

MINUTES: University Self-Study Steering Committee

DATE: August 6, 2001  
1:00-3:00 PM, Room 231 Student Center

PRESENT: C. Havice (presiding), T. Birdwhistell, C. Currens, L. Edgerton,  
D. Kalika, M. Molinaro, W. Pfeifle, J. Picoro, D. Watt,  
C. Vaughn

C. Havice called the meeting to order at 1:00 PM.

### **DIRECTOR'S REPORT:**

J. Picoro reported that we have call in to D. Crump, our SACS liaison, to discuss several matters. We have also received a few nominations of individuals to serve as members of our SACS review team. As soon as we have a Chair for the visiting committee, we will also send a message to the various deans asking for their input.

#### Faculty Credentials

J. Picoro and C. Vaughn have been visiting colleges regarding the SACS requirements for faculty credentials. They have only three colleges left to visit – Medicine, Agriculture, and Communications. The College of Communications has requested that we come there after the beginning of the semester when all of their faculty have returned.

### **SCHEDULE OF MEETINGS:**

C. Currens discussed the schedule of meetings for review of committee reports. They are:

August 13	Public Service and Athletics
August 17	Graduate, Undergraduate and Professional Education
August 23	Continuing Education, Student Development
August 28	Staff (possibly Faculty)
August 30	Library and Information Resources
Sept 4	Principles and Philosophy and Administrative Processes

The meetings on the 13<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> will be from 1:00-3:00 PM. The Tuesday and Thursday meetings will be from 3:00-5:00 PM. Locations will be announced.

### **REVIEW OF COMMITTEE REPORTS:**

At the previous meeting, a handout was distributed outlining how reports would be reviewed. The focus is on content, analysis and clarity. General comments are requested first and then the group will look at specific suggestions/recommendations contained in each report. When the Steering Committee completes these reviews, the chapters will be in a semi-final state. Some fine-tuning may still need to be done, but no major changes are anticipated.

### Distance Learning Report:

#### General Comments/Observations –

L. Nora sent written comments. She stated that the language used in the Continuing Education and Distance Learning reports might need to be “matched” when the reports are completed. W. Pfeifle stated that the Distance Learning report is trying to place the responsibility with colleges and departments for whether or not academic requirements are met. The distance learning programs act as a delivery system, but all decisions about content come from the colleges.

C. Havice asked if there is a place in the report where it states that the courses offered are the same as those provided on campus. If not, could this be added. Would it help to give an example of courses taught that are the same as those provided on campus? W. Pfeifle stated that the course offerings are the same. He will clarify that in the report.

D. Kalika requested a breakdown of the enrollment figures by various delivery systems. He suggested a plot or chart showing a 10-year retrospective of programs and technology. What has led to the increase in enrollments? It is because of the technology or the diversity of programs? Is distance learning being adequately served by the institutional effectiveness office on campus?

C. Havice asked for clarification of a statement that a specific component has decreased. W. Pfeifle said this refers to the international component. This refers to UK students going abroad to study.

L. Edgerton asked where independent studies come in. W. Pfeifle replied that independent studies are not considered as distance learning. Independent studies are one on one – one faculty person to one student. Distance learning courses are one faculty member to a group of students.

C. Havice left the meeting and T. Birdwhistell stepped in as facilitator.

T. Birdwhistell asked the group to review the list of suggestions made in the Distance Learning report. If the group is in agreement, we will let these suggestions stand. If not, he requested comment and discussion. Each suggestion was reviewed. Several were combined and/or deleted. Others were edited for language. C. Currens recorded these changes and will make them in the report.

### Research Report:

D. Watt reviewed the report with the Steering Committee. He stated that some of the suggestions may be duplicative with other sections of the self-study and requested that these be pointed out and deleted when appropriate.

D. Kalika complimented the opening of the report and list of research accomplishments. He asked for clarification of what the committee sees as the University’s research priorities (what they should be). D. Watt stated that the membership of his committee was diverse and, thus, had different priorities. He will clarify this.

The group began review of the suggestions made in the research report. Each was discussed individually. Several were combined/deleted. Others were edited for language. C. Currens recorded specific changes and will include them in the report. Review of the suggestions was not completed. This will be done at the September 4, 2001 meeting of the Steering Committee.

**NEXT MEETING:**

The next meeting of the Steering Committee will be August 13 from 1:00-3:00 PM.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

The meeting adjourned at 3:00 PM.

---

Connie Vaughn, Recorder