed 5 – 20 objectives with as many as 60 tactics each. Data provided within the narrative of the compliance certificate and the text of the business plans provide evidence that a small number of assessments were made, often through the use of the Annual Customer Satisfaction Survey. While some units included analysis of the results and subsequent actions meant to result in improved achievement of the objective, other units used boiler-plate that was present in the business plans for the last three years referencing that the results of the survey were analyzed and corrective solutions presented.

Business plans or assessment reports could not be found for 12 of the remaining 13 functions identified within the Division of Administration and Finance. The narrative provided anecdotal information regarding one to three improvements in each of these 12 functions but it was not clear that these improvements were done in response to stated expected outcomes and the analyses of assessment results related to the extent of achievement of that outcome.

3.3.1.3 academic and student support services

Compliance

The institution identified 16 units within the Division of Student Affairs as units providing academic and student support services. In addition, the institution identified the Center for Academic Enrichment, the Center for Career Discovery and Development and the

GT 1000, as well as the Georgia Tech Library, as programs within the Office of the Provost involved in providing academic and student support services.

Assessment reports were provided for 15 of the 16 Student Affairs units in the OATS. The committee did not find an OATS report for the Dean of Students and the link to the OATS report for the Women's Resource Center appeared to be broken. The Veteran's Resource Center and the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, Queer/Questioning, Intersex and Asexual/Ally Resource Center are new additions to campus, and assessment plans are under development. The committee reviewed the remaining 12 assessment reports. Overall, the reports had defined and measurable learning outcomes and the assessment plans were, for the most part, cogent. All reports included descriptions of reasonable processes for evaluating the achievement of the learning outcomes. Mixed methods and different kinds of assessment inquiries were used depending on the expected outcome. While the reports varied in the presentation of results, there was evidence that the assessment and the (sometimes unstated) assessment results were the drivers behind the articulated improvement plans.

The committee found that the Georgia Tech Library has a mission statement and strategic objectives. The library leadership analyzed its assessment needs and eventually formed an assessment committee that coordinates and consults on assessment projects. Data gathered from a variety of assessment activities (including a decade of LibQUAL surveys, use statistics, advisory groups, etc.) informed the development of strategic objectives. Based on its strategic objectives, the library is making or has made major changes related to collections, services, spaces, and technology in order to meet users' needs more effectively. Among these are a shift from print to electronic resources and subsequent adjustments in service delivery, the Library Renewal project (renovation of spaces), and enhancing access to new technologies. The library is tracking progress in achieving its strategic objectives and is establishing mechanisms to make assessment findings as transparent as possible.

In addition to the Georgia Tech Library, three units reporting to the Office of the Provost were mentioned in the narrative. The committee found that the assessment of the GT 1000 appeared to be contained within the assessment report of the Center for Academic Enrichment. The Committee reviewed the three reports and found that the institution stated expected outcomes; in most cases, conducted assessments to determine the extent to which the unit had attained the outcome; and used the assessment results to instill changes aimed at improving the attainment of the outcome.

Students taking credit courses through distance education have access to most student support services. Examples of student services available to distance students were provided. Production services are monitored and assessed among distance students to ensure quality video communication. In addition, student satisfaction is monitored and significant differences between on-campus student satisfaction and distance student satisfaction are investigated and addressed.

3.3.1.4 research within its mission, if appropriate

Compliance

Research is a central part of the institution's mission and strategic plan. The institution's strategic plan states that one of the five over-arching goals of the institution is "Sustain and Enhance Excellence in Scholarship and Research". The institution provided information on institutional effectiveness process at the institution-wide level through the Institute Research Strategy; at the college or degree program level, through the Academic Program Review Process; and at the undergraduate experience level, through the Undergraduate Research Opportunities Program.

The Office of the Executive Vice President for Research provides central administration leadership for all research units within the institution and initiated a campus-wide effort to formulate a strategic plan to support the institution's research enterprise. Despite a listing of research centers that the Executive Vice President for Research oversees, the committee did not find assessment in those centers. However, the committee did find evidence of the assessment of the overall effectiveness of the research function. While goals and objectives were quite process-oriented and not necessarily focused on eventual outcomes, they seemed appropriate given the relative newness of the Executive Vice President for Research and the research strategic plan. There is adequate evidence of a strategic approach, and measures are typically counts and hosted events, consistent with the process-oriented goals of the plan. Evidence was also presented that clearly demonstrated that the Executive Vice President for Research annually evaluates the impact of the action plans from the previous year and uses data to determine if those plans should continue.

The committee found that the institution had a well-documented Academic Program Review process that required the inclusion of a report on Research and Scholarship in the program's self-study. The template of the Academic Program Review does describe a data-driven assessment process that should provide the institution with the basis to make good assessment decisions. The Academic Program Review examples provided in the text seem to demonstrate the tracking of key performance indicators in support of the overall research goals of the institution. While the Academic Program Review self-studies usually did not provide expected outcomes or objectives, the small number of examples discussed in the narrative summarized a rather large quantity of data. In each case, data was summarized to describe research dollar volume, enrollment/degree metrics, publications, patents, professional service and other common measures to illustrate a healthy program. These four examples demonstrate that performance data is available to drive decisions and that these four units have used made changes to improve performance in general. The number of examples provided was very small, and a review of other 2013/14 Academic Program Review self-studies not cited as examples revealed that there were inconsistencies in institutional effectiveness practices among departments, but overall, there appeared to be evidence that, in support of institution-level goals, data were reviewed, decisions were based on those reviews and those decisions were re-evaluated during the next Academic Program Review cycle.

The committee reviewed the 2011 QEP Impact Report and noted that the establishment of the Research Thesis Option and the Undergraduate Research Opportunities Program had involved specific expected student learning outcomes that were clearly articulated, measured and analyzed. "Support" courses were modified based on the assessment results and assessment continues.

3.3.1.5 community/public service within its mission, if appropriate

Compliance

The institution focuses its outreach mission to helping educate Georgia's youth in the areas of science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM). The committee reviewed information provided relative to the Center for Education Integrating Science, Mathematics, and Computing, the Institute for Computing Education, and the Office of Leadership and Civic Engagement.

The committee reviewed a report for the Center for Education Integrating Science, Mathematics, and Computing documenting the collaborators, funding, and project descriptions for a wide variety of programs and grants that broadly impact K-12 STEM education. While it was difficult to determine the overarching goals and objectives for the Center for Education Integrating Science, Mathematics, and Computing, the documentation did provide abundant evidence that expected outcomes, measures, results, and improvement plans were articulated for many of the Center's projects.

The committee also reviewed documentation provided relative to the Institute for Computing Education. Two goals of the Institute for Computing Education were presented in measurable terms, but no data was presented showing that the overall effectiveness of the institute was being assessed. However, one of those goals was clearly supported by the two examples provided in the narrative. For each of the two examples, expected outcomes, assessment measures, results, and descriptions of how those results were used for improvement were concisely articulated in the document, providing adequate evidence of institutional effectiveness processes within the Institute for computing Education.

The Office of Leadership and Civic Engagement oversees the Community Service program. The committee reviewed the relevant portions of the Division of Student Affairs Institutional Effectiveness report and determined that outcomes were identified and that assessment of those outcomes was used to drive improvements in attaining the expected outcome.

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)**

Not Applicable

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)**

Compliance

Georgia Tech has a well-defined process for approval of those educational programs for which it awards credit. New program proposals are initiated by faculty and reviewed within the department and college curriculum committees and by the college dean and approved through faculty governance. Administrative review and approval are carried out by either the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education or the Vice Provost for Graduate Education and Faculty Affairs. Institutional review includes the Institute Curriculum Committee and the Academic Faculty Senate. As part of the University System of Georgia, Georgia Tech also submits new programs for approval to the Georgia Board of Regents. The University System Academic and Student Affairs Handbook (BoR Policy Manual 3.6.1) defines the review process for the creation of new academic programs, including those involving distance education.

The process of new program, course, or minor approval or program revision is managed through the Institute Curriculum Committee website under the administrative control of the Registrar. Posts of the minutes from the meetings of both the undergraduate and graduate curriculum committees show the actions presented and votes taken by the members of the committees on all curricular changes. Course syllabi are also posted on this website. Committee agendas are archived on the site, which also provides templates and guidance for the program approval process.

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

Compliance

The Institution's mission is for technological change that is fundamental to the advancement of the human condition. Its continuing education, outreach, and service programs are selected in fields related to the focus of the institution – science, technology, and their related fields, thus satisfying compliance with this standard.

The Institution is in the forefront of developing not-for-credit professional development courses in the MOOCs (Massive Open Online Courses) and is partnering with a for-profit educational technology company to make these courses available to a global audience. The Institute has developed 38 MOOCs – e.g., control of mobile robots; survey of music technology; health information in the cloud, computational investing.

A language institute includes an intensive English program that helps students in 40 countries to improve their communication skills in English and thus contribute to the mission of the Institution.

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

Compliance

Comment: The Committee's review of Georgia Tech's mission, Board of Regents Policy manual section addressing admission standards, the Undergraduate Admission website that publishes the Competitive Admission policy, the Office of Graduate Studies website that outlines the graduate and professional schools admission policies

and procedures, the online Georgia Tech Catalog which also includes undergraduate and graduate admission information, indicate Georgia Tech's admission policies are in agreement with the institutions stated mission.

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)**

Non-Compliance

Georgia Tech annually publishes the established policies and procedures of the Institute and of the University System of Georgia relevant to undergraduate and graduate students in the Catalog, and policy and procedure information is maintained by the registrar's office and is also available in the Policy Library and on the Office of Undergraduate Admission website. The basic policy regarding the acceptance of courses by transfer is to allow credit for courses completed with satisfactory grades (C or better) at other accredited colleges and universities in the United States and Canada, provided the courses correspond in time and content to courses offered at the Georgia Institute of Technology. Coursework completed at colleges and universities outside the United States and Canada is evaluated on a case-by-case basis. The registrar's office maintains the Transfer Equivalency Table.

Students entering Georgia Tech may receive college credit based upon test scores taken in conjunction with designated high school advanced placement classes, SAT Subject Tests, International Baccalaureate Credit, and/or Georgia Tech departmental exams. The Institute also maintains an internal advanced standing examination policy through which students can earn credit for prior learning. There is no Institute policy awarding credit for experiential or professional certificate achievement. The criteria for the awarding of credit are clear, published, and accessible to students. Georgia Tech publishes policies that include criteria for evaluating, awarding, and accepting credit for transfer, credit by examination and advanced placement that is consistent with the University System of Georgia Academic & Student Affairs Handbook as well as the Institute's mission and motto of "Progress and Service."

There is one area where the Institute failed to provide sufficient evident to demonstrate compliance with this standard. While it is stated that "Georgia Tech ensures that coursework and learning outcomes are at the collegiate level and comparable to the institution's own degree programs," it is not clear exactly how the institution assumes responsibility for the academic quality of any course work or credit recorded on the institution's transcript but earned at institutions or organizations outside the United States (including joint degree programs).

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)**

Compliance

Georgia Tech maintains an online policy library. It aggregates in one place access to Board of Regents policies, academic, administrative, student and research policies. The site is easily searchable and covers all major academic policy areas including satisfactory academic progress, course withdrawal, grade substitution, grade appeals, hour loads for graduate students, and academic integrity. Policies are organized into a Faculty Handbook, the Georgia Tech Catalog, and other handbooks and policy collections. Policies under consideration are posted for review and newly approved or revised policies are posted prominently. Thus, policies are available to all constituents. The Office of Institute Communications sets standards for Institute publications and is responsible for maintaining up-to-date information on programs and other elements of the website.

Faculty governance follows standard practice. The process for developing academic policies is contained in the Faculty Handbook and gives the faculty responsibility for the development of comprehensive educational policies and regulations including admissions, grading standards, degree requirements, and general regulations on student conduct. Academic policies are developed and recommended by faculty standing committees. The committees publish their minutes, which are reviewed by the Academic Faculty Senate. Administrative responsibility for academic affairs resides with the provost. The provost and vice provosts develop policies and procedures for the administration of academic affairs in collaboration with the faculty.

Periodic academic program review is conducted for degree programs at all levels every 7-10 years. The Office of Assessment plans the reviews in conjunction with the colleges and the Faculty Executive Board. Written results of the self-study and external evaluation are conveyed to the dean, provost, and Faculty Executive Board.

Policies for Distance Education are the same as those for residential programs and are developed under the guidance of the dean of Professional Education and the dean of the relevant college.

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)**

Non-Compliance

Per the policy published in the Institute's Catalog, Georgia Tech operates on a semester calendar with 15 weeks of instruction, in which 50 minutes of class attendance per week is considered one contact hour and one unit of credit. The working unit of credit definition is most three-hour classes meet three times per week for 50-minute periods, for a total of 2,250 minutes (3x50x15); or classes meet two times per week for 80-minute periods, for a total of 2,400 minutes (2x80x15).

The off-site review team could not locate documentation to address how the institution awards credit for courses delivered in an alternative format, such as distance learning. The policies that determine the level and amount of credit awarded for undergraduate and graduate course work delivered through distance learning technology were not addressed.

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)**

Non-Compliance

The institution fails to provide adequate evidence to affirm appropriate quality of educational programs and courses offered through consortial relationships or contractual agreements in dual and joint international programs with non-accredited international partners. While example letters of agreement for three relationships are provided, Peking University in Biomedical Engineering, Seoul National University in Mechanical Engineering, and Tianjin University in Electrical and Computer Engineering, these agreements do not incorporate processes or evidence that the institution is ensuring the quality of credits recorded on transcripts. The SACSCOC document entitled "Agreements Involving Joint and Dual Academic Awards: Policy and Procedures" states that when evaluating, accepting, and transcripting credits awarded through an agreement involving dual or joint academic awards, the member institution must ensure several criteria, such as examine courses transferred in and transcripted from partner institutions to ensure that they meet the requirements of the member institution and assess and monitor effectively courses and components completed through instruction by partner institutions. There was no evidence presented to demonstrate compliance with these criteria.

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)**

Compliance

The Georgia Institute of Technology does not award credit for experiential or professional education. In addition, the Professional Education division of the Institute requires students to sign an enrollment agreement to ensure that they understand they cannot convert such coursework into academic degree program credit.

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

Compliance

Academic support services at Georgia Tech are designed to promote student and faculty success. The services are central to the mission of the institution and provide suitable support for both teaching and learning. Various campus units offer a variety of programs. The Center for Academic Success offers academic advising, tutoring, coaching, and success workshops and resources. Academic advising also occurs in the following campus offices: Pre-Health Advising, Pre-Law Advising, Pre-Teaching Advising and Student Athlete Academic Support Services. The Office of Minority Education (OMED) and the Office of Hispanic Initiatives also provide academic coaching in addition to retention and intervention programs. The Center for Career Discovery and Development provides career counseling and information regarding internships and cooperative education. The Office of Disability Services assists students with disabilities needing testing accommodations. The Office of Scholarships and Financial Aid provide scholarship, grants, and fellowship information. The LEAD program incorporates leadership training and coaching initiatives. The Honors Program, Grand Challenges Program and the ThinkBig Living Learning Program provide living learning experiences for students. The Student Alumni Association and Women in Engineering Program have mentoring programs to nurture and prepare students for careers. The Fellowships Office helps students identify and apply for competitive fellowships and awards. The Center for Academic Enrichment, the Office of New Student and Sophomore Programs, the Veterans Resource Center, the Freshman Experience Program, OMED's Challenge Program, and the Office of Graduate Studies offer orientation and transition programs targeted to special student populations. Undergraduate research and student innovation opportunities and support are offered through the Undergraduate Research and Opportunities Program. A new undergraduate learning commons was established in 2011 to encourage collaborative study and small group interactions.

Students and faculty on the Georgia Tech Lorraine campus in Metz, France, also access the services on the Atlanta campus. A support person in Metz assists with the coordination of these services. The Georgia Tech Professional Education office provides support to both graduate and undergraduate online learners. Specifically, online orientation, student handbook and sample lectures are provided. Students also receive academic advising, and a support person assists with connecting these students with appropriate departments and university officials.

Academic Services for faculty can be found in the following units: Center for the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning, Communication Center, Office of Faculty Affairs, Georgia Tech Academic Advisors Network, Office of Postdoctoral Services, Office of Information Technology, the Technology Support Center, the Office of Educational Technology, and the Faculty and Graduate Student Ombuds Program. Additionally, the Office of the Executive Vice President for Research provides research support to faculty.

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

Compliance

This institution maintains standing faculty committees that enable faculty to have primary responsibility for degree requirements, course development, and program

development. Primary responsibility for undergraduate matters resides in the Institute Undergraduate Curriculum Committee and for graduate matters in the Institute Graduate Curriculum committee. Through these committees, the faculty leads both the development and approval of new courses and programs and modification to existing courses and programs. The institution maintains ongoing programs to assess the quality and effectiveness of individual courses and programs. The faculty are engaged in ongoing evaluation of the assessment data.

*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)**

Compliance

The institution describes appropriate procedures and policies for assigning responsibilities for academic program coordination. The institution also describes the duties of the academic program coordinators.

A review of the program coordinators noted several cases where the coordinator's terminal degree was not the same as the program. However, in viewing vitae and publications, sufficient evidence is presented regarding the qualifications of program coordinators.

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)**

Compliance

The institution's strategic plan incorporates the use of technology as an essential component for accomplishing its mission.

All entering undergraduate students are required to own a laptop computer. Through the university's secure Web-based portal (BuzzPort), students have access to a wide array of academic, administrative, and productivity/collaborative tools. The university's learning management system (T-Square) had 1,245 sites during the 2013 fall semester. Using T-Square, faculty can create syllabi, post resources, and communicate with their classes; students can collaborate and post assignments.

Each entering student is assigned an academic advisor, and these advisors can find numerous resources through the Georgia Tech Academic Advisors Network. Students themselves can track their progress toward completion to degree through a program called Degree Works. BuzzPort also provides a personalized library resource function that links each student to an appropriate subject expert within the library.

The Office of Technology supports all centrally scheduled classrooms and conference rooms. The university currently has 534 technology-enhanced classrooms. The

Clough Undergraduate Learning Commons, which opened in 2011, is adjacent to the library and is open 24 hours most of the week. It contains a variety of learning spaces and presentation rehearsal labs. Additional learning commons and a Multimedia Studio are located in the library, and students can also borrow technology devices through the library. Specialized labs (gaming labs, computing labs, a business-oriented lab, etc.) can be found throughout campus.

In addition to productivity software, students can utilize a range of specialized software. Examples include the VLAB with a focus on engineering, architecture, and mathematics; the Trading Floor in the School of Business; and software in the School of Modern Languages. Students across disciplines can participate in the Capstone Design Expo, where they work in teams to develop prototypes with real-world applications.

The Center of the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning (CETL) and the Office of Educational Technology assist faculty in incorporating technology into their classes.

The campus has a wireless network that covers nearly every building on campus and busy outdoor areas. It has a robust Ethernet-based IP network, and its Virtual Private Network provides a secure connection for remote access to digital resources and services.

Students can receive one-on-one assistance in the learning commons and labs. Through BuzzPort, they can also take self-paced training in subjects such as website design and graphic design. The library, individual campus departments, the Office of Information Technology, and CETL all offer technology training.

The Georgia Tech infrastructure meets the needs of distance education students; the Georgia Tech Professional Education (GTPE) unit provides support for students and faculty involved in distance education. Technical assistance is available for all students and faculty 24/7 (Buzz Service).

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

Non-Compliance

General Education competencies were defined by the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia in 2009. Nine learning goals were defined along with an overlay of learning goals on U.S. Perspectives, Global Perspectives, and Critical Thinking. The learning outcomes are required to be collegiate level, not skills based, and broadly focused. Georgia Tech adopted its core curriculum in response to these competencies in 2011. The institution's competency areas are: communications, quantitative outcomes, humanities/fine arts/ethics, natural sciences, social sciences, development and implementation of algorithms (an institutional option), and the three overlay areas. The definitions of the competencies are consistent with expectations for baccalaureate programs. The curriculum assessment has been implemented over the past three years. The competency areas are assessed in specific courses, generally by embedding questions in course exams, but also in the case of written communications by sampling of student portfolios and evaluation against a rubric. Faculty members

define the nature of the assignment, performance expectations, and changes made in response to the results. Critical thinking is assessed with the California Critical Thinking Skills Test. Georgia Tech also administers the NSSE survey and an exit survey, which provide indirect information on some competencies. Data were provided to indicate the success of students in meeting the benchmarks for performance for all general education goals.

For direct assessment of General Education competencies, the report provided numbers of assignments assessed, but the report lacked information on, or an explanation for, the sampling process for the assessments.

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)**.

Compliance

The Georgia Institute of Technology publicizes and enforces a residency rule requirement which exceeds the 25 percent minimum requirement for undergraduate degrees. This requirement is enforced through the academic advising process, electronic monitoring via DegreeWorks, and degree audits conducting by the registrar's office when a student applies for graduation. As evidence of enforcement of this policy, the institution present a tabular summary by student of hours earned at Georgia Tech, the number of hours for the degree granted, and the total number of transfer credits. This table included graduates in all three degree lists for academic year 2013-14 with no exceptions to the 25 percent credit hours requirement noted. A sample DegreeWorks audit report was provided indicating all of the degree requirements satisfied as a further illustration.

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)**

Compliance

The Institution has its catalog online, as well as having each individual college with online listing of its undergraduate degree requirements. These are updated annually, and as needed. The core requirements are grouped into 6 areas (writing /quantitative reasoning; computer science; humanities/fine arts; natural sciences/Mathematics/Technology; social sciences; lower division courses related to the Major). The lower division courses requirement is so constructed that the student has more support for their major. There is a coherent connection between the general education requirements and the major.

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)**

Compliance

The minimum percentage of course hours taught by faculty holding the appropriate terminal degree is 44.8% on the main campus (course ML), 39.4% on the Lorraine campus, 29.8% in Studies Abroad, and 62.7% in Online/Video courses. Other percentages were significantly above 50%.

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)**

Compliance

The institution effectively demonstrates evidence of processes to meet this standard and clearly define the more advanced content and rigor of post-baccalaureate degree programs at the master's and doctoral program levels.

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)**

Compliance

The Institution offers graduate curricula leading to both MS and Ph. D degrees. The MS degree requires at least 30 semester hours of specific graduate level courses that fosters knowledge of the appropriate literature and leads the student into research or appropriate training. The Ph.D. degree requires the passing of a comprehensive exam and original research requiring accurate knowledge of published literature in that research area. In general while there are no fixed course requirements for the Ph.D., some disciplines will require some specific course sequences that must be completed. Sometimes a Ph.D. student must also show proficiency in another area of research.

The Institution presents a sampling of 41 particular courses in various Departments from among the Colleges of the Institution [Liberal Arts, Computing, Engineering, Business, Architecture, and Sciences], as well as their catalog course description, to show how they promote student engagement in research and appropriate professional practice and training experiences.

There is an Academic Program Review that examines at least every 10 years the graduate program's effectiveness and relevance in assessing outcomes, and ensuring that the curricula are consistent with the expectations of higher education institutions. There is also a periodic accreditation of many of the graduate degree programs by appropriate professional certifying agencies.

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)**

Compliance

The Georgia Institute of Technology publicizes and enforces a policy which limits the amount of transfer credits applicable to graduate degrees. This policy exceeds the requirement that at least one-third of credits towards a post-baccalaureate professional degree must be earned through the institution. This requirement is enforced through the academic advising process, electronic monitoring via DegreeWorks, and degree audits conducting by the registrar's office when a student applies for graduation.

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)**

Compliance

The institution provides solid evidence that it defines and publishes requirements for each graduate and post-baccalaureate professional program of study, and that it employs an appropriate process for determining what coursework is included and why it is appropriate. Data, programmatic/specialized accreditation reports, and external program reviews were made available.

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)**

Non-Compliance

Georgia Tech follows the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia policy on the minimum employment qualifications for academic ranks. The terminal degree in the appropriate discipline, evidence of teaching ability, and evidence of scholarly ability and activity are considered in faculty appointments. Georgia Tech has specific qualifications and criteria for appointment, promotion and tenure as well as criteria for the non-tenure earning research faculty who specifically support the research mission of the institution. Appointments are made through the Office of Graduate Education and Faculty Affairs and the Office of Faculty Affairs where transcripts showing the highest degree earned are maintained. In 2013, Georgia Tech undertook an audit of

faculty credentials and began digitization of faculty credentials, a project that is still underway. Information on faculty expertise is also maintained through GTS scholar, although this appears to be a voluntary activity. There is a defined approval process for teaching assignments for instructors of record and for the granting of grading privileges. Colleges are responsible for assuring the credentials of graduate teaching assistants. Instructors of record are evaluated regularly and graduate teaching assistants assigned classes are provided with both evaluation and support.

The faculty roster was provided for each college and contained information about teaching assignments, the highest degree earned, and many narratives about specific qualifications. Based on this information, Georgia Tech has many distinguished faculty who appear to be generally well matched to their teaching assignments. Potential exceptions are listed on the faculty roster. For example, in modern languages, Georgia Tech employs a number of heritage speakers with varying credentials. It is not clear that they have the pedagogical training for effective language instruction.

Although the narrative described the general qualifications of the faculty in each college, there were no files provided containing transcripts, curriculum vitae, or teaching evaluations making it impossible to confirm the qualification of the faculty listed in Appendix C. (See Request for Justifying and Documenting Qualifications of Faculty)

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)**

Non-Compliance

Comment: This Institution, in 2014, organized its faculty into two groups: (1) academic [both tenured and non-tenured] positions, and (2) research [only non-tenured] positions. Every faculty member is evaluated annually and receives a written evaluation from the chair, to which he can make a written response. The evaluation and any responses becomes part of the faculty member's record. Evaluation is based on instruction, creativity and service. A tenure decision must be made on a faculty member who has completed 6th year of service. Post-tenure reviews are also mandated. Part-time faculty are evaluated for their teaching just as a full-time faculty member.

Whereas the processes are described in detail, the off-site review team could not find direct evidence that these processes have actually been implemented.

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

Compliance

The institution provides a wide range of professional development opportunities for faculty to support their teaching and research activities. Grant funds are available to support innovation in research and education, to support meetings, and to encourage

innovation and collaboration. Faculty research awards are also available for teaching, research, and mentoring. The Office of the Executive Vice President for Research maintains a website with information on these initiatives. Other programs and awards are supported by the Center for the Enhancement of Teaching and Learning. Programs address the needs of faculty at all levels. Workshops offered by the Center attract 40-60 faculty/day. Events celebrating teaching and sharing best practices attract 200 or more participants. The Office of the Vice President for Graduate Education and Faculty Affairs is responsible for providing faculty support for the reappointment, tenure and promotion process. In addition an Institute for Leadership and Entrepreneurship offers programming to enhance values based leadership. Faculty members engaged in Distance Education have support through the Georgia Tech Professional Education office. Most of these programs are open to all faculty members. Those programs that are competitive, e.g., awards and grants programs, have defined processes for selection.

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

Compliance

The institution has articulated a principle of academic freedom that recognizes and guarantees the first amendment freedoms and encourages the exercise of these rights. The Faculty Handbook affirms the rights of faculty "to freely express their opinions on any matter that falls within the field of knowledge that they are employed to teach and study, subject to high standards of professional ethics, accurate expression and respect for the rights, feelings, opinions of others." Policies and procedures in the Handbook affirm that appointments and decisions on salaries, promotion, and tenure are made on the basis of professional merit. A Faculty Status and Grievance Committee is available to hear the grievances of faculty who believe that their rights have been infringed. An Institute Ombuds Office serves to provide confidential advice on the handling of complaints. Finally, the University System of Georgia has a system-wide Faculty Council that provides a voice for the faculty on matters pertaining to topics including academic freedom, tenure, and post-tenure review.

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

Compliance

The Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia developed and maintains policy that delineates specific responsibility and authority to the faculty and the president of the university to make statues, rules, and regulations for governance and to prescribe regulations governing the academic enterprise. This system requirement is further embellished in the Institute's Faculty Handbook which documents establishment of key standing committees including: the Faculty Executive Board, the Academic Faculty, the Research Faculty, the Academic Faculty Senate, and the Research Faculty Senate. The Institution provided evidence documenting the faculty role in governance through a link to a faculty governance website. This website provides links

to key governance policies and archives of elections, agendas, and minutes of the various standing committees.

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)**

Compliance

The Georgia Tech Library has developed both physical and online environments to meet the needs of its users.

Physical facilities include a main library, an architecture library, an archives reading room, and an undergraduate learning commons adjacent to the main library. The library offers a "one-stop" approach for users seeking assistance through service desks at the main library and the undergraduate learning commons. The library is open 24 hours a day during much of the week.

Examination of evidence shows that the physical spaces have been designed to support the work of groups and individuals. Technology and software are accessible throughout the facilities; among the offerings are presentation rehearsal studios, classrooms, quiet and group study spaces, and a multi-media studio. Spaces are flexible and have been designed to encourage innovation, the use of technology, and collaborative learning. Faculty and students can borrow a range of technology devices. The library's gate count has increased dramatically in recent years as improvements have been made—reaching 1.25 million visits in 2012.

The library's online portal provides access to resources and services, and a mobile version is available. Subject experts play a key role in fulfilling the library's mission, and items located in the online catalog provide convenient links to these individuals.

The library's physical environment continues to evolve, with a "renewal" project planned for the upper floors of the main library in 2015. The relocation of physical volumes to a storage facility shared with Emory will create additional space for services that are in high demand. The library utilizes a variety of approaches to assess facilities and to plan for the future, including surveys, focus groups, advisory boards, and use studies.

For further comments about library resources and services, see Core Requirement 2.9; instruction, Comprehensive Standard 3.8.2; and staffing, Comprehensive Standard 3.8.3.

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)**

Compliance

The Georgia Tech Library has implemented a multi-faceted approach for its instructional program, placing it within the context of its mission statement and

standards promulgated by the Association of College and Research Libraries. Subject specialist librarians play a key role in working with faculty to develop students' competence in information literacy.

Face-to-face instruction ranges from broad orientation sessions, to course- or resource-specific overviews, to librarians embedded within courses, to walk-in workshops open to anyone. The library's website provides access to many tutorials and to over 200 research guides developed by subject experts. The program reaches students early in their studies through intensive work with the first-year English series, and recent offerings have targeted the graduate student population. The library utilizes a number of delivery mechanisms to make instruction for distance education students convenient and accessible.

The university has recognized the importance of providing appropriate space for library instruction with dedicated classrooms, a multi-media studio, Library West Commons, Library East Commons, and the Wayne Clough Undergraduate Learning Commons. These spaces are equipped with hardware, software, and furniture to support interactive, collaborative learning.

Statistics for the last five years reflect a steady increase in the number of formal sessions offered by the library and in the number of participants. Statistics for one-on-one consultations reflect an increase in the number of consultations provided and in the complexity of these sessions. The library is utilizing a wide variety of approaches (print, online calendars, social media, etc.) to publicize the availability of its instructional services.

In individual classes, the library routinely relies upon formative assessments; instructors are moving away from attitudinal surveys to demonstrations that student learning outcomes have been achieved.

For further comments about library resources and services, see Core Requirement 2.9; spaces, Comprehensive Standard 3.8.1; and staffing, Comprehensive Standard 3.8.3.

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)**

Compliance

The library's 137 FTE employees provide a range of services, instruction, resources, and facilities sufficient to support the university's mission. For much of the week the library is open 24 hours a day, and staff members are accessible for both on-campus and distance education students. The library relies heavily on its subject and technical experts in tailoring its offerings to meet the university's needs.

An examination of the roster of the library's 38 faculty positions provides evidence that they are well qualified through their educational backgrounds, experience, or a combination of both to perform their responsibilities. Numerous library faculty hold advanced degrees in subject disciplines in addition to the appropriate library/information science degree.

All staff members have annual performance appraisals, and library faculty are awarded rank based on performance, achievements, and qualifications. This peer-reviewed process is clearly documented.

The library's strategic plan for 2007-2011 included a component on employee development. Statistics provide evidence that employees are taking advantage of internal and external training opportunities, and that they are attending an appropriate range of professional conferences and meetings. Two award programs recognize exemplary performances by faculty and classified staff.

LibQUAL survey results (2003-2013) and undergraduate exit surveys indicate that the library's employees are meeting or exceeding users' expectations.

For further comments about library resources and services, see Core Requirement 2.9; spaces, Comprehensive Standard 3.8.1; and instruction, Comprehensive Standard 3.8.2.

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)**

Compliance

The Committee's review of Georgia Tech's Student Code of Conduct, Student Honor Code, and Student Faculty Expectations found in the Georgia Tech 2014-2015 Catalog, and the Office of Student Integrity Website indicate the institution publishes a clear and appropriate statement regarding student rights and responsibilities. New students are directed to the Honor Code and Student Code of Conduct during New Student Orientation. The Office of Academic Integrity has administrative responsibility for facilitating violations of the Student Code of Conduct. The Division of Student Affairs distributes a brochure that has information about the Office of Student Integrity and the Academic Honor Code and the Student Code of Conduct.

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).**

Compliance

Georgia Tech has adopted a comprehensive set of policies and procedures designed to comply with federal laws and regulations protecting personally identifiable student information. Access to student information is granted through the guidelines of the data access policy and procedures supported by the Office of Information Technology. The Office of the Registrar is responsible for maintaining student academic records and other student related documents. The Office of the Registrar adheres to Georgia Tech's policies and procedures by enforcing and maintaining signed FERPA agreements prior to releasing student information. The office publishes policies online as well as provides training to the campus community regarding FERPA rights and responsibilities and other information.

Georgia Tech has an Office of Internal Audit that establishes procedures that require owned network devices that have been compromised must file a report. The office also provides information on the process for managing data breaches. The institution also has an Incident Response Program that manages breaches of the security policy. Student data is protected against disruptions by a use of a multi-tiered disaster recovery strategy. The Office of Information Technology keeps two separate data centers in two different campus locations in the event of a major disruption that could affect one of the centers and employs a number of strategies designed to address security, confidentiality, and integrity of electronic data.

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)**

Compliance

The Committee's review of Georgia Tech's mission, the Division of Student Affairs programs and services, the Electronic Verification of Staff Credentials, as well as a review of the annual Performance Appraisal Record process indicate the institution has a suitable number of staff with appropriate experience to provide the various student support programs and services provided by 18 departments. The Division of Student Affairs employs 94 full-time employees and has a Professional Development Committee that plans programs to assist in the professional development of all staff.

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

Compliance

Georgia Tech's fiscal strength, as reflected in unrestricted net assets, has been improving in spite of many pressures. For FY 2008-09 through FY 2012-13, the Institute received total state budget reductions of $99.7 million, 35 percent of the FY 2008-09 base state funding. As reflected in the unaudited financial statements, state appropriations increased $15.2 million in FY 2013-14. However, overall revenue for FY 2013-14 decreased by $27.9 million compared to the previous year.

The net decrease in revenues was primarily a result of a $60.8 million decline in gifts, grants and contracts. The unaudited financial report does reflect a $67.0 million increase in net position for FY 2013-14 including a $37.6 million increase in net investment in capital assets and a $21.3 million increase in unrestricted funds.

Tuition and fees revenue has been the stable source of new revenue, increasing by $135.5 million, or 89.3 percent, from FY 2008-09 to FY 2013-14. The cumulative result has been a $425.45 million increase (39.2%) in the Institute's total net position from June 30, 2009 to June 30, 2014 (based on unaudited financial statements).

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

Compliance

As a participant in federal and state financial aid programs, Georgia Tech is subject to various Title IV federal and state audits and reviews. The State of Georgia Department of Audits and Accounts' audit report expresses an unqualified opinion on the financial statements of Georgia Tech for the year ended June 30, 2013, and has issued reports on internal control structure and compliance with laws and regulations based on its audit of the financial statements dated December 12, 2013. No significant deficiencies in internal control over financial reporting were reported by the State of Georgia Department of Audits and Accounts. No instances of noncompliance material to the financial statements of Georgia Tech were reported as a result of the audit. There were no Federal Award Findings or Questioned Costs included in the reports.

Pursuant to the most recently completed Office of Management and Budget Circular A-133 audit (OMB A-133), Georgia Tech is in compliance with the federal requirements for the year ended June 30, 2013. The audit opinion was issued by Cherry Bekaert, LLP, an independent auditor. The audit specifically included the Student Financial Assistance Cluster totaling $99,826,145 of expenditures from federal awards. The total amount of expenditure of federal awards subject to review was $642,657,260.

For FY 2012-13, Georgia Tech processed 7,248 awards for state funds for student financial aid totaling $42,272,098. In March 2012, the Georgia Student Finance Commission (GSFC) conducted a compliance review of Georgia Tech. The State of Georgia Department of Audits and Accounts' audit report expressed an unqualified opinion on the financial statements for the year ended June 30, 2013. There were no significant deficiencies in internal control over financial reporting.

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

Compliance

Based on the Committee's review of the biographical information provided, Georgia Tech's key financial leaders have the appropriate skills and credentials to steward George Tech's financial resources.

With regard to policies and responsibilities, all public colleges and universities within the University System of Georgia (USG) operate under common statutory and policy requirements as described in the USG Business Procedures Manual. The manual contains the essential procedural components that each institution must follow to meet both Board of Regents policy mandates and the statutory or regulatory requirements of the state of Georgia and the federal government. For example, the manual sets forth the required uniform and effective procedures of accounting, budgetary control, internal checks and audits, inventory controls, and business practices.

In addition, Georgia Tech has a well-established internal audit function that performs compliance audits and provides various consulting services. In alignment with best

practices, Georgia Tech's Chief Audit Executive directly reports to the President and the USG's Chief Audit Officer.

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

Compliance

Georgia Tech's sponsored research expenditures, direct and indirect, totaled $787,133,307 for FY 2012-13. Georgia Tech's academic units, the Economic Innovation Institute, Georgia Tech Professional Education, and the Georgia Tech Research Institute (GTRI) perform these research activities. GTRI represents the largest component of sponsored research programs with expenditures of $296,747,496 or 37.7 percent. GTRI focuses on applied research and development. The College of Engineering is responsible for the second largest segment of Georgia Tech's sponsored research expenditures.

Pursuant to the most recently completed Office of Management and Budget Circular A-133 audit (OMB A-133), Georgia Tech is in compliance with the federal requirements for the year ended June 30, 2013. The audit opinion was issued by Cherry Bekaert, LLP, an independent auditor. The Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards included a Research and Development – Cluster totaling $518,981,781 of federal expenditures for the fiscal year. The OMB A-133 audits for the past five years did not contain any federal award findings or questioned costs.

Georgia Tech maintains a comprehensive Policy Library website and the Office of Grants and Accounting website is especially robust with regard to easy access to policies and procedures including manuals and notices, industry standards and regulations; a comprehensive administrative calendar; training opportunities; and Frequently Asked Questions.

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

Compliance

The State of Georgia General Statutes requires the Institute to be accountable for all equipment under its control. Management of assets is administered by the Property Control Department of the Business Services unit. Colleges and departments are responsible for ensuring the physical security of all property; tagging items valued at $3,000 or more; preparing property reports as required; and documenting and reporting all acquisitions, disposals and changes in the status of unit equipment using a perpetual inventory system.

The perpetual inventory system provides:
- Equipment control and accountability through a comprehensive campus-wide inventory system.
- Improved equipment utilization through control and identification of capital assets.

- Database to meet University, state and federal grant, and audit requirements.
- Database to meet requirements of proper risk management, and
- Basis for identifying equipment for the State's self-insurance program.

Georgia Tech has a comprehensive policy on the disposal of property. Policy No. 7.9 concisely describes the process for disposal of non-inventoried supplies and materials; inventoried equipment and materials; and non-inventoried equipment and materials. In addition, it includes specific instructions related to equipment purchased with federal or state funds.

With regard to deferred maintenance, Georgia Tech is in the process of transitioning from a Facilities Management generated major repair plan to building specific Facility Condition Assessments (FCAs) to determine and prioritize deferred maintenance projects. The Committee reviewed a list of completed deferred maintenance projects, which reflect regular repair, maintenance, replacement and renovations over the past decade. A list of future projects was also reviewed.

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)**

Compliance

Georgia Tech's main campus occupies over 400 acres in Atlanta, Georgia. Per the Campus Safety Report, Georgia Tech is an open campus; access to the campus is not restricted. Safety and security is a key concern at all of Georgia Tech's campuses.

The Georgia Tech Police Department (GTPD) has over 80 sworn police officer positions and was recently accredited by the Commission on Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies. The Crime Prevention Unit within the GTPD offers a range of services including:

- Security and Safety Education and Awareness Presentations
- Facility Security Assessments
- Citizen's Police Academy
- Property/Bicycle Registration

The Georgia Tech Emergency Notification System (GTENS) is a communications system that allows urgent messages to be distributed to students, faculty, and staff in a matter of minutes, via email, voice mail, and text messages. Messages will also be posted on the GTPD Emergency Preparedness Facebook and Twitter pages, and on many TV monitors across campus.

In addition to the main campus, the GTPD protects and serves the Georgia Tech-Savannah instructional site. Georgia Tech-Savannah uses a security company that works in conjunction with GTPD after-hours and on weekends. The Institute contracts security services for its other instructional sites.

*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)**

Compliance

Georgia Tech has developed, implemented and maintained impressive multifaceted plans to develop and maintain adequate facilities. Appropriateness and adequacy of physical facilities are ensured through master planning, appropriate repair and renovation activities, ongoing facility condition assessments, routine preventive and maintenance activities, maintaining energy conservation, and providing a sufficient technological infrastructure. The Institute's assessment techniques are comprehensive and include customer satisfaction surveys and various comparisons to peer institutions. The Committee found that the Institute is adequately planning and constructing new facilities; repair, renovation, and replacement.

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))**

Compliance

The institution reports that it had failed to report to SACSCOC the termination of six dual degree programs, which had previously been approved. These six dual degree programs were each in combination with an international institution and it is stated that each of these programs did not enroll a student. The institution has now submitted the notification to SACSCOC of these terminations. These were apparently discovered during the submission of an additional notification to create an off-campus site for the delivery of a MS in Electrical and Computer Engineering at Shenzhen, China. A prospectus for the latter has been submitted and has been approved, with an on-site review being scheduled for the near future.

The institution describes a recently approved and published policy and procedures it has put in place to prevent overlooking the need for future substantive change notifications. While late developments, these appear adequate.

3.13. 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.

Non-Compliance

The report lists only one program that is subject to a Department of Education recognized specialized accreditor, the National Association of Schools of Art and Design. The date of the most recent reaffirmation with NASAD is given, but the institution has not provided copies or evidence of how it has described itself to NASAD.

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.

Compliance

The institution has several joint and dual academic program (collaborative) arrangements and it appears that these have all been reported to SACSCOC. Copies of SACSCOC approval letters are provided.

*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.

Non-Compliance

The institution has published student complaint procedures that are reasonable. This evidence is presented in reports for standards 4.5.

The institution has a policy (apparently recently adopted) and procedure for receiving complaints against the institution via an ethicpoint web site. This policy appears to relate to complaints of non-compliance with SACSCOC standards. The institution states that it is not aware of any complaints filed against it. It is not clear whether this complaint reporting system received, or is designed to receive, other types of complaints against the institution. Further, no information is provided as to the office that will receive the complaints, the review process for complaints, and where records of the complaints will be maintained.

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.

Documentation: In order to be in compliance with this policy, the institution must have incorporated an assessment of its compliance with standards that apply to its distance and correspondence education programs and courses.

Compliance

The institution included a review of its distance education programs throughout the compliance report.

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.

Not applicable

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.

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.***

Not applicable

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)**

Compliance

The institution publishes its accreditation status in its online catalog and Fact Book, with appropriate approved language.

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)**

Compliance

The institution's primary method for documenting student success at the program level is accomplished through the assessment of student learning outcomes through the OATS and through the Academic Program Review self-studies. In February 2014, the institution established five key student achievement indicators, four of which reflect institution-wide efforts. The student achievement indicators reflect the teaching and learning portion of the institution's mission. Freshman first-year retention rates, six-year baccalaureate graduation rates, eight-year doctorate graduation rate, and employment rates reflect students from across the institution. The fifth indicator, pass rate for the Fundamental of Engineering (licensing) Exam reflects achievement of students in engineering, specifically, Civil Engineering or Mechanical Engineering.

The committee reviewed documentation that indicated data on three of the five metrics have been collected and reviewed for several years. The institution provided multiple reports confirming that an annual retention and graduation report for freshmen and undergraduate transfer students is produced each fall and that alumni survey reports are produced every three to five years. Regular review of licensing exam pass rates was less thoroughly documented, but noted as assessment measures in the two Academic Program Review self-studies cited as evidence. The institution does not have a long history of reviewing the eight-year graduation rate for doctoral students because the measure has only recently been defined at a national level.

*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)**

Compliance

The institution's curriculum is consistent with its mission. The institution offers programs that lead to the BS, MS and Ph. D degrees. The courses offered, at each level, have the appropriate linkage to the mission and goals of the Institute. As the faculty develop courses these courses are reviewed for approval by the Board of Regents, as described in report 2.7.2, keeping the mission and goals of the Institute in mind. Thus science, technology and innovation are foremost in each course. The Board of Regents requires comprehensive academic review at least every seven years for the undergraduate programs while at least every 10 years for the graduate programs.

In the distance learning program, the MS degree is offered online in nine fields. All these online program requirements are consistent with the same program that is offered on-site at the main campus. This is also true for the international sites.

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

Compliance

The institution publishes its academic calendar (for multiple years), grading policy, and tuition refund practices and schedule on its registrar's or bursar's web site.

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

Compliance

Program length is established in accordance with the policies of the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia. Minimum credit hours are established by the Regents for baccalaureate and masters programs. Limits on credit hours are also established and cannot be exceeded without permission of the System academic officer. Program length is determined during the process of planning, development, and approval, or revision of a program. Reviews are conducted at the school and college level, the Office of Undergraduate Education or Graduate Education, the Institute Undergraduate or Graduate Curriculum Committee, and the Academic Senate. External reviews include the University System Office of Academic Affairs, the Board of Regents, SACSCOC, and specialized accreditors. Lists were provided for the credit hour requirements of all baccalaureate and masters programs. In those cases in which the number of required credit hours exceeded the maximums, the authority for the number of hours was cited. Although the Board of Regents does not set limits for doctoral degrees, a table with links to the programs of study was provided. Degree programs sampled from all the colleges provided published programs of study appropriate to doctoral education.

*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)**

Compliance

The institution states four general categories of student complaints/appeals: 1) those associated with student code of conduct; 2) appeals for exceptions to academic rules and regulations; 3) academic complaints sent to the provost's web site; and 4) complaints related to federal requirements (e.g., sexual harassment, disability services, FERPA)).

For each general category, evidence is presented that the institution a) has an appropriate policy, b) adequately disseminates information about the policy or means to appeal/complain, c) has implemented the policy, and d) has a record of cases.

For example, appeals for exceptions to academic rules (e.g., grade appeals) involve dissemination of the policy as part of the online catalog. It is stated that a standing committee received one formal appeal in 2010-11 and a redacted record of the outcome was presented. In another example involving appeals by graduate students to exceptions to rules and regulations, a larger number of petitions is indicated, with most resolved administratively.

The report also gives examples of student complaints involving disability assistance and sexual harassment.

The institution has provided convincing information to support its compliance with this federal standard.

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

Compliance

The institution takes reasonable measures to assure the accuracy of its recruiting materials. Several examples of recruiting brochures and web sites are presented. Undergraduate recruitment materials are developed primarily by the Office of Undergraduate Admissions, working with the Office of Enrollment Management and Communications. The institution describes steps taken to train its recruiters and the consistent use of a common set of recruiting slides.

Graduate recruitment is more decentralized, but is coordinated by the Graduate School. Graduate recruitment tends to be Web based, with some traditional brochures. The Graduate School office attempts to assure consistency via communications with graduate coordinators and by hosting a "best practices" workshop on recruiting.

*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)**

Compliance

The Committee reviewed documentation from the U.S. Department of Education including the Title IV Federal Financial Aid Programs Eligibility and Certification Approval Report (ECAR) and the Title IV Federal Financial Aid Program Participation Agreement (PPA). In addition, federal and state audit reports do not contain any findings or questioned costs related to compliance with the administration of Title IV financial aid.

*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.

Compliance

The dean of Professional Education is responsible for ensuring that a student who registers for a distance or correspondence course is the student who participates and receives credit for the course or program. Georgia Tech has extensive experience in delivery of programs through technology and uses secure logins and passwords and proctored examinations monitored by individuals screened and approved by Georgia Tech Professional Education staff. Clearly defined policies are in place to govern the nomination and selection of proctors. ProctorU, an online proctoring service is used for the online master's in Computer Science. The same policies for authentication and authorization and vetted human proctors apply to residential and distance education students.

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

Non-Compliance

Educational records for students enrolled in distance education courses and programs are maintained, managed, and protected by the Registrar's Office under the same policies that apply to residential student privacy and data security. These policies are published and in compliance with FERPA regulations. Georgia Tech provides extensive resources to train faculty and staff about FERPA requirements. Annual notifications are provided directing faculty and staff in Professional Education to the FERPA policy and training materials. Georgia Tech has external partners for the delivery of some online programs. The narrative does not describe the relationship of these partners to the privacy and data security policies and processes of the campus.

4.8.3 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.

Compliance

Costs associated with the verification on online student identity are posted on the Georgia Tech Professional Education website and are published in the Online Student Handbook distributed to all registered students each semester. Georgia Tech does not charge students for authentication and verification, but

does alert students to the fact that some proctoring services may results in an additional charge.

*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)**

Non-Compliance

The institution provided a comprehensive definition of the length and appropriateness of a credit hour in a traditional delivery setting. This definition was compliant with the federal definition of the credit hour. It was also comparable to the definition used at peer institutions. However, inadequate evidence was presented to determine compliance in the appropriateness of awarding credit for courses and programs outside the commonly accepted delivery modes in higher education, such as distance learning, intersession, joint degree courses, study abroad options, etc.

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

Part III. **Assessment of the Quality Enhancement Plan**

To be completed by the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee.

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

B. **Analysis of the Acceptability of the Quality Enhancement Plan**

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

2. ***Focus of the Plan***. *The institution identifies a significant issue that (1) focuses on learning outcomes and/or the environment supporting student learning and (2) accomplishes the mission of the institution.*

3. ***Institutional Capability for the Initiation, Implementation, and Completion of the Plan***. *The institution provides evidence that it has sufficient resources to initiate, implement, sustain, and complete the QEP.*

4. ***Broad-based Involvement of Institutional Constituencies***. *The institution demonstrates the involvement of its constituencies in the development and proposed implementation of the Plan.*

5. ***Assessment of the Plan***. *The institution identifies goals and a plan to assess the achievement of those goals.*

C. **Analysis and Comments for Strengthening the QEP**

Form edited July 2014

Part IV.   **Third-Party Comments**

To be completed by the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee.

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.)*

  1.   Describe the nature of the Comments and any allegations of non-compliance that may have been part of the formal Third-Party Comments;

  2.   Indicate whether the Committee found evidence in support of any allegations of non-compliance.

  If found to be out of compliance, the Committee should write a recommendation and include it in Part II under the standard cited with a full narrative that describes why the institution was found to be out of compliance and the documentation that supports that determination. In this space, reference the number of the Core Requirement, Comprehensive Standard, or Federal Requirement and the recommendation number cited in Part II.

  If determined to be in compliance, explain in this space the reasons and refer to the documentation in support of this finding.

APPENDIX A	
Roster of the Off-Site Reaffirmation Committee	**Roster of the On-Site Reaffirmation Committee**

Dr. Maurice R. Eftink – **CHAIR**
Associate Provost
University of Mississippi
 	
Dr. Roger G. Brown
Chancellor (Retired)
 	
Dr. Kathleen R. Brown
Director, Planning and Research
  for the NCSU Libraries (Retired)
 	
Dr. Kristen H. Bush
Assistant Provost
Institutional Research and Effectiveness
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State
  University
 	
Dr. Paula P. Carson
Professor of Management
University of Louisiana Lafayette
 	
Dr. Maxine T. Davis
Assistant Vice Chancellor for Student Life
University of Tennessee
 	
Dr. David H. Huddleston
Professor
Department of Civil and Environmental
  Engineering
Tennessee Technological University
 	
Dr. Joan F. Lorden
Provost and Vice Chancellor for Academic
  Affairs
University of North Carolina - Charlotte
 	
Ms. Angela S. Martin *
Vice President for Financial Planning
  and Chief Budget Officer
University of Kentucky
 	
Dr. Linda L. Vahala (Absent)
Associate Dean
College of Engineering and Technology
Old Dominion University	

Form edited July 2014

| **SACSCOC Staff Coordinator**
Dr. Cheryl D. Cardell
Vice President, SACS Commission on Colleges

*Finance Evaluator | |

APPENDIX B

Off-Campus Sites or Distance Learning Programs Reviewed
(Refer to "Directions for Completion of the Report of the Reaffirmation Committee.")

Form edited July 2014

APPENDIX C

List of Recommendations
Cited in the Report of the Reaffirmation Committee
(Refer to "Directions for Completion of the Report of the Reaffirmation Committee.")

Form edited July 2014

Request for Justifying and Documenting
Qualifications of Faculty

Institution: Georgia Institute of Technology

For each of the faculty members listed below, the committee either found the academic qualification of the faculty member to be inadequate and/or the institution did not adequately justify and document the faculty member's other qualifications to teach the identified course(s). For each case, the committee checked the column appropriate to its findings and provided additional comments if needed to clarify the concern.

The institution is requested to submit additional justification and documentation on the qualifications of each of the faculty member listed. When responding, the institution should use the Commission's "Faculty Roster Form: Qualifications of Full-Time and Part-Time Faculty" and its "Instructions for Reporting the Qualifications of Full-Time and Part-Time Faculty," which can be accessed under the Institutional Resources tab of the Commission website: *www.sacscoc.org*. Read the instructions carefully and pay close attention to the section "Providing Information that Establishes Qualifications." The completed form, or similar document, should be included as part of the institution's formal response to the Commission.

1	2	3	4	5
Name of Faculty Member	**Course(s) in Question**	**Inadequate Academic Qualifications**	**Insufficient Justification of Other Qualifications**	**Comments** (if needed)
Houssami, Rima	ARBC1001 Elementary Arabic I		x	Native speaker, qualifications do not necessarily suggest adequate pedagogical experience in second language instruction
Gall, Lionel Bruno	FREN 1001 Elementary French I		X	"
Huang, Hsin Wei	CHIN1001 Elementary Chinese I		x	"
Kuhne, Anne Marie	FREN1002 Elementary French II		x	"
Lee, Jong Hyun	KOR 1001 Elementary Korean I		x	"
Nassereddine, Ragheda	ARBC 1001 Elementary Arabic I		x	"
Hovorka, Christopher	#6209 Clinical Pathology #6983 Upper Limb Orthotics	X		PhD candidate. Need more justification for teaching graduate level courses
Kistenberg, Robert	#6971, #6981, #6985	x		M Public Health Need more justification
	#6975, #6223, #6982,	x		MS Need more

Lucas, Benjammin	#6984			justification
Bongiorno, Angelo			x	His vita should give publications from 1996 (his Ph. D in Physics) to 2004 to show his transition (?) from Physics to Chemistry
Hud, Nicholas			x	Publication list appears incomplete in his vita; more information is needed to document the transition from his Ph. D Engineering Physics to Chemistry.
Grodzinsky, Klara	Math 8801 Special Topics		X	More justification is needed for teaching a graduate level course, since terminal degree is MS
Baerlecken	Architecture (all assigned courses)	X		No terminal degree in field and insufficient evidence of other professional experiences or credentials determine qualifications to teach courses
Jones, Brian	Computing (all assigned courses)	X		No terminal degree in field and insufficient evidence of other professional experiences or credentials determine qualifications to teach courses
Odom, Joel	Computing (all assigned courses)	X		No terminal degree in field and insufficient evidence of other professional experiences or credentials determine qualifications to teach courses
Perumalla	Computing (all assigned courses)	X		No terminal degree in field and insufficient evidence of other professional experiences or

Form edited July 2014

				credentials determine qualifications to teach courses
Royal	Computing (all assigned courses)	X		No terminal degree in field and insufficient evidence of other professional experiences or credentials determine qualifications to teach courses
Burgess, R.	Business (all assigned courses)	X		No terminal degree in field and insufficient evidence of other professional experiences or credentials determine qualifications to teach courses
Campe	Business (all assigned courses)	X		No terminal degree in field and insufficient evidence of other professional experiences or credentials determine qualifications to teach courses
Giuiano	Business(all assigned courses)	X		No terminal degree in field and insufficient evidence of other professional experiences or credentials determine qualifications to teach courses
Hackett	Business (all assigned courses)	X		No terminal degree in field and insufficient evidence of other professional experiences or credentials determine qualifications to teach courses
Kaligortia	Business(all assigned courses)	X		No terminal degree in field and insufficient evidence of other professional experiences or credentials determine qualifications to teach

Form edited July 2014

				courses
Kilgore	Business (all assigned courses)	X		No terminal degree in field and insufficient evidence of other professional experiences or credentials determine qualifications to teach courses
Pap	Business (all assigned courses)	X		No terminal degree in field and insufficient evidence of other professional experiences or credentials determine qualifications to teach courses

Form Adopted: January 2007

Form edited July 2014