



shining the light

*A Report Card on Georgia's System of
Public Higher Education*

American Council of Trustees and Alumni

shining the light

*A Report Card on Georgia's System of
Public Higher Education*

American Council of Trustees and Alumni
Washington, DC

By Phyllis Palmiero
February 2008

Acknowledgments

This report was prepared by the staff of the American Council of Trustees and Alumni, primarily by ACTA policy director Phyllis Palmiero. Thanks are also in order to senior consultant Dr. Barry Latzer, who researched general education, and ACTA program director Charles Mitchell, who prepared the section on intellectual diversity.

The American Council of Trustees and Alumni is a national non-profit based in Washington, DC, dedicated to academic freedom, academic quality, and accountability in higher education. ACTA has also published: *The Vanishing Shakespeare* (2007); *Intellectual Diversity: Time for Action* (2005); *Governance in the Public Interest: A Case Study of the University of North Carolina System* (2005); *The Hollow Core: Failure of the General Education Curriculum* (2004); *Becoming an Educated Person: Toward a Core Curriculum for College Students* (2003); and *Losing America's Memory: Historical Illiteracy in the 21st Century* (2000).

For further information about ACTA and its programs, please contact:

American Council of Trustees and Alumni
1726 M Street, NW, Suite 802
Washington, DC 20036
Phone: 202.467.6787; 888.258.6648
Fax: 202.467.6784
www.goacta.org • info@goacta.org

contents

	1
INTRODUCTION	
	4
CHAPTER I GENERAL EDUCATION	
	7
CHAPTER II INTELLECTUAL DIVERSITY	
	11
CHAPTER III GOVERNANCE	
BOARD STRUCTURE AND TRANSPARENCY OF OPERATIONS	
BOARD ACCOMPLISHMENTS	
	24
CHAPTER IV COST AND EFFECTIVENESS	
	36
APPENDIX A SELECTION CRITERIA FOR CORE COURSES	
	38
APPENDIX B STUDENT SURVEY DATA	

Introduction

ACCORDING TO A 2007 SURVEY by the National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education, 87 percent of the public believes that a college degree is key to getting ahead. Yet, despite high expectations, public confidence in our institutions of higher education has declined—especially at the state level. Nearly half of the respondents in that survey said that public higher education in their state should be “fundamentally overhauled,” up from 39 percent in 1998. A similar number indicated that college costs are not justified by the education students receive.¹

Parents and taxpayers are frustrated by reports of students who have failed to master the reading, writing, and thinking skills we expect of college graduates. They are searching for evidence of how much or how little students learn at competing institutions. And they are wondering why a third of full-time college graduates don't finish a four-year degree in six years, let alone four.²

The U.S. Secretary of Education's Commission on the Future of Higher Education underscored the challenges in its 2006 report, *A Test of Leadership*. It said that the higher education sector's “past attainments have led our nation to unwarranted complacency about its future.” Our universities have “remained so far ahead of our competitors for so long,” the Commission wrote, that “we began to take our postsecondary superiority for granted.” Meanwhile, other nations are “educating more of their citizens to more advanced levels than we are.”³

Against this backdrop of concern—from the highest levels of the federal government to parents and taxpayers across the country—the American Council of Trustees and Alumni (ACTA) developed this report card on public higher education in Georgia. If our nation is to ensure its continued preeminence, policymakers, trustees, alumni, and taxpayers must know what's going on in higher education. This report card aims to do just that—and it will be followed by others in different states.

It takes a close look at the University System of Georgia (USG), focusing on four key areas of the public's interest: what students are learning (the curriculum), whether the marketplace of ideas is vibrant (intellectual diversity), how

1 John Immerwahr and Jean Johnson, *Squeeze Play: How Parents and the Public Look at Higher Education Today*, a report prepared by Public Agenda for The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education (Washington, DC: 2007).

2 The Secretary of Education's Commission on the Future of Higher Education, *A Test of Leadership: Charting the Future of U.S. Higher Education* (Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, 2006), 12, <http://www.ed.gov/about/bdscomm/list/hiedfuture/reports/final-report.pdf>.

3 *Ibid.*, vi-vii.

the universities are run (governance), and what a college education costs (affordability). Applying the benchmark used by the System's largest institution—the University of Georgia—to determine whether students pass or fail (64 percent), this report card offers a Passing or Failing grade on each point.

The first section focuses on **general education**—those courses completed usually within the first two years of a bachelor's degree program, to ensure a common intellectual background, as well as college-level skills critical to work-force participation. To assess the state of general education, ACTA examines curricula at seven of the state's largest four-year public institutions—representing more than half of the System's four-year students. Are students studying math and science, foreign languages, and literature? Are they graduating with exposure to key areas of knowledge that will help them be informed citizens, effective workers, and life-long learners?

In the second section, we focus on **intellectual diversity**, a value that lies at the very heart of the educational enterprise. In the simplest terms, intellectual diversity means the free exchange of ideas. According to the Association of American Colleges & Universities, it is an abundance of “new knowledge, different perspectives, competing ideas, and alternative claims of truth.”⁴ A scientific survey commissioned by ACTA and conducted by a national polling firm asks students in the classrooms of two major public institutions, the University of Georgia and Georgia Tech: What is the intellectual atmosphere on campus?

The third section turns to **governance** and the USG Regents. By law, the Regents oversee Georgia's 35 public colleges and universities. This means they are responsible—as fiduciaries—for the academic and financial well-being of these institutions and must safeguard the public interest. In this section, we examine how well the board is structured to do its work and what it has actually accomplished. Is the governance process open and transparent? Are the Regents addressing key issues that are central to academic excellence?

Lastly, we take a look at USG in terms of **cost and effectiveness**. In this section, we examine trends in spending and tuition and fee increases, generally over a five-year period. We ask such questions as: Are students graduating in four years? Are institutions seeing better cost management and efficiency of operations? Are performance benchmarks in place?

4 Association of American Colleges & Universities, “Academic Freedom and Educational Responsibility,” a statement from the Board of Directors (2006), 2.

In some places, we find that the System is doing a great job. In other places, we find it doing not so well. The purpose of the report is not to be punitive, but to shine a light on areas of keen interest to students, parents, alumni, and taxpayers. Our report, in sum, is designed to help make the University System of Georgia more *accountable*—to the very people who finance it and whom it serves.

Anne D. Neal
President

CHAPTER I:

System Grade	GENERAL EDUCATION
P	Institutions have strong general education requirements in most core subjects; however, large numbers of Georgia students can graduate without ever taking courses in foreign language, economics, or literature.

“GENERAL EDUCATION” REFERS TO required undergraduate courses outside the student’s specialization or major. These courses, usually completed within the first two years of a bachelor’s degree program, are supposed to ensure a common intellectual background, exposure to a range of disciplines, a core of fundamental knowledge, and college-level skills in areas critical to good citizenship and workforce participation.

To assess the state of general education in Georgia, we looked at the University of Georgia, Georgia Institute of Technology and Georgia State, as well as Kennesaw State, Georgia Southern, Valdosta State, and the University of West Georgia. Together, these institutions represent more than half of the System’s four-year university enrollment. We gauged—using the most recent college bulletins—whether these institutions require their students to take general education courses in seven key subjects that we believe are essential to a strong contemporary liberal arts education: writing (or composition), literature, foreign language, American government or history, economics, mathematics, and physical or biological science.

In order to be counted, the subject in question must be required, not optional. Many colleges around the country give the appearance of providing a core curriculum because they require students to take courses in several subject areas other than their major—the so-called “distribution requirements.” However, a course does not satisfy our requirements when it is simply one of many from which students can pick and choose. Furthermore, to be counted, the course must be a true general education course—broad in scope, exposing the student to the rich array of material that exemplifies the subject. For further details on the criteria used, please see Appendix A.

After researching the institutions, we assigned Passing (P) or Failing (F) grades to the System on each subject. We believe that every Georgia graduate

should be guaranteed exposure to all of the broad areas outlined below. However, applying the same benchmark used by the System's largest institution—the University of Georgia—to determine whether students pass or fail (64 percent)⁵, if five or more institutions required the subject in question—a grade of “P” was awarded. If four or fewer of the institutions surveyed required the subject, the System received an “F.”

On the whole, the System earned a “P”:

GENERAL EDUCATION	
Composition	P
Literature	F
Language	F
American Government/History	P
Economics	F
Mathematics	P
Science	P
SYSTEM GRADE	P

The public institutions surveyed—across the board—deserve praise for having strong general education requirements in composition, math, and science. And all but one require history or government. By contrast, when ACTA surveyed 50 top colleges and universities across the country in 2004, 30 percent did not require composition, 60 percent did not require math, 38 percent did not require science, and only 14 percent required history or government.

Compared to the country at large, the University System of Georgia (USG) is doing well—but there is significant work yet to be done. Not one of the Georgia institutions surveyed has a general education requirement in foreign language; only two (Kennesaw State and Georgia Southern) have an economics requirement; and a mere two (Kennesaw State and Valdosta State) require students to undertake a comprehensive study of literature. As a result, students in Georgia are being deprived of parts of the broad-based, coherent body of knowledge that they need to succeed.

5 The University of Georgia Bulletin, <http://bulletin.uga.edu/PlusMinusSampleGradingScales.pdf>.

The following table summarizes our research.

GENERAL EDUCATION REQUIREMENTS BY INSTITUTION

Institution	Gov/						
	Comp	Lit	Lang	Hist	Econ	Math	Sci
University of Georgia	√					√	√
Georgia Institute of Technology	√			√		√	√
Georgia State University	√			√		√	√
Kennesaw State University	√	√		√	√	√	√
Georgia Southern University	√			√	√	√	√
Valdosta State University	√	√		√		√	√
University of West Georgia	√			√		√	√
GRADES	P	F	F	P	F	P	P

Notes:

Institutions were not given credit for Literature or Foreign Language if these courses were listed among many other options in the Humanities and Fine Arts section of the Core Curriculum or were not required for a majority of students.

University of Georgia. *Students are required to pass an examination on the history of the United States and Georgia, as well as on the constitutions of the U.S. and Georgia. They can be exempted from these requirements by taking specified courses, some of which are narrow in scope, i.e., United States relations with northeast Asia. Accordingly, UGA is not given credit for Government/History.*

CHAPTER II:

System Grade	INTELLECTUAL DIVERSITY
F	Students report that major Georgia universities do not provide an intellectual atmosphere conducive to a robust exchange of ideas.

“IN ANY EDUCATION OF QUALITY, students encounter an abundance of intellectual diversity.”⁶

In 2006, the American Association of Colleges & Universities (AAC&U)—a respected national organization of which the University System of Georgia is a member—issued a statement making that claim.

To experience intellectual diversity, the AAC&U explained, students should be exposed to “new knowledge, different perspectives, competing ideas, and alternative claims of truth.” They should learn to think critically—so that they understand “the inappropriateness and dangers of indoctrination ... see through the distortions of propaganda, and ... [can] assess judiciously the persuasiveness of powerful emotional appeals.”⁷

To make this happen, the AAC&U said students “require a safe environment in order to feel free to express their own views.” They “need the freedom to express their ideas publicly as well as repeated opportunities to explore a wide range of insights and perspectives.” And as part of this process, the AAC&U noted, faculty play a critical role in helping students to “form their own grounded judgments.”⁸

The AAC&U is not alone in voicing these sentiments. The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) cautioned in its 1940 Statement of Principles that faculty “should be careful not to introduce into their teaching controversial matter which has no relation to their subject.”⁹ The AAUP’s 1915 Declaration of Principles is even more explicit:

6 Academic Freedom and Educational Responsibility, 2.

7 Ibid., 2-3.

8 Ibid., 2, 5.

9 American Association of University Professors, “1940 Statement of Principles on Academic Freedom and Tenure with 1970 Interpretive Comments,” http://www.higher-ed.org/resources/AAUP_1940stat.htm.

The teacher ought also to be especially on his guard against taking unfair advantage of the student's immaturity by indoctrinating him with the teacher's own opinions before the student has had an opportunity fairly to examine other opinions upon the matters of question, and before he has sufficient knowledge and ripeness in judgment to be entitled to form any definitive opinion of his own. It is not the least service which a college or university may render to those under its instruction, to habituate them to looking not only patiently but methodically on both sides, before adopting any conclusion upon controverted issues.¹⁰

In recent years, however, anecdotal evidence has suggested that Georgia's public universities are not, in fact, providing students an environment rich with intellectual diversity. For example, in the fall of 2006, over 1,000 copies of a University of Georgia student newspaper were stolen, and its distribution bins were vandalized.¹¹ In 2007, a Georgia Tech display relating to abortion was destroyed.¹² Georgia Tech has found itself in court for what student plaintiffs allege are unconstitutional "speech codes," including one policy—now altered—banning such things as "injurious slogans."¹³ So has Valdosta State, after a student was expelled, allegedly for criticizing the president's proposal for a new parking garage.¹⁴

But anecdotal evidence is only that. In an effort to find out what the intellectual environment is really like, the American Council of Trustees and Alumni decided to undertake a scientific survey of those in the know, namely the students. ACTA commissioned Pulsar Research and Consulting, a national firm

10 General Report of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Academic Tenure (1915), 1 AAUP Bull 17 (1915), cited in *Freedom and Tenure in the Academy*, William W. Van Alstyne, Editor (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 1993), 402.

11 Marnette Federis, "Vandals steal conservative paper at University of Georgia," News Flash in *SPLC: Student Press Law Center*, 29 September 2006, <http://www.splc.org/newsflash.asp?id=1340>.

12 Andrea Jones, "Cross thief hits Georgia Tech," *Cop Briefs* and *The Atlanta Journal-Constitution*, 31 January 2007, <http://www.ajc.com/metro/content/shared-blogs/ajc/copbriefs/entries/2007.01.31.131316.html>.

13 Doug Lederman, "Freer Speech at Georgia Tech," *Inside Higher Ed*, 16 August 2006, <http://insidehighered.com/news/2006/08/16/speech>.

14 Andy Guess, "Maybe He Shouldn't Have Spoken His Mind," *Inside Higher Ed*, 11 January 2008, <http://insidehighered.com/news/2008/01/11/Valdosta>.

headquartered in Hartford, Connecticut, to perform a survey of students at two major Georgia institutions: University of Georgia and Georgia Tech.¹⁵

Based on the standards outlined above, the following table lists key indicators of intellectual diversity and follows them with questions—and answers—obtained from Georgia students in the Pulsar poll. We would expect institutions that are fostering intellectual diversity and adhering to professional standards to garner only minimal complaints. And yet, as shown by the results, substantial numbers of students complained. Notably, the vast majority of respondents described their political views as moderate, liberal, or radical left (75.6 percent). Some 65.5 percent also reported that they studied professional or science topics.

Far from indicating a healthy environment, the student responses underscore a significant perception that many Georgia university classrooms are hostile to a diversity of viewpoints. On key indicators of intellectual diversity, more than a third—and often more than half of the students—reported problems. And in other categories with smaller percentages, the numbers represent thousands and thousands of students who complain about the atmosphere in the classroom. Every ten percent reporting problems represents over 4,000 undergraduates at Georgia Tech and the University of Georgia alone.

Once again, we held the institutions to the grading standard applied by the largest institution in the state: 64 percent or below is a Failing grade (F). Stated another way: For the institutions to receive a Passing grade (P), the percentage of students reporting problems on key indicators had to be less than 36 percent. For this reason, we award the University System of Georgia a Failing grade on intellectual diversity.

15 Pulsar's principal, Christopher Barnes, who oversaw the project, formerly worked for the University of Connecticut and the Connecticut Senate Democratic Caucus and has performed surveys for *TIME* magazine and other well-known institutions. The survey was performed in February 2007 and included 636 students, total, from the two institutions. The margin of error is plus-or-minus four percent. More detailed results are available in Appendix B.

KEY INDICATORS OF INTELLECTUAL DIVERSITY**OFFERING COMPETING IDEAS, DIFFERENT PERSPECTIVES, AND ALTERNATE CLAIMS OF TRUTH****GRADE: F****QUESTION**

“On my campus, some courses have readings which present only one side of a controversial issue.”

RESULT

55.3 percent of students agreed

QUESTION

“On my campus, some panel discussions and presentations on political issues seem totally one-sided.”

RESULT

54.1 percent agreed

QUESTION

“On my campus, some courses present social and political issues in an unfair and one-sided manner.”

RESULT

38 percent agreed

TEACHING STUDENTS TO THINK CRITICALLY**GRADE: F****QUESTION**

“On my campus, some professors use the classroom to present their personal political views.”

RESULT

56.3 percent agreed

QUESTION

“On my campus, there are courses in which students feel they have to agree with the professor’s political or social views in order to get a good grade.”

RESULT

48.5 percent agreed

QUESTION

“On my campus, some professors frequently comment on politics in class even though it has nothing to do with the course.”

RESULT

38.3 percent agreed

OFFERING A SAFE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT FOR STUDENTS**GRADE: F****QUESTION**

“On my campus, there are certain topics or viewpoints that are off limits.”

RESULT

38.6 percent agreed

ENSURING PROFESSIONAL RESPONSIBILITY IN THE CLASSROOM**GRADE: F****QUESTION**

“Do the student evaluation forms of the faculty at your campus ask about a professor’s social, political or religious bias?”

RESULT

74.7 percent said no;
23.6 percent did not know

SYSTEM GRADE: F

CHAPTER III:

System Grade	GOVERNANCE
P	Board Structure and Transparency of Operations The University System of Georgia Board of Regents operates in the open and is well structured to do its work.
F	Board Accomplishments The University System of Georgia Board of Regents keeps busy but could do much more in the way of meaningful accomplishments.

TRUSTEES MUST BE STEWARDS of the public interest, helping colleges and universities provide a high-quality education at an affordable price. They must support their institutions but be prepared to question the status quo. They must trust the president but feel free to seek other sources of information. Even in a world of shared governance, it is trustees who hold the ultimate responsibility for the academic and financial health of their institutions. In the words of Henry Clay, “Government is a trust, and the officers of the government are trustees; and both the trust and trustees are created for the benefit of the people.”

Lay governance is designed to bring the viewpoint of informed citizens to the very heart of the university. However, experience shows that the full promise and actual practice of lay boards are often worlds apart. Some boards rubber stamp administrative recommendations, while others—working closely with administrators—look at the big picture and willingly exercise the authority needed to make tough choices.

The pre-eminence of our system of higher education can be ensured only if there is informed leadership from those who are vested with the financial and academic health of our colleges and universities—namely, college and university trustees.

This section of the report examines the effectiveness of the University System of Georgia’s Board of Regents in exercising its fiduciary duties.

In 1931, the Georgia Legislature created the USG Board of Regents to unify higher education under a single governing authority. The governor appoints

members to the Board, each serving seven years. The Board is composed of 18 members, five of whom are appointed from the state at large, and one from each of the 13 congressional districts. The Board elects a Chancellor who serves as the Board's chief executive officer and the chief administrative officer of the University System.

The Board oversees four research universities, two regional universities, 13 state universities, seven state colleges, and nine two-year colleges.

This section is divided into two parts. **Part I** examines the effectiveness of the Board's structure and transparency of its operations, based on elements viewed as effective governance practices by such organizations as Independent Sector, ACTA's Institute for Effective Governance, the Internal Revenue Service, and the Committee on Finance of the United States Senate. The elements examined include: availability and accessibility of Regents' names and contact information; meeting frequency; member attendance; Board size; the Board's periodic review of its bylaws and/or policies; member engagement in professional development; transparency of the Board's activities and actions; the Board's committee structure including its use of an executive committee; the Board's role in presidential searches and its assessment of the Chancellor and presidents; and the Board's involvement in the development and monitoring of a long-range plan.

Part II examines the Board's actual outcomes with particular emphasis on System-wide academic quality and fiscal accountability. Elements examined include actions the Board has taken to improve academic quality, assess student learning, and control costs. This part also examines whether the items brought by the administration to the Board were ever rejected and whether action items ever received dissenting votes. Both criteria are designed to assess whether Board members are asking questions and engaging the issues thoughtfully as opposed to simply "rubber stamping" administrative/staff recommendations.

In a nutshell, Part I examines how well the USG Board is structured to do its work, and Part II examines what the USG Board has actually accomplished in a given period.

The analysis covers Board actions from June 2005 through June 2007. Board meeting minutes, the Board's Action Report, Board press releases, USG bylaws and policies, and other USG published/web-based documents were examined.

Grading is on a Pass/Fail basis. The University System of Georgia Board of Regents received a Passing grade (P) if the Board, via its formal actions, demonstrated that good governance practices were being implemented. If good governance was not in practice, then the Board received a Failing grade (F).

PART I: BOARD STRUCTURE AND TRANSPARENCY OF OPERATIONS

Governance

Element	Comments
Names and contact information of Regents publicly available and easily accessible Grade: P	To hold a board accountable, the public needs to know and have access to its members. ¹⁶ USG Board members' names, pictures, the district they serve, their term of service, and correspondence address (not a college address) are available and easily accessible on the Board of Regents website at www.usg.edu/regents/members/ .
Board meets frequently Grade: P	A board should meet as often as necessary to conduct its business. ¹⁷ While the necessary number of meetings to conduct business will vary, meeting regularly, at least quarterly, and calling other meetings as necessary, is a good general practice. The USG Board of Regents meets at least eight times a year and calls special meetings as needed [Required pursuant to Bylaws III.1,2].
Board members attend regularly Grade: P	A board that meets to conduct business cannot be effective if a majority of the board members are not present or members fail to attend regularly. ¹⁸ The USG Board's bylaws outline attendance requirements and a process for removal of any Board member who does not meet those requirements [Bylaws I.4]. If a Board member must miss a meeting, he/she requests an excused absence. There is a set protocol for these requirements at the beginning of each meeting, reflected in all minutes in a section entitled Attendance Report. During the review period, USG Board member attendance averaged 92 percent.
Effective board size Grade: P	While there is no magic number for the size of a governing board, an effectively functioning board should have about 15 members. ¹⁹ The USG Board of Regents has 18 members, enabling meaningful subcommittees and substantive examination of issues.

16 Martin Anderson, *Impostors in the Temple* (Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution Press, 1996), 202.
 17 *Principles for Good Governance and Ethical Practice: A Guide for Charities and Foundations* (Washington, DC: Panel on the Nonprofit Sector, 2007), 13.
 18 "Best Practices in University Governance," expert testimony by ACTA's Institute for Effective Governance at U.S. Senate Finance Committee Roundtable Discussion, March 3, 2006.
 19 *Governance in the Public Interest: A Case Study of the University of North Carolina System* (Washington, DC: American Council of Trustees and Alumni, 2005), 57.

Governance

Element	Comments
<p>Periodic review of bylaws and/or policies</p> <p>Grade: P</p>	<p>Periodic review of bylaws and policies helps boards ensure that they are abiding by the rules they have set for themselves.²⁰</p> <p>The USG Board of Regents regularly amends its policies and bylaws. The Board’s standing committee—the Committee on Organization and Law—deals specifically with university organization and laws and regularly brings action items to the full Board.</p>
<p>Pre-service training and/or professional development</p> <p>Grade: F</p>	<p>Regents stand in trust for the institution and the public, and it is important that they be oriented in their new role and receive expert advice from inside and outside the institution. However, training should not cease after orientation. Ongoing professional development can also advance and inform board operations and offer varying perspectives on the issues at hand.²¹</p> <p>Neither Georgia’s statute nor USG Board of Regents policies/bylaws require Board orientation or professional development. The USG Office of the Board Secretary and System staff provide an orientation to all newly-appointed members. Ongoing professional board development appears non-existent.</p>
<p>Transparency of board activities and actions</p> <p>Grade: P</p>	<p>Transparency of operations is an important element of effective governance. The ability of the public to see how the board operates and what it is doing is a critical element to a board’s success.²² Transparency helps the Board communicate with the university community at large and build trust and confidence in the university’s overseers.</p> <p>The USG Board provides advance notice of its meetings on its website. It also provides the meeting agenda in advance. In addition, the Board of Regents’ website has all current and prior meeting minutes, which are very extensive, going back to 1996. In 2005, the Board began publishing a Board Actions Summary that highlights Board actions taken at each meeting. This report is available on the website for all actions taken since 2005.</p>

20 *Principles for Good Governance and Ethical Practice*, 18.

21 “Best Practices in University Governance” and *Principles for Good Governance and Ethical Practice*, 17.

22 *Principles for Good Governance and Ethical Practice*, 12.

Governance

Element	Comments
Functioning committee structure	For a Board to conduct its work effectively and delve into issues in meaningful ways, it should have standing committees with specific roles and duties. ²³
Grade: P	The USG Board has an extensive committee structure including those vital to successful higher education governance. Committees include: executive and compensation, academic affairs, organization and law, finance and business operations, real estate and facilities, internal audit, and strategic planning. Furthermore, the Board has created strategic planning oversight committees charged with overseeing progress on each of the six goals in the strategic plan.
Executive and compensation committees	Executive committees are typically responsible for developing meeting agendas, planning board activities, reviewing compensation and reappointments, and monitoring committee work. In some cases, they also act on emergency or other items when the full board cannot convene. Given the important issues the Executive Committee frequently addresses, it is important that it not represent a quorum so that its actions are not binding on the full board. ²⁴
Grade: P	USG's Executive and Compensation Committee is made up of no more than eight voting members of the Board of Regents and also includes the Chancellor as an ex-officio and non-voting member. This represents less than a majority of the Board—and is good practice. It should be noted that this committee handles presidential and Chancellor evaluations and personnel and compensation matters.

23 "Best Practices in University Governance."

24 Ibid.

Governance

Element	Comments
<p>Involvement in presidential search committees</p> <p>Grade: P</p>	<p>Selecting a president is a board's most important decision. While boards should seek input from higher education's varied consistencies, they should always maintain control over the search process and ultimately the candidates from which they will make their selection. Boards must remember that they hire, fire, and evaluate the chief executive and to delegate or abdicate their most important fiduciary duty is not good governance practice.²⁵</p> <p>The USG Regents maintain a significant amount of control over presidential searches and do not delegate their search authority to others—consistent with best practices. Moreover, the search process is transparent and documented in detail in the Regents' policy manual [Policy Manual: Section 202].</p>
<p>Renewal of Chancellor/presidential contracts based on regular evaluation</p> <p>Grade: P</p>	<p>In addition to selecting the chief executive, evaluating him/her is one of the board's most important duties. Regular evaluations of the chancellor and/or president(s) prior to compensation adjustments and contract renewals or reappointments are important to ensure that board goals are being achieved.²⁶</p> <p>The USG Board of Regents elects institutional presidents at the April monthly meeting for a term of one year. The Chancellor notifies them of their appointment, but the presidents are not entitled to a written employment contract.</p> <p>USG Board policy states the Board's intent to evaluate the presidents on an ongoing basis that consists of open communication between the Chancellor/supervisor and the president on individual and institutional goals and objectives, as well as on methods and processes used to achieve them. Evaluations are supposed to be factored into the annual appointment renewal for each president.</p>

²⁵ *Selecting a New President: What to do Before You Hire a Search Firm* (Washington DC: ACTA's Institute for Effective Governance, 2004).

²⁶ *Principles for Good Governance and Ethical Practice*, 15 and *Assessing the President's Performance: A "How To" Guide for Trustees* (Washington DC: ACTA's Institute for Effective Governance, 2006).

Governance

Element	Comments
	<p>The Board of Regents elects the Chancellor at the first regular meeting following May 1. The Chancellor is given an annual letter of agreement.</p> <p>All of the Chancellor’s and presidential renewals and compensation matters occur in closed Executive Sessions of the Board [BR Minutes]. The Board does report reappointments of presidents and the Chancellor. However, it is not known to what extent a formal evaluation process has actually taken place and whether evaluations are indeed the basis for reappointments and/or compensation adjustments.</p>
<p>Development of a long-range plan</p> <p>Grade: P</p>	<p>Development of the university’s strategic plan is the primary responsibility of the board, working with the president, faculty and administration. Trustees, working with the university stakeholders, have a responsibility to clarify the mission, articulate the vision, and set broad strategic goals for the institution in achieving that vision. Once approved, the strategic plan should become the guiding plan that drives decision-making and evaluation processes.²⁷</p> <p>In 2007, the USG Board celebrated its 75th anniversary and, with it, unveiled a new strategic plan. The plan, approved by the Board in August 2007 and entitled “Transforming the System, Changing Lives, Strengthening the State,” contains six goals:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Renew excellence in undergraduate education; 2) Create enrollment capacity to meet the needs of projected additional students; 3) Increase the System’s participation in research and economic development; 4) Strengthen System partnerships with the state’s other education agencies; 5) Maintain affordability; and 6) Increase efficiency as a System

27 *Strategic Planning: And Trustee Responsibility* (Washington DC: ACTA’s Institute for Effective Governance, 2005).

**Governance
Element**

Comments

The Board has established special committees—the Strategic Planning Oversight Committees (six in all)—to monitor the System’s progress in each of the six goal areas. In addition, the Board has, in the last two years, aligned discretionary funding consistent with its strategic plan.

The Board develops, monitors, and modifies its long-range plan on a regular basis. It previously approved its 2002-2007 strategic plan in 2002 and reformulated it with additional goals in April 2004.

SYSTEM GRADE: P

PART II: BOARD ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Governance

Element	Comments
<p>Actions to improve academic quality</p> <p>Grade: P</p>	<p>While the Board of Regents spent most of its time approving new academic programs (generally in response to workforce demands), revising mission statements, and acting on administrative and academic appointments, they also acted to increase retention, progression and graduation rates, and the supply of graduates in certain professions.</p> <p>Moreover, in August 2007, the Board adopted a strategic plan outlining its number one goal to “Renew excellence in undergraduate education to meet students’ 21st century educational needs.” Specifically, the plan states that it is critical “to determine whether undergraduate students are learning what they need to lead full lives and to become productive citizens.” As a result of the strategic plan, the Board outlined three promising initiatives: 1) institutions will re-examine their general education curriculum; 2) renew their commitment to liberal arts education for this century; and 3) improve the quality of undergraduate teaching and learning.</p> <p>Consistent with the USG strategic plan, the Board allocated \$750,000 in May 2007 for an effort “to take a fresh look at the core curriculum.” The funding is designed to support revisions in the core curriculum, with an eye to improving student transferability after the first two years of study. In response, the University System has launched an initiative, “Strong Foundations for a Global Future.”</p>

Governance**Element****Comments**

Actions to assess student learning

Grade: F

The Board—during the two-year review period—did not take any specific actions addressing the assessment of student learning. While the System has required an assessment of writing and reading competency for college graduation—the Regents’ Test—since 1972, more than 40 percent of incoming students are immediately exempted from taking the test based on their incoming SAT scores. For those 40 percent, the test proves they obtained their reading and writing competency before ever stepping foot in college! Of the remaining students, 75 percent pass the reading and 85 percent pass the writing test on the first try.

The Board receives regular updates on pass rates and has periodically amended its policies on the test. Most recently, in June 2007, the Board revised its policy to test some students “early” in order to identify areas where intervention might be appropriate and thus help improve retention, progression and graduation rates [BR Minutes June 13, 2007]. However, at no time during the past two years has rigor of the test or value-added assessment been reviewed by the Board. Similarly, since 1975, the Board has also had a policy stating that no undergraduate shall graduate without successfully completing course work or passing an examination on the history of the United States and Georgia and the constitutions of the U.S. and Georgia. It does not appear that the Board has specifically reviewed or addressed this requirement, nor has it, over the last two years, examined the results of any tests.

Assessment, by Board policy, is delegated to the institutions. The USG Board policy states that “each institution shall have a formal process by which systematic assessment of institutional effectiveness is conducted and the results of assessments are used to achieve institutional improvement.” The policy further states that “each institution shall assess basic academic skills at entry, general education, degree programs, and academic and administrative support programs and/or functions.” [BR Policy 205]. While the Board requires that each institution’s process for assessing and improving institutional effectiveness be part of its strategic plan and on file with the System office, the Board does not appear to have had any dialogue or review of such assessment processes nor their impact on improving the quality of education at each of USG’s respective campuses.

Governance

Element	Comments
	<p>USG has participated, System-wide, in the National Survey of Student Engagement and the Community College Survey of Student Engagement to aid in efforts to measure itself against national peers and target improvements in student learning. In February 2006, the Board was privy to those survey results. However, it is unclear how—or whether—those results have helped shape Board policy or initiatives to improve student learning.</p> <p>There does appear to be promise in this area as the Board, in its recently adopted strategic plan, has identified, as a priority, “to determine whether undergraduate students are learning what they need to lead full lives and to become productive citizens.”</p>
<p>Actions to control costs and increase efficiency</p>	<p>Much of the USG Board of Regents’ time over the last two years has been spent setting tuition and fees, approving budgets, receiving expense reports, and approving/renewing contracts.</p>
<p>Grade: P</p>	<p>It does not appear that the University System engages in program productivity reviews aimed to close unproductive or obsolete programs. Certainly in the last two years, no such review was conducted by the System office and presented to the Board. By Board policy, program productivity is delegated to the individual campuses. The Board policy requires that each institution submit an annual program review report which must identify “(1) quality, viability, and productivity parameters measured, and (2) findings relative to internal standards, the institutions’ strategic plan, and as appropriate, external benchmarks.” [BR Policy 205.01]. The policy further states that staff shall monitor a small number of performance indicators and initiate a dialogue with the chief academic officer when the institution’s programs do not meet the guidelines defined. It does not appear that the Board is involved in any way.</p>

Governance**Element****Comments**

The Board has discussed/acted upon several initiatives to keep higher education affordable and to increase the efficiency of USG. For example, in October 2006, the Board implemented a guaranteed tuition program (the Fixed For Four program) that offers freshmen entering the University System's four-year institutions a fixed tuition rate for the next four years.

In 2006, the Board funded initiatives to make back-office operations more efficient by better utilizing technology and improving processes, along with greater energy conservation efforts, risk management, and human resources development. In addition, the USG System staff, in 2007, examined institutional budgets in far greater detail than it had in the past. The effect of these efforts is unclear.

In 2006, the Board also implemented a new capital outlay prioritization model that takes into account building utilization and productivity. This new model prioritizes new capital outlay based on efficiency factors rather than just enrollment growth.

The Board's strategic plan, adopted in August 2007, also has stated goals to achieve greater affordability and efficiency—Goal 5: Maintain affordability and Goal 6: Increase efficiency as a System. And in January 2008, the Chancellor, during his State of the System address, noted that “the level of resources we receive is not our primary challenge, but the major challenge is the proper and strategic use of those resources.” He then vowed to “set and meet higher levels of transparency and accountability in management of the System's \$5.6 billion annual budget.”

While there is much work to be done to reduce costs, it is noteworthy that the Board and Chancellor recognize the deficiencies in this area and are beginning to address them.

Governance

Element	Comments
Willingness to disagree Grade: F	In more than two years, and on 669 Board actions, there was only one time where a Regent cast a dissenting vote. The dissenting vote came on a motion to waive Board policy prohibiting an acting president from seeking the vacancy [BR Minutes June 2007]. The remaining 668 actions were unanimously approved.
Avoiding the rubber stamp Grade: F	In more than two years, and on 669 Board actions, the Regents rejected only one item brought to them by the administration. All other 668 Board actions were unanimously approved.

SYSTEM GRADE: F

CHAPTER IV:

System Grade	COST AND EFFECTIVENESS
F	The University System of Georgia has done little to contain costs and increase effectiveness; however, signs of progress appear on the horizon.

PRICES OF PUBLIC FOUR-YEAR COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES rose more rapidly between 1997-98 and 2007-08 than in the preceding decade, and tuition and fee levels at four-year public colleges across the country increased 31 percent in just five years—and that’s after adjusting for inflation.²⁸ Faced with these increases, according to a 2007 survey by the National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education, 60 percent of people believe that higher education is being priced beyond the income of the average middle class family.²⁹ In fact, on average, lower income families spent 39 percent of their annual income for their children to attend public four-year colleges in 2003-04,³⁰ compared with 13 percent in 1980.³¹

According to the Lumina Foundation for Education, “Rising prices are the tip of the iceberg. The amount of money that colleges and universities spend to provide education to their students is rising faster than consumer prices and health care costs.”³² With costs out of control, many question the effectiveness and cost management of the higher education enterprise. In fact, four out of ten Americans surveyed consider waste and mismanagement a major factor in driving up higher education costs.³³

Given these numbers and the growing public concern, it is imperative that higher education earn the confidence of the public in the use of funds.

This section examines the University System of Georgia in terms of cost and effectiveness. The report takes a look at trends in spending and tuition and fee

28 College Board, *Trends in College Pricing* 2007, 10.

29 *Squeeze Play: How Parents and the Public Look at Higher Education Today*, 15.

30 *Trends in College Pricing*, 18.

31 The National Center for Public Policy and Higher Education, *Losing Ground: A National Status Report on the Affordability of American Higher Education* (Washington, DC: 2007), 5.

32 Lumina Foundation for Education, *Hitting Home: Quality, Cost, and Access Challenges Confronting Higher Education Today* (2007), 3.

33 *Squeeze Play: How Parents and the Public Look at Higher Education Today*, 23.

increases. It examines whether USG is successful in graduating full-time freshmen and retaining such students after their first year of study.

In addition, it evaluates the System's handling of unproductive programs and whether USG/the state uses performance as a criterion in funding allocations.

The period of evaluation is generally five years; however, periods of measure may vary based on data availability and the specific measure. Comments relative to each element include the period reviewed.

Grading is on a Pass/Fail basis. The following describes the various elements used to evaluate USG and explains the grading criteria.

Instructional vs. administrative spending. This measure attempts to assess the System's commitment to instructional versus administrative spending. It examines instructional and administrative expenditures as a percentage of Educational and General expenditures (E&G) and total expenditures relative to the base year. The percentage change in instructional and administrative spending over the period is also examined. If instructional spending as a percent of total expenditures increased or the percentage increase in instructional spending was equal to or higher than administrative spending increases, signifying that instruction was a priority, USG received a Passing grade. If the opposite was true, USG received a Failing grade.

Trend in in-state undergraduate tuition and fees. This measure assesses the USG's commitment to keeping tuition and fee increases at reasonable levels. If over the five-year period, tuition and fees increased at a rate equal to or less than the rate of inflation (using the Consumer Price Index), USG received a Passing grade. If however, tuition and fees increased greater than the rate of inflation, USG received a Failing grade.

Tuition and fees as a percentage of median household income. This measure indicates how well USG has kept higher education affordable relative to median household income. If the amount of median family income required to pay for tuition and fees decreased or remained relatively unchanged from the base year, USG received a Passing grade. Conversely, if tuition and fees required a greater percentage of a family's median income, USG received a Failing grade.

Ratio of new programs to closed programs. This is an efficiency measure that attempts to assess how well the USG is monitoring program growth through approval and closure of new programs. If USG established twice as many or more programs than it closed, it received a Failing grade.

Baccalaureate graduation rates for first-time, full-time freshmen. This measure examines the current four-, five-, and six-year graduation rates for the USG. While optimally 100 percent of first-time, full-time freshmen should graduate

in four years and certainly by six years, we have applied a 64 percent benchmark - the same used by the University of Georgia to assess its students' pass/fail rate. If less than 64 percent of students graduated in four, five, or six years, the System received a Failing grade. The national six-year baccalaureate graduation rate of 55.8 percent³⁴ is unacceptable, and is not used as a standard for grading purposes.

First-year retention rates for first-time, full-time freshmen. This measure depicts the percentage of first-time, full-time students enrolled as freshmen who continue the following year as sophomores. In effect, this is the first-year drop-out rate. It is an important measure for two reasons: First, remaining after the first year is an indicator that the student is more likely to complete his or her degree; and second, it can also suggest—especially to an institution that has a large “drop-out” rate after the first year—that the students were not sufficiently prepared (either academically or socially) to succeed. Both are important indicators for Board members to examine. If the first- to second-year retention rates were less than 64 percent, then USG received a Failing grade.

Performance as a criterion for funding. Rewards and incentives for good outcomes can lead to better results. Building on the philosophy that “what gets measured gets better,” this measure ascertains whether or not USG/the state uses, either in part or fully, performance as a criterion for funding. If USG used performance as a criterion, it received a Passing grade. If not, it received a Failing grade.

34 Graduation Rates, NCHEMS Information Center for State Higher Education Policy Making and Analysis, <http://www.higheredinfo.org/dbrowser/index.php?level=nation&mode=graph&state=0&submeasure=27>.

Cost/Effectiveness

Element

Comments

Instructional vs. administrative spending

Grade: F

In 2002, 40 percent of USG's Educational and General (E&G) expenditures and 35 percent of total expenditures supported Instruction while 18 percent of E&G expenses and 16 percent of total expenses supported Administration. For Instruction, the picture changed slightly in 2006, with 39 percent of E&G expenditures and 34 percent of total expenditures supporting Instruction, marking a slight decline in proportional spending (about one percent) from the 2002 base year. The percentage of E&G and total expenditures remained remarkably unchanged for administrative costs during this same period. While the proportion of E&G and total spending on Instruction and Administration remained relatively even, the University System spent nine percent more in 2006 than it did in 2002 on Instruction while Administration spending grew nearly twice that—at 15 percent—during the same period. Thus, the Failing grade.

INSTRUCTIONAL VS. ADMINISTRATIVE SPENDING

	2006	2002 ⁽¹⁾
INSTRUCTION*		
Expenditures on Instruction	\$1,474,139,544	\$1,353,536,703
Instruction as a % of E&G	38.7%	40.2%
Instruction as a % of Total	34.0%	35.1%
\$ Change from 2002	\$120,602,841	
% Change from 2002	8.9%	
<i>* Instruction = Instruction and Academic Support</i>		
ADMINISTRATION**		
Expenditures on Administration	\$693,500,531	\$605,038,421
Administration as a % of E&G	18.2%	18.0%
Administration as a % of Total	16.0%	15.7%
\$ Change from 2002	\$88,462,110	
% Change from 2002	14.6%	
<i>** Administration = Institutional Support</i>		

Source: USG Annual Financial Reports

⁽¹⁾ FY2001 was not used as the base year (for a five-year comparison) due to the restatement of expenditures pursuant to GASB Statements 34 and 35 in 2002. A restated FY2001 was not available from USG System Office, thus FY2002 was used as the base year to allow for appropriate comparisons of expenditure categories.

Cost/Effectiveness

Element	Comments
In-state undergraduate tuition and fee trend	Although the University of Georgia System was recently ranked last in the Southern region for tuition and fees (meaning it has the lowest tuition and fees in the region), Georgia increased its average <i>inflation adjusted</i> in-state tuition and fees over the five year period 2005-06 v. 2000-01 by 11 percent at four-year institutions and by 3.8 percent for two-year institutions. Hence, the Failing grade.
Grade: F	

TRENDS IN UNDERGRADUATE TUITION AND REQUIRED FEES

	2005-2006	2000-2001	% CHANGE
PUBLIC 4-YEAR COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES			
Not adjusted for inflation	\$3,044	\$2,410	26.3%
Inflation adjusted (using CPI expressed in 2006 \$)	3,044	2,743	11.0%
PUBLIC 2-YEAR COLLEGES			
Not adjusted for inflation	\$1,742	\$1,474	18.2%
Inflation adjusted (using CPI expressed in 2006 \$)	1,742	1,678	3.8%

Source: Southern Regional Educational Board

Cost/Effectiveness

Element

Comments

Tuition and fees as a percentage of median household income

Grade: P

In 2005-06, median annual in-state undergraduate tuition and fees required a slightly greater percentage of median household income. In 2000-01, 5.7 percent of median income was required to pay for median annual in-state tuition and fees for four-year colleges and universities and in 2005-06, 6.5 percent of median household income was required to cover in-state tuition and fees. This marks an increase of less than one percent of additional household income required to pay for tuition and fees. For community colleges, the increase is even slighter—from 3.5 percent in 2000-01 to 3.7 percent in 2005-06.

UNDERGRADUATE TUITION AND FEES AS A PERCENTAGE OF MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME

	2005-2006	2000-2001	% CHANGE
Public 4-year Institutions	6.50%	5.66%	0.84%
Public 2-year Institutions	3.70%	3.46%	0.24%

Source: Southern Regional Education Board

Ratio of new programs to closed programs

Grade: F

During the two-year period examined, 139 new academic programs were approved and only 21 terminated/consolidated. Consequently, the public institutions in Georgia now offer nearly 120 more academic programs than they did just two years prior. Nearly 65 percent of the new academic programs approved by the Board were in education, nursing and the health professions, aviation, agriculture and technology, science and math—all areas identified by the Board as shortage or high-priority disciplines. While the approved programs were consistent with the Board's objectives, the Board still did not consider eliminating lower priority or unessential programs to assist in mitigating the net cost of the additional programs approved. Since there was an insignificant number of programs closed during this same period, the funds to support the additional programs likely came from the state taxpayers and tuition increases rather than a reallocation from less productive or closed programs. Thus, the Failing grade.

Cost/Effectiveness**Element****Comments**

Baccalaureate graduation rates for first-time, full-time freshmen

Grade: F

The University System of Georgia does an exceptional job publicly reporting four-, five- and six-year baccalaureate graduation rates for each of its public colleges. This is not common practice since universities typically report only the six-year graduation rate. Regrettably, the data show that USG only graduates 20 percent of its first-time, full-time freshmen in four years; 41 percent in five years; and 48 percent in six years. Hence, USG's Failing grade.

The University System appears to have acknowledged the problem and has been addressing it. In February 2004, a task force was appointed to study the USG's graduation rates and how to improve them. In October of that same year, a committee began implementing the recommendations of the task force. In fall 2005, the USG Board of Regents asked all its campuses to submit target graduation rates and plans for achieving them. In 2006, the Board received an update on its efforts, which showed improvement (as is depicted herein).

As a result of USG's recent efforts, there have been positive trends in the area of baccalaureate graduation rates going from an 18.2 percent four-year graduation rate for the 1994 first-time freshmen cohort to 20.1 percent for the 1999 cohort. The same trends apply for the five-year and six-year System-wide graduation rates. Significant improvement is called for, but the trend is in the right direction.

Cost/Effectiveness

Element **Comments**

BACCALAUREATE GRADUATION RATES FOR FIRST-TIME, FULL-TIME FRESHMEN

INSTITUTION	CLASS OF 1999 ENTERING COHORT-GRADUATION RATE			CLASS OF 1994 ENTERING COHORT-GRADUATION RATE			CHANGE 1999 COHORT VS. 1994 COHORT		
	FOUR YEAR	FIVE YEAR	SIX YEAR	FOUR YEAR	FIVE YEAR	SIX YEAR	FOUR YEAR	FIVE YEAR	SIX YEAR
Research	32.9%	60.7%	67.0%	30.5%	54.2%	61.3%	2.4%	6.5%	5.7%
Regional	13.4%	34.0%	40.9%	12.5%	27.2%	33.2%	0.9%	6.8%	7.7%
State University	10.8%	25.6%	32.2%	9.2%	19.8%	24.9%	1.6%	5.8%	7.3%
System Total	20.1%	41.4%	47.9%	18.2%	34.8%	40.9%	1.9%	6.6%	7.0%

Source: USG Information Digest 2005-06, 2000-01

Cost/Effectiveness

Element	Comments
Percent of first-time, full-time freshmen continuing after the first year (first to second year retention rate)	In the fall of 2000, 71.4 percent of first-time, full-time freshmen returned for their second year. Five years later, nearly 74 percent of first-time, full-time freshmen returned for their second year. This means that, System-wide, more than one-fourth of the full-time freshmen do not return for their second year.
Grade: P	While these results are troubling, the USG Board has made retention a priority and has shown some improvement in retention rates since the Fall of 1999. However, having more than one-fourth of the freshmen not return is alarming, and the USG Board should continue to focus on improving retention.

FIRST-YEAR RETENTION RATES OF FIRST-TIME, FULL-TIME FRESHMEN

INSTITUTION	FALL 2004 TO 2005	FALL 1999 TO 2000	%CHANGE
Research	89.5%	86.0%	3.5%
Regional	77.1%	73.1%	4.0%
State University	71.5%	68.1%	3.4%
State College	62.5%	58.5%	4.0%
2-Year College	61.0%	57.5%	3.5%
System Total	73.8%	71.4%	2.4%

Source: USG Information Digest 2004-05, 2000-01

Cost/Effectiveness

Element

Comments

Performance as a criterion for funding

Grade: F

The USG Board of Regents uses formula funding to make higher education funding recommendations to the Governor and legislature and to allocate funds to institutions. This formula has been in place since 1982. Supplemental funding is also provided for specific initiatives and is usually earmarked for such purposes. In addition, the USG receives funds for systemic strategic initiatives for which it has discretion. Progress on these specifically funded and discretionary initiatives is reported by the USG in an annual Report of Accountability (since 1996). Outside of specific initiative funding, funding for institutions of higher education is based largely on a funding formula that is driven by credit hours generated for instruction and research and on square footage of buildings for operations and maintenance. When making its final appropriations, neither the Governor nor the General Assembly utilizes performance as a criterion for funding of its public colleges and universities. And until Fiscal Year 2008, neither had USG.

It should be noted that in October 2005, the Regents unveiled a new performance-based funding model that included tying financial incentives to measurable performance outcomes. Some of the measures include increasing graduation and retention rates; increasing pass rates on the Regents' writing and reading test; and results on licensure exams. This proposal was approved by the Board and sent to the General Assembly and Governor for their consideration; its implementation is unclear.

Most recently, in May 2007, the USG Board of Regents did utilize a "temporary model" to allocate two-thirds of \$38.8 million in enrollment funding that would have historically been allocated by formula to USG institutions. According to the Chancellor, one of the clear signals he has received from the institutional level is that there is no reward for good performance [BR Minutes]. Thus, the System office, in an attempt to rectify this with the budget

Cost/Effectiveness**Element****Comments**

process, used the following variables when allocating \$25.6 million of enrollment funding to institutions for FY2008: 1) relative level of base funding; 2) strategically increasing capacity; 3) focus on retention, progression, and graduation rates; 4) excellence in financial stewardship; and 5) increasing efficiency through continuous process improvement. It should be noted that these variables, and the model used, are “temporary” until the Board’s approval of the System’s strategic plan (which occurred in August 2007); thus it is expected that a revised, and possibly permanent, model would be utilized for institutional allocations in future fiscal years.

While only a mere \$25 million of the System’s \$5.6 billion annual budget was allocated based on “performance,” the University has made some efforts to incorporate performance elements into its funding allocations.

SYSTEM GRADE: F

appendices

APPENDIX A SELECTION CRITERIA FOR
CORE COURSES

APPENDIX B STUDENT SURVEY DATA

Appendix A

SELECTION CRITERIA FOR CORE COURSES

The criteria for the seven courses used to evaluate each college's general education program are:

1. Writing or Composition

Does not include remedial writing. Also excludes courses taught by faculty not trained to teach writing, such as so-called writing-intensive seminars, or writing "for" a discipline (such as business or law), where the instructors are not from the English or composition department.

2. Literature

Broad course on literature, such as a "great works" course. Does not include narrow, esoteric or single author courses.

3. Foreign Language

Competence at the intermediate level, as indicated by more than one year of college work, or three years of high school work, or an appropriate examination score.

4. American Government or American History

Colleges were credited for requiring either subject. The government course should be devoted primarily to American national government and politics. The history course should be broad enough to give a sense of the general sweep of American history. We excluded courses on one particular era, e.g., the U.S. post-1945, or a single issue, or courses on the politics and history of a particular state.

5. Economics

A general course, such as macro- or microeconomics, taught by faculty in the economics or business department.

6. Mathematics

Includes college-level, but not remedial mathematics. Includes advanced algebra, trigonometry, calculus, computer programming, statistics/probability, or mathematical reasoning at or above the intermediate level. Logic courses taught

by philosophers, linguistics courses, or computer literacy (“computer science”) courses were not credited, as the math content is usually minimal.

7. Natural or Physical Science

Includes such sciences as astronomy, biology, chemistry, geology and physics. Environmental science counts if taught by faculty in one of the preceding departments. Psychology, generally considered a social science, was not counted, except for courses on the biological or chemical aspects of the brain.

Appendix B

STUDENT SURVEY DATA



**American Council of Trustees and Alumni
Georgia Public Schools Surveying
Total Sample
February 2007**

School

	Unweighted N	Weighted N	%
Georgia Tech	321	200	31.5
University of Georgia	315	436	68.5
Total	636	636	100.0

Q1. Are you a freshman, sophomore, junior or senior?

	n	%
Freshman	145	22.8
Sophomore	133	20.8
Junior	159	25.0
Senior	199	31.4
Total	636	100.0

Q2. Do you agree or disagree: On my campus, some professors make negative comments in class about liberals.

	n	%
Strongly Disagree	172	27.1
Disagree	347	54.8
Agree	107	17.0
Strongly Agree	7	1.0
Total	632	100.0
No Answer	4	
Total	636	

Q3. Do you agree or disagree: On my campus, some professors make positive comments in class about liberals.

	n	%
Strongly Disagree	72	11.4
Disagree	196	31.1
Agree	304	48.1
Strongly Agree	59	9.4
Total	631	100.0
No Answer	5	
Total	636	



**American Council of Trustees and Alumni
Georgia Public Schools Surveying
Total Sample
February 2007**

Q4. Do you agree or disagree: On my campus, some professors make negative comments in class about conservatives.

	n	%
Strongly Disagree	87	13.7
Disagree	259	41.0
Agree	237	37.6
Strongly Agree	48	7.7
Total	632	100.0
No Answer	4	
Total	636	

Q5. Do you agree or disagree: On my campus, some professors make positive comments in class about conservatives.

	n	%
Strongly Disagree	96	15.1
Disagree	323	51.0
Agree	205	32.4
Strongly Agree	10	1.6
Total	634	100.0
No Answer	2	
Total	636	

Q6. Do you agree or disagree: On my campus, some professors make negative comments about people of faith.

	n	%
Strongly Disagree	196	31.1
Disagree	308	48.8
Agree	111	17.6
Strongly Agree	16	2.5
Total	631	100.0
No Answer	5	
Total	636	

Q7. Do you agree or disagree: On my campus, some professors make positive comments about people of faith.

	n	%
Strongly Disagree	121	19.2
Disagree	251	39.7
Agree	252	39.9
Strongly Agree	8	1.2
Total	632	100.0
No Answer	4	
Total	636	



**American Council of Trustees and Alumni
Georgia Public Schools Surveying
Total Sample
February 2007**

Q8. Do you agree or disagree: On my campus, there are certain topics or viewpoints that are off limits.

	n	%
Strongly Disagree	124	19.6
Disagree	264	41.8
Agree	207	32.7
Strongly Agree	37	5.9
Total	632	100.0
No Answer	4	
Total	636	

Q9. Do you agree or disagree: On my campus, students don't feel free to express their patriotism.

	n	%
Strongly Disagree	227	35.7
Disagree	355	55.9
Agree	46	7.2
Strongly Agree	8	1.2
Total	635	100.0
No Answer	1	
Total	636	

Q10. Do you agree or disagree: On my campus, some panel discussions and presentations on political issues seem totally one-sided.

	n	%
Strongly Disagree	46	7.4
Disagree	241	38.5
Agree	281	44.9
Strongly Agree	57	9.2
Total	626	100.0
No Answer	10	
Total	636	

Q11. Do you agree or disagree: On my campus, there is no effective way to complain about a professor's bias without risking retaliation.

	n	%
Strongly Disagree	89	14.1
Disagree	336	53.4
Agree	174	27.6
Strongly Agree	31	4.9
Total	629	100.0
No Answer	7	
Total	636	



**American Council of Trustees and Alumni
Georgia Public Schools Surveying
Total Sample
February 2007**

Q12. Do you agree or disagree: On my campus, some courses present social and political issues in an unfair and one-sided manner.

	n	%
Strongly Disagree	70	11.0
Disagree	323	51.1
Agree	210	33.2
Strongly Agree	30	4.8
Total	633	100.0
No Answer	3	
Total	636	

Q13. Do you agree or disagree: On my campus, there are courses in which students feel they have to agree with the professor's political or social views in order to get a good grade.

	n	%
Strongly Disagree	100	15.8
Disagree	226	35.6
Agree	237	37.3
Strongly Agree	71	11.2
Total	635	100.0
No Answer	2	
Total	636	

Q14. Do you agree or disagree: On my campus, some courses have readings which present only one side of a controversial issue.

	n	%
Strongly Disagree	52	8.3
Disagree	229	36.4
Agree	292	46.3
Strongly Agree	57	9.0
Total	630	100.0
No Answer	6	
Total	636	



**American Council of Trustees and Alumni
Georgia Public Schools Surveying
Total Sample
February 2007**

Q15. Do you agree or disagree: On my campus, there are courses in which the professor creates an environment that is hostile to certain political or social views.

	n	%
Strongly Disagree	153	24.1
Disagree	335	52.9
Agree	135	21.3
Strongly Agree	11	1.7
Total	634	100.0
No Answer	2	
Total	636	

Q16. Do you agree or disagree: On my campus, some professor penalize students because of the student's political or social views.

	n	%
Strongly Disagree	221	35.0
Disagree	338	53.6
Agree	66	10.5
Strongly Agree	6	1.0
Total	632	100.0
No Answer	4	
Total	636	

Q17. Do you agree or disagree: On my campus, some professors use the classroom to present their personal political views.

	n	%
Strongly Disagree	79	12.4
Disagree	199	31.3
Agree	287	45.2
Strongly Agree	70	11.1
Total	634	100.0
No Answer	2	
Total	636	

Q18. Do you agree or disagree: On my campus, some professors frequently comment on politics in class even though it has nothing to do with the course.

	n	%
Strongly Disagree	111	17.5
Disagree	280	44.2
Agree	210	33.1
Strongly Agree	33	5.2
Total	634	100.0
No Answer	2	
Total	636	



**American Council of Trustees and Alumni
Georgia Public Schools Surveying
Total Sample
February 2007**

Q19. Do you agree or disagree: On my campus, some professors are intolerant of certain political and social viewpoints.

	n	%
Strongly Disagree	137	21.6
Disagree	367	57.9
Agree	120	18.9
Strongly Agree	10	1.6
Total	634	100.0
No Answer	2	
Total	636	

Q20. Do you agree or disagree: On my campus, some courses present only a negative view of the United States.

	n	%
Strongly Disagree	217	34.2
Disagree	345	54.4
Agree	66	10.4
Strongly Agree	6	1.0
Total	634	100.0
No Answer	2	
Total	636	

Q21. Do the student evaluation forms of the faculty at your campus ask about a professor's social, political or religious bias?

	n	%
Yes	11	1.7
No	463	74.7
Don't Know	146	23.6
Total	620	100.0
No Answer	16	
Total	636	

Q22. How would you describe your views? Radical left, Liberal, Moderate, Conservative, or Ultraconservative?

	n	%
Radical Left	8	1.3
Liberal	150	24.9
Moderate	297	49.4
Conservative	138	22.9
Ultraconservative	9	1.5
Total	602	100.0
No Answer	34	
Total	636	



**American Council of Trustees and Alumni
Georgia Public Schools Surveying
Total Sample
February 2007**

Q23. What is your current major?

	n	%
Fine Arts	11	1.8
Humanities	115	18.1
Professional	283	44.5
Science	134	21.0
Social Science	57	8.9
Other	36	5.6
Total	636	100.0

Q24. Are you: male or female?

	n	%
Male	327	52.7
Female	293	47.3
Total	620	100.0
No Answer	16	
Total	636	

Q25. What is your race/ethnicity?

	n	%
White	479	77.6
Black	25	4.0
Hispanic	16	2.5
Asian	70	11.3
Multi-racial or other	29	4.6
Total	618	100.0
No Answer	18	
Total	636	



ACTA
AMERICAN COUNCIL OF
TRUSTEES AND ALUMNI

American Council of Trustees and Alumni
1726 M Street, NW, Suite 802
Washington, DC 20036

Phone: 1-888-ALUMNI-8 or 202-467-6787

Fax: 202-467-6784

Email: info@goacta.org • Website: www.goacta.org