

**JACKSONVILLE STATE UNIVERSITY  
JACKSONVILLE, ALABAMA**

**2002-2003  
SELF-STUDY ADDENDUM**

**Prepared for the  
Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS)  
Commission on Colleges**

# JACKSONVILLE STATE UNIVERSITY

## Self-Study Addendum

### Table of Contents

Response to Recommendations and Suggestions .....	1
I. Principles and Philosophy of Accreditation .....	1
1.2 Application of the Criteria .....	1
II. Institutional Purpose .....	2
III. Institutional Effectiveness .....	4
3.1 Planning and Evaluation: Educational Programs.....	4
3.2 Planning and Evaluation: Administrative and Educational Support Services .....	9
3.3 Institutional Research .....	12
IV. Educational Program .....	14
4.2 Undergraduate Program .....	14
4.3 Graduate Program.....	18
4.7 Student Records.....	20
4.8 Faculty.....	21
4.9 Consortial Relationships and Contractual Agreements .....	23
Appendix IV.A “Distance Education: Definitions and Principles” ...	24
V. Educational Support Services .....	25
5.1 Library and Other Learning Resources .....	25
5.4 Student Development Services .....	26
VI. Administrative Processes .....	28
6.1 Organization and Administration .....	28
6.4 Physical Resources .....	29
Attachments .....	32
Attachment 1.2 Draft Substantive Change Policy .....	33
Attachment 3.1 Planning, Budgeting, and Reporting Calendar ....	34

**JACKSONVILLE STATE UNIVERSITY  
SELF-STUDY ADDENDUM**

**RESPONSES TO RECOMMENDATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS**

**I. PRINCIPLES AND PHILOSOPHY OF ACCREDITATION**

1.2 APPLICATION OF THE CRITERIA

**An institution must refrain from making a substantive change, defined as a significant modification in the nature or scope of an institution or its programs, except in accordance with the Commission's Substantive Change Policy for Accredited Institutions and its attendant procedures.**

**All existing or planned activities must be reported according to the policies, procedures and guidelines of the Commission on Colleges and must be in compliance with the *Criteria*.**

**Suggestion:**

The committee suggests that the University develop a policy to guide institutional procedures for COC notification of potential substantive changes.

**Response:**

The Division of Academic and Student Affairs has developed a draft policy (Attachment 1.2) to ensure compliance with the SACS Substantive Change Policy, which will be considered in Spring 2003. The draft policy will include notifying the Director of Institutional Effectiveness (IE) of proposed new degrees, programs (majors, minors, or concentrations), instructional sites, or course delivery methodologies. The Director, in consultation with the IE Committee, will review the proposal and report to the Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs (VPASA). The IE Committee will monitor the program's progress in achieving external approval, including timely notification to COC.

## II. INSTITUTIONAL PURPOSE

**Appropriate publications must accurately cite the current statement of purpose.**

**Suggestion:**

The committee suggests that the mission statement have a direct link from the University's home page.

**Response:**

The University's home page was modified November 2002 to include a link to the mission statement.

---

**An institution must study periodically its statement of purpose, considering internal changes as well as the changing responsibilities of the institution to its constituencies.**

**Suggestion:**

The committee suggests that the Institutional Effectiveness Committee outline and publish the procedures for review of the mission statement and institutional goals.

**Response:**

The IE Committee has recommended a five-year cycle of formal review of the mission statement and institutional goals. The IE Committee will recommend procedures and a timeline for the formal review to the President by September 1, 2004. In addition, the annual IE calendar has been revised to include annual assessment of institutional goals. Recommendations for revisions of goals may be submitted during any annual planning cycle. Any such recommendations should be submitted through appropriate administrative channels, i.e., chain of command, to the IE Committee. The IE Committee must receive the recommendations no later than June 1 of each year. The IE Committee will make a recommendation to the President regarding the proposed revision(s) by September 1 of each year.

---

**The institution must demonstrate that its planning and evaluation processes, educational programs, educational support services, financial and physical resources, and administrative processes are adequate and appropriate to fulfill its stated purpose.**

**Recommendation:**

The committee recommends that the University demonstrate its planning and evaluation processes are adequate and appropriate to fulfill its stated purpose.

**Response:**

When fully implemented, the actions described in response to Section III recommendations and suggestions will provide sufficient evidence that the University's planning and evaluation processes are adequate and appropriate to fulfill its stated purposes. Effective August 2003, annual reports by deans and division heads will document that their planning units have plans in place that will appropriately align with the University's mission and goals, that they will have appropriate and adequate procedures for assessing their success in fulfilling their plans, and that the units will use the results of their evaluations/assessments for improvement. In Fall 2003, the IE Committee will initiate an annual evaluation of plans and annual reports submitted by the individual units. In addition, the Committee will evaluate how well the University's planning and evaluation processes are functioning. Recommendations for improving processes and content at the unit level will be submitted to the appropriate vice president. Recommendations to improve planning and evaluation at the University level will be submitted to the President.

Information from scheduled five-year program reviews to begin in Fall 2004 will provide an in-depth analysis of each unit's planning and evaluation processes and how effectively the University is supporting planning and evaluation by planning units. Finally, a comprehensive, University-wide review of planning will be conducted every seven years, beginning in Fall 2004. This review will provide a global view of the alignment of planning and evaluation with the University's purposes, and provide information to guide future planning and evaluation.

### **III. INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS**

#### **3.1 PLANNING AND EVALUATION: EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS**

**Educational activities of an institution include teaching, research and public service. Planning and evaluation for these activities must be systematic, broad based, interrelated and appropriate to the institution.**

#### **Recommendations:**

1. The committee recommends that the University develop a process for the review and approval of all academic unit plans, provide a mechanism to link planning with budgeting, and create a strategic planning statement to guide decisions related to resource allocation and establishment of funding priorities.
2. The committee recommends that the University implement a process for evaluation of academic processes, policies, and procedures at the institutional level.
3. The committee recommends that the University establish, adopt, and document a planning, budgeting, and assessment calendar that are appropriate to the institutional funding cycle.

#### **Response to Recommendation 1:**

The University's revised planning process was implemented during January 2003 to require documentation of the approval of each plan at each level of the decision-making hierarchy (Attachment 3.1). In addition to an approved/not approved check-off, individuals approving or disapproving plans are also required to provide a narrative evaluation of the plan.

The planning and budgeting processes will be merged, beginning with the 2003-04 planning and budgeting cycle. Effective January 2003, planning and budgeting occurs on the same schedule and no budget will be approved without an approved plan. Effective linkage of planning and budgeting requires adequately trained unit planners and budget managers. Annually, funds will be allocated to the IE Office to provide training in budget planning (emphasizing function/activity based budgeting) for all budget managers. The Office of Human Resources has been charged with the responsibility of maintaining in personnel records evidence of this training.

The Director of IE has been charged with responsibility for developing, and annually updating, a document describing the University's internal and external environment, and projecting likely changes in these environments. The first report is due no later than Fall 2003.

**Response to Recommendation 2:**

The President has charged the VPASA with developing and implementing a process for review and evaluation of all policies that are unique to her division. Effective February 2003, all additions or modifications of published policies must have a statement of purpose, a means of evaluating achievement of the purpose, designation of who is responsible for evaluating the policy, and when it will be evaluated. By August 2005, all published policies will be in compliance.

**Response to Recommendation 3:**

Beginning with the 2003-04 planning and budgeting cycle, the planning and budgeting will follow the same time-line (Attachment 3.1).

**Suggestions:**

1. The committee suggests that evaluation of all administrators include specified criteria for addressing effectiveness in planning, budgeting, and evaluation.
2. The committee suggests that all institutional policies include a statement of purpose, defined evaluation cycle/method, and responsible entity.

**Response to Suggestion 1:**

The President has charged each division head with revising processes for evaluating administrators to include assessment of administrators' effectiveness in planning, budgeting, and evaluation. The Administrative Council will be responsible for developing the revisions for evaluating division heads and others who report directly to the President. The revised procedures are to be completed and approved in time for implementation during the 2003-04 academic year.

**Response to Suggestion 2:**

The vice-presidents have been charged with responsibility to develop a statement of purpose for each policy in the *JSU Manual of Policies and Procedures*, describing how and when the policy will be evaluated, and designation of the individual, office, or entity responsible for evaluating the policy. This process is to be completed by August 2005.

---

**The Institution must define its expected educational results and describe its methods for analyzing the results.****Suggestions:**

1. The committee suggests that educational outcomes and assessment methodology be reviewed and revised to ensure alignment with the revised University mission and goals.

2. The committee suggests that the University identify the office and/or individual(s) responsible for establishing general education outcomes.
3. The committee suggests that each unit review, and revise as needed, unit-specific educational outcomes.

**Response to Suggestion 1:**

The VPASA has been instructed to develop and implement, by December 2003, a continuous process for reviewing, and revising as necessary, institutional goals to measure student learning outcomes. This process must ensure continual monitoring of students' success in meeting these learning goals.

**Response to Suggestion 2:**

General education outcomes represent those learning outcomes desirable for each graduate from the institution, regardless of major. They transcend individual departments/programs and colleges. Defining and evaluating these outcomes require collaboration across departments and colleges. The VPASA and the academic deans have been directed to identify, or establish, by February 2003, an individual or entity with overall responsibility for establishing student learning goals in general education (e.g., communications skills, information technology, quantitative skills, appreciation and understanding of fine arts and literature, understanding of the philosophy and methodology of science, critical-thinking skills, etc.), for recommending strategies for achieving the learning goals, for developing and implementing appropriate evaluation methodologies, and in monitoring success in achieving the expected learning outcomes.

**Response to Suggestion 3:**

The VPASA will instruct units to develop and implement, by December 2003, a continuous process for reviewing, and revising as necessary, unit-specific educational goals to measure student learning outcomes. This process must ensure continual monitoring of students' success in meeting these learning goals.

---

**The institution must:**

1. **Establish a clearly defined purpose appropriate to collegiate education.**
2. **Formulate educational goals consistent with the institution's purpose.**
3. **Develop and implement procedures to evaluate the extent to which these educational goals are being achieved.**
4. **Use the results of these evaluations to improve educational programs, services, and operations.**

**Recommendations:**

1. The committee recommends that JSU demonstrate that all academic planning units have developed procedures to evaluate the extent to which the educational goals are being achieved.
2. The committee recommends that JSU demonstrate that all academic planning units are using the results of evaluations to improve educational programs, services, and operations.

**Response to Recommendation 1:**

Each department/college has been instructed to review, revise as necessary, and to submit its assessment plan for student learning to the IE Committee for review and evaluation. Unit assessment plans must be entered into a centralized, electronic database, in a common format by May 2003. The IE Committee has been charged to provide a report of its evaluation to the VPASA by October 2003.

**Response to Recommendation 2:**

Each dean has been charged with the responsibility of evaluating each unit's planning, evaluation of goal achievement, and use of evaluation results to improve educational programs, services, operations, and student learning. This involves each dean annually reviewing the assessment plans, five-year plan, and annual report for each unit under his/her authority and reporting, to the unit and the VPASA, on the adequacy of the unit's plans and its implementation of the plans. The first such report will be due during Fall 2003.

---

**The institution must develop guidelines and procedures to evaluate educational effectiveness including the quality of student learning and of research and service. This evaluation must encompass educational goals at all academic levels and research and service functions of the institution.**

**Recommendation:**

The committee recommends that the University develop guidelines and procedures to evaluate research and public service functions of the institution.

**Response:**

By April 2003, the President, in collaboration with the VPASA, will establish institutional goals for research and public service. These goals will provide guidance to the colleges and other units where research and/or public service is part of their mission in the development of more detailed, measurable goals. The VPASA will instruct each dean to develop, within his/her college, measurable goals for research and for public service that support the President's goals. These plans, implemented in Fall 2003, will describe measurable outcomes, how

attainment of the outcomes will be evaluated, and how evaluation results will be used for improvement. Effective August 2004, the VPASA will provide a report of goal attainment by each college and other units as appropriate. Based on this report, the President will determine if the research accomplishments have met institutional research goals, and if public service accomplishments have met institutional public service goals.

**Suggestion:**

The committee suggests that the University periodically study student-learning outcomes as exemplified in the 1998 report completed by the Office of Assessment.

**Response:**

Every four years, the Office of Assessment will prepare and the IE Committee will publish and distribute a comprehensive report on all institution-wide student-learning outcomes. The report will incorporate longitudinal results of all designated indices of student learning. The next report will be published in Fall 2003.

### 3.2 PLANNING AND EVALUATION: ADMINISTRATIVE AND EDUCATIONAL SUPPORT SERVICES

**In addition to providing evidence of planning and evaluation in its educational program, the institution must demonstrate planning and evaluation in its administrative and educational support services.**

#### **Recommendations:**

1. The committee recommends that the University develop a process for the review and approval of all administrative and educational support unit plans, provide a mechanism to link planning with budgeting, and create a strategic planning statement to guide decisions related to resource allocation and establishment of funding priorities.
2. The committee recommends that the University implement a process for evaluation of administrative and educational support processes, policies, and procedures at the institutional level.
3. The committee recommends that the University establish, adopt, and document a planning, budgeting, and assessment calendar that are appropriate to the institutional funding cycle.

#### **Response to Recommendation 1:**

The University's revised planning process was implemented during January 2003 to require documentation of the approval of each plan at each level of the decision-making hierarchy (Attachment 3.1). In addition to an approved/not approved check-off, individuals approving or disapproving plans are also required to provide a narrative evaluation of the plan.

The planning and budgeting processes will be merged, beginning with the 2003-04 planning and budgeting cycle. Effective January 2003, planning and budgeting occurs on the same schedule and no budget will be approved without an approved plan. Effective linkage of planning and budgeting requires adequately trained unit planners and budget managers. Annually, funds will be allocated to the IE Office to provide training in budget planning (emphasizing function/activity based budgeting) for all budget managers. The Office of Human Resources has been charged with the responsibility of maintaining in personnel records evidence of this training.

The Director of IE has been charged with responsibility for developing and annually updating a document describing the University's external and internal environment, and projecting likely changes in these environments. This report will be published each fall semester beginning Fall 2003.

**Response to Recommendation 2:**

Each unit has been instructed to include in unit plans, a description of its key administrative or education support processes, expected outcomes of these processes or services, and how they will be evaluated. Each dean or division head has been charged with reviewing statements of purpose, goals, means of evaluation, and use of the evaluation results to improve processes and services. These activities are to be recorded in the University's planning template, Prism, annually every August beginning in August 2003.

**Response to Recommendation 3:**

Beginning with the 2003-04 planning and budgeting cycles, the planning and budgeting will follow the same time-line (Attachment 3.1).

**Suggestions:**

1. The committee suggests that evaluation of all administrators/directors include specified criteria for addressing effectiveness in planning, budgeting, and evaluation.
2. The committee suggests that all institutional policies include a statement of purpose, defined evaluation cycle/method, and responsible entity.

**Response to Suggestion 1:**

The President has charged each division head with revising processes for evaluating administrators to include assessment of administrators' effectiveness in planning, budgeting, and evaluation. The Administrative Council will be responsible for developing the revisions for evaluating division heads and others who report directly to the President. The revised procedures are to be completed and approved in time for implementation during the 2003-04 academic year.

**Response to Suggestion 2:**

The President has charged each division head to develop and implement a process for review and evaluation of all policies that are unique to her/his division. Effective February 2003, all additions or modifications of published policies must have a statement of purpose, a means of evaluating achievement of the purpose, designation of who is responsible for evaluating the policy, and when it will be evaluated. By August 2005, all published policies will be in compliance.

---

**For each administrative and educational support service unit, the Institution must:**

1. **Establish a clearly defined purpose which supports the institution's purpose and goals;**
2. **Formulate goals which support the purpose of each unit;**
3. **Develop and implement procedures to evaluate the extent to which these goals are being achieved in each unit; and**
4. **Use the results of the evaluations to improve administrative and educational support services.**

**Recommendations:**

1. The committee recommends that JSU demonstrate that all administrative and educational support services planning units have developed procedures to evaluate the extent to which the administrative/educational support goals are being achieved.
2. The committee recommends that JSU demonstrate that all administrative and educational support services planning units are using the results of evaluations to improve educational programs, services, and operations.

**Response to Recommendation 1:**

Each department/unit has been instructed to review, revise as necessary, and submit its assessment plans for all administrative and educational support services to the IE Committee for review and evaluation. Unit assessment plans must be entered into a centralized, electronic database, in a common format by May 2003. The IE Committee has been charged to provide a report of its evaluation to the VPABA by October 2003.

**Response to Recommendation 2:**

The VPABA and division directors have been charged with the responsibility of evaluating each subordinate administrative or educational support unit's planning, evaluation of goal achievement, and use of evaluation results to improve procedures, processes, policies, and student learning. This involves annually reviewing the assessment plans, five-year plan, and annual report for each unit under his/her authority and reporting, to the unit and the President through the Director of IE, on the adequacy of the unit's plans and their implementation. The report will be due each fall semester beginning Fall 2003.

### 3.3 INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

**It must be effective in collecting and analyzing data and disseminating results.**

**Suggestion:**

The committee suggests that survey findings be linked to the University web site for review and use by the University community.

**Response:**

The Office of Assessment is currently providing selected results of surveys and student testing on the University's Intranet. For example, detailed results from the Spring 2002 administration of the College Students Experiences Questionnaire (CSEQ) survey are presented in numerous EXCEL tables. The IE Office is implementing 'datamart' capability that will allow interested faculty and administrators to make direct queries of raw data for many of our survey files.

---

**An institution must regularly evaluate the effectiveness of its institutional research process and use its findings for the improvement of its process.**

**Recommendation:**

The committee recommends that the University regularly evaluate the effectiveness of its institutional research process and use its findings for the improvement of its process.

**Response:**

Effective Fall 2003, the University is implementing a three-pronged approach to evaluating institutional research:

1. The IE Committee has been charged with reviewing the annual reports and plans of the IE Office and the Office of Assessment and providing the President a report on the effectiveness of these offices and making recommendations for improvement. Currently, recipients of institutional research-produced information such as survey results; demographic profiles of enrolled students, etc. are given an opportunity to provide feedback about the usefulness of the data. Periodically, users of surveys are asked to provide suggestions for revisions of information gathering instruments. This information will be included in the annual reports of these two offices.
2. All program reviews for academic and non-academic units will include a section on planning and evaluation. The review will also evaluate the adequacy of data provided to units for evaluation and planning purposes. The IE Committee will monitor this aspect of program

review to determine the effectiveness of the institutional research process.

3. Every seven years, the University will initiate a comprehensive review of the planning process. The segment of this review dealing with institutional research support of planning and evaluation will provide a comprehensive evaluation of the institutional research process. The next comprehensive review is scheduled for Fall 2004.

## **IV. EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM**

### **4.2 UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAM**

#### **4.2.1 Undergraduate Admission**

**An institution admitting students with deficiencies in their preparation for collegiate study must offer appropriate developmental or remedial support to assist these students.**

**Suggestion:**

The committee suggests that JSU develop a computerized system to track the removal of deficiencies to ensure that students register for appropriate courses.

**Response:**

Existing software restricts enrollment in English and Math courses according to pre-selected sequential progression and successful completion of English and Math courses. Students and academic advisers have access to Degree Audit Reporting System (DARS) forms at any time to review and determine that prerequisites are met and deficiencies removed. A program is being written to identify conditionally admitted students who have achieved sophomore status without completing the required Learning Services Course(s). This tracking system will be in place by Summer 2003.

---

**Each institution must regularly evaluate its admission policies.**

**Recommendation:**

The committee recommends that the University regularly evaluate admission policies for all admission categories to include transfer, international, special student, accelerated pre-college program/dual enrollment, early admission, non-traditional entrance admissions.

**Response:**

A ten-year admission standards review will be implemented in Fall 2004. A ten-year analysis of the admission standards for first-time college students was completed in October 2002. The report was submitted to the Academic Standards Subcommittee of the Enrollment Management Committee. In addition to first-time students admitted conditionally or unconditionally, the analysis included students admitted through the ExSEL summer program, through the appeals process (Admissions Committee), and those classified as non-traditional.

A comparable analysis of transfer and international student admission criteria will be completed by August 2003. In addition, the admission policy governing early admission, accelerated high school admission, dual

enrollment, and special student admission will be reviewed. The Coordinator of Assessment in collaboration with the Director of IE will conduct the analysis and review.

---

**It is the responsibility of the institution to ensure that its recruiting activities and materials accurately and truthfully portray the institution.**

**Suggestion:**

The committee suggests that to ensure accuracy all departments should frequently update departmental web sites and brochures.

**Response:**

Deans will require department heads to review and update web sites and brochures and will require verification from departments of this action. Deans' offices will periodically review web sites for timeliness and accuracy. The review was begun in Fall 2002 and will be repeated at least annually. Also beginning in the Fall 2002, the Data Systems Management Division implemented a process to systematically oversee the accuracy of web sites through electronic means.

---

#### 4.2.3 Undergraduate Curriculum

**The institution must have a clearly defined process by which the curriculum is established, reviewed and evaluated.**

**Suggestion:**

The committee suggests that curriculum proposals be placed on the University Intranet, with password-protected access, so that all faculty will have opportunity to access and respond to proposals.

**Response:**

The current process of curriculum proposal and review is available on-line and for a period of time each month, curriculum proposals can be viewed and responded to. The Curriculum Committee will consider this recommendation and reconsider the policies and procedures guiding curriculum review and approval. The committee will then make recommendations to the Academic Council and the VPASA on how to increase faculty accessibility to the curriculum review and approval process by Fall 2003.

#### 4.2.4 Undergraduate Instruction

**Experimentation with methods to improve instruction must be adequately supported and critically evaluated.**

**Suggestion:**

The committee suggests that the University develop a written policy on the development, implementation, and evaluation of “M” designated courses.

**Response:**

The current practice views M courses as experimental courses only with a temporary life span during which time the faculty member determines whether the course has merit and should be proposed as a permanent course or terminated. By Summer 2003, the Curriculum Committee will develop a written policy to guide the M course process including periodic review of M courses and time limits for their offerings.

---

**Courses offered in non-traditional formats, e.g., concentrated or abbreviated time periods, must be designed to ensure an opportunity for preparation, reflection and analysis concerning the subject matter.**

**Suggestion:**

The committee suggests that an explanation of Marathon terms is included in the *University Catalogue* and that more complete information be provided in the summer *Schedule of Classes* for each Marathon.

**Response:**

The number of marathons offered has been reduced and time frames for marathons now coincide with a fixed period of time, about 16 weeks, beginning in May and ending in August. Sessions are 4 weeks, 6 weeks, 8 weeks, or twelve weeks, with common beginning and ending dates. This schedule will be implemented May 2003. All pertinent dates for registration, class beginnings, payments due, mid-term grades, final exams, grade reporting, etc, will be published for short sessions/marathons just as they are published for fall and spring semesters.

---

#### 4.2.5 Academic Advising of Undergraduate Students

**Each institution must conduct a systematic, effective program of undergraduate academic advising.**

**Suggestions:**

1. The committee suggests that JSU develop a plan to address advisor availability during extended registration periods.

2. The committee suggests that the University develop advisor training programs and evaluation procedures for all major advisors.

**Response to Suggestion 1:**

To address the suggestion, an ad hoc committee on advising was formed in January 2003 to review the findings; survey faculty, staff, and students; and make recommendations for improving the advising system. In particular, the committee will study the extended registration periods.

**Response to Suggestion 2:**

Beginning in the Spring 2003, the Coordinator of Academic Advisement will conduct a series of in-service training sessions for major advisors. These training sessions, scheduled for four sessions in February 2003, will cover such topics as academic standards in advising, programs for high school students, course credits and grades, resources for student success, addressing the special needs of undecided majors and other pertinent topics as requested by participants. An activity designed to evaluate the University's academic advising processes and procedures will also be included in the sessions.

The office of the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs (AVPAA) will promote this training program actively at the deans' level and recruit advisors from as many major areas as possible at the department/program level. Depending upon the results of the evaluation and upon in-service participation, this planned course of action should lead to more focused discussions and initiatives on the topics mentioned above in semesters to come.

The AVPAA is chairing an ad hoc committee that will develop and recommend revised evaluation procedures for major advisors to the VPASA by Fall 2004.

### 4.3 GRADUATE PROGRAM

#### 4.3.4 Graduate Curriculum

**Combined instruction of graduate and undergraduate students, if permitted at all, must be structured to ensure appropriate attention to both groups.**

**Recommendation:**

The committee recommends that all 400G courses ensure that course requirements are appropriate for students seeking graduate course credit.

**Response:**

Beginning in Fall 2002, deans and department heads in all colleges began a review of course requirements of all 400G classes to ensure that the requirements are appropriate for students seeking graduate course credit in that discipline. Each department will provide verification of the review to the Dean of the College by Spring 2003.

**Suggestion:**

The committee suggests that the academic departments develop criteria to differentiate 400 and 400G courses.

**Response:**

Deans and department heads will develop criteria to differentiate 400 and 400G classes and will provide these in writing to the AVPAA who will review the criteria for appropriate differentiation. Starting Fall 2003, 400 and 400G courses will have two separate syllabi appropriate to the instructional level. To provide additional oversight, the Graduate Council, with administrative assistance from the AVPAA, will be charged with responsibility for monitoring 400G courses to ensure that the syllabi and course evaluation procedures/instruments assure appropriate differentiation, consistent with criteria developed for undergraduate and graduate versions of the course.

---

#### 4.3.6 Academic Advising of Graduate Students

**Each institution must conduct a systematic, effective program of graduate academic advising.**

**Suggestion:**

The committee suggests that JSU develop a plan to address advisor availability during extended registration periods.

**Response:**

To address the suggestion, an ad hoc committee on advising was formed in January 2003 to review the findings; survey faculty, staff, and students;

and make recommendations for improving the advising system. In particular, the committee will study the extended registration periods.

## 4.7 STUDENT RECORDS

**The institution must take all steps necessary to ensure the security of its student records, including storage in a secure vault or fireproof cabinet.**

**Suggestion:**

The committee suggests that the Continuing Education records be stored in the Registrar's Office to ensure that the records for both credit and non-credit courses are stored in one central location.

**Response:**

The non-credit transcripts in the Office of Continuing Education and the In-Service Education Center have been downloaded to CDs and these have been stored in the Registrar's vault as of November 2002. In the future, this process will be followed quarterly.

4.8 FACULTY  
4.8.2.2 Baccalaureate

**At least 25 percent of the discipline course hours in each undergraduate major must be taught by faculty members holding the terminal degree, usually the earned doctorate, in that discipline.**

**Recommendation:**

The committee recommends that JSU employ a sufficient number of faculty with terminal degrees in Family & Consumer Sciences to meet the criterion of at least 25 percent of discipline course hours in the undergraduate major taught by faculty members holding a terminal degree in the discipline.

**Response:**

A candidate with a doctorate was interviewed in November 2002 for a Child Development faculty position to be filled by Fall 2003. Full-time faculty include one faculty member with a doctorate in the discipline and another that is a candidate for the doctoral degree for Spring 2003. With these additional faculty credentials, the FCS Department will exceed the 25 percent requirement. Compliance with the criteria is expected by Fall 2003.

---

4.8.2.3 Graduate

**Eligibility requirements for faculty members teaching graduate courses must be clearly defined and publicized.**

**Suggestion:**

The committee suggests that the College of Graduate Studies develop a procedure for updating the status of graduate faculty appointments.

**Response:**

In Fall 2002 the graduate faculty were entered on a spreadsheet, which may be sorted by name, department, and expiration of graduate faculty appointment term. This spreadsheet will permit a timely updating of the status of graduate faculty appointments.

---

**Each faculty member teaching courses at the master's and specialist degree level must hold the terminal degree, usually the earned doctorate, in the teaching discipline or a related discipline.**

**Recommendation:**

The committee recommends that the faculty in Curriculum and Instruction be allowed to teach graduate courses only upon completion of the doctorate.

**Response:**

The Department of Curriculum and Instruction currently has two faculty members that are ABD (all but dissertation) at the University of Alabama at Birmingham in the area of Early Childhood Education (ECE). A faculty member with the terminal degree will be assigned to all graduate level ECE courses beginning in Fall 2003.

---

#### 4.8.3 Part-Time Faculty

**Each institution must also provide for appropriate orientation, supervision and evaluation of all part-time faculty members.**

**Suggestion:**

The committee suggests that an orientation protocol, including written material, for part-time faculty be developed.

**Response:**

Each college has a plan for orientation of part-time faculty on file in the office of the AVPAA. A university-wide orientation plan for part-time faculty consisting of common elements across colleges, including but limited to human resource policies, concerns and issues, is planned for implementation in Fall 2003. A handbook for part-time faculty is also being developed and will be available in Fall 2003.

---

#### 4.8.4 Graduate Teaching Assistants

**Each institution employing graduate teaching assistants must provide a published set of guidelines for institution-wide graduate assistantship administration, including appointment criteria, remuneration, rights and responsibilities, evaluation and reappointment.**

**Suggestion:**

The committee suggests that an updated "Graduate Assistantship Program Guide" be made available both in hard copy and on the University web site.

**Response:**

The "Graduate Assistantship Program Guide" was revised in Fall 2002 and is available in hard copy and on the graduate studies web site.

## 4.9 CONSORTIAL RELATIONSHIPS AND CONTRACTUAL AGREEMENTS

**All consortia and contracts must be evaluated regularly.**

**Suggestions:**

1. The committee suggests that all contracts or agreements involving activities for which academic credit is granted be housed in a central location on campus.
2. The committee suggests that the institution establish guidelines for regular evaluation of contracts and agreements.

**Response to Suggestion 1:**

Currently contracts and agreements that include a component of academic credit are housed in the respective academic units. This is appropriate for programs with accreditation requirements and for their daily oversight of such arrangements. There is a need for centralized information about such arrangements. With that caveat, the AVPAA will develop a set of questions and reporting items that pertain to contracts of this nature for units to respond to annually as part of their annual report and systematic program review. The University's planning and reporting template will include a section for the systematic reporting of this information. The reporting will be implemented by Fall 2003 and the information will become part of the University's information system. The AVPAA and the Director of IE will work in partnership to assure that appropriate information is requested, provided, and stored.

**Response to Suggestion 2:**

Contracts and agreements are evaluated according to the terms of the contracts and agreements themselves. In some instances the review is annual, while others may be reviewed more often or less frequently. To institutionalize the evaluation of contracts and agreements, units will include an annual evaluation and reporting of all contracts during the annual reporting process beginning in May 2003. They are reviewed more fully during the five-year program review cycle.

## Appendix IV-A

### “DISTANCE EDUCATION: DEFINITIONS AND PRINCIPLES”

**Principle 2: The institution’s faculty assumes responsibility for and exercises oversight over Distance Education, ensuring both the rigor of programs and quality of instruction.**

**Suggestion:**

The committee suggests that a checklist be made available on-line and used by faculty members and administration to ensure academically rigorous courses are being provided through Distance Education technology.

**Response:**

Following the SACS requirement that the institution develop a reasonable plan for evaluating the effectiveness of its distance education activities, evaluation instruments are currently placed on-line and may be considered guidelines to further support the delivery of academically rigorous courses. In addition, a committee appointed by the VPASA is revising the Distance Education Policy that will be implemented in Fall 2003. The Policy includes checklists for Distance Education Intent to Plan (for existing courses) and Distance Education Intent to Plan (for new courses).

**Principle 13: The institution provides laboratories, facilities, and equipment appropriate to the courses or programs.**

**Suggestion:**

The committee suggests that appropriate space be provided to the Department of Distance Education for training purposes in the form of an instructional design lab, in order to provide for optimum service to faculty and staff members.

**Response:**

The Office of Distance Education's Five-Year Plan calls for the establishment of an Instructional Design Laboratory. Currently existing labs across campus are shared with the campus community. While this is not an ideal arrangement it is adequate to the task. Within two years, the Office of Distance Education will move to a campus building that is occupied by the Department of Communication, a television studio, and the campus radio station. The building will have dedicated space for instructional technology so that training can be conducted more optimally. The expected date of this move is Fall 2004.

## **V. EDUCATIONAL SUPPORT SERVICES**

### **5.1 LIBRARY AND OTHER LEARNING RESOURCES**

#### **5.1.3 Library Collections**

**Institutions offering graduate work must provide library resources substantially beyond those required for baccalaureate programs.**

**Recommendation:**

The committee recommends that the University demonstrate that library resources for graduate programs are substantially beyond those required for baccalaureate programs.

**Response:**

While ongoing collection development is more intense for graduate programs than undergraduate, the JSU collection excels in peer, state, and national comparisons. Even though graduate students and faculty indicate satisfaction with library collections in a number of surveys, not all subject collections meet the 3c goal (Advanced Study or Instructional Support Level) specified for graduate instruction by the WLN Conspectus. Those disciplines where the subject collections fall below with 3c goal for advanced study holdings will have the need for more collections addressed. The administration recognizes the library cannot maintain its collections at the graduate level without additional funding. To address this need, library staff will list the areas and request budget increases accordingly beginning with the Spring 2003 budget development process. These requests will be funded in order to upgrade all graduate collections to the 3c level. Beginning in FY 2004, the library will receive start-up and ongoing collection development funds for new academic programs with a special emphasis on new graduate programs. The University will be in compliance by Spring 2004.

## 5.4 STUDENT DEVELOPMENT SERVICES

### 5.4.2 Resources

**Human, physical, financial and equipment resources for student development services must be adequate to support the goals of the institution.**

**Suggestion:**

The committee suggests that the needs identified in the Unit Reports be prioritized and that innovative solutions and additional funding sources be pursued.

**Response:**

The University administration is very supportive of student development services and has made great efforts over the past five years to upgrade equipment including computers, add needed personnel, and renovate and refurbish facilities including the student center (Theron Montgomery Building), student service offices, and residence hall lobbies. Personnel needs identified in the Self-Study Report for Admissions, Financial Aid, University Housing, Disability Support Services, and University Police Department have been adequately addressed. Personnel needs still exist in Career Placement Services, Counseling and Career Services, and Student Activities. A coordinator of cooperative education for Career Placement is needed to support the growth of the Co-op program as well as to develop service-learning opportunities.

In Counseling and Career Services, the student/counselor ratio is currently 1:2400. The goal of that department is one counselor to every 1000 students. The director of Counseling and Career Services is actively seeking external funding to support an additional counselor.

The responsibilities of the director of Student Activities have increased over the past five years. The need exists for an additional staff member to optimally fulfill the expanded job expectations assigned to that unit.

In addition, the director of recreational sports expressed a need for a tuition scholarship to fund a graduate assistant position. Funding for student salaries in that unit will be reviewed to determine if appropriate funds can be reallocated to meet expressed need.

In the area of equipment, Career Placement, Counseling and Career Services, Financial Aid, Admissions, and Disability Support Services upgraded computers in the Summer of 2002. Equipment needs not met include a new tour van for the Admissions Office and a new patrol car for University Police Department. As of Spring 2003, a used vehicle will be added to the police fleet.

With enrollment steadily increasing, several offices have reported a shortage of desired space. The Academic Center for Excellence (3<sup>rd</sup> floor TMB) houses several student support services including Counseling and Career Services, Disability Support Services, Supplemental Learning Services (tutoring), and the Testing Coordinator. Common space and classroom space is shared by these entities. With the increased usage of the Center, student confidentiality is compromised (counseling) and tutors must find quiet locations for study sessions.

Should the Student Health Center secure funding to increase services to the university community, the current facility requires expansion or the service requires relocation. The final unit concerned about space is University Housing. Currently, one residence hall is off-line for occupancy while serving as an academic building for the next two years. In addition, two residence halls were demolished last year. Therefore, in the past five years, three residence halls have been removed from use without replacement of lost sleeping beds. While enrollment has increased, the number of residence hall rooms has decreased. Effective Fall 2004/Spring 2005, the residence hall currently designated as an academic building will return to the listing of resident facilities.

The Director of Admissions noted a need for professional development funds for her staff. Travel funds in that unit are dedicated primarily to recruiting efforts. A commitment has been made to increase opportunities and funding for professional development for the Admissions staff in 2003.

Student development services unit directors are encouraged to identify and pursue outside funding for special needs and projects. For example in 1998, the University was awarded a Title III grant to enhance student persistence and to provide opportunities for faculty development. The grant period ends September 2003. Similar granting sources must be pursued to provide the funding for additional personnel, expanded technological services, and increased office space.

## VI. ADMINISTRATIVE PROCESSES

### 6.1 ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION

#### 6.1.4 Official Policies

**The institution must publish official documents which contain, but are not limited to, the following information: the duties and responsibilities of administrative officers, the patterns of institutional organization, the role of the faculty in institutional governance, statements governing tenure or employment security, statements governing due process, and other institutional policies and procedures that affect the faculty and other personnel.**

**Suggestion:**

The committee suggests that the *Staff Handbook* be placed on-line.

**Response:**

The Administrative and Business Affairs Division has proposed that the Staff Handbook be placed on-line during Spring 2003, following approval by the Board of Trustees.

---

#### 6.2.2 Fund Raising

**An institution must develop policies and procedures for fund raising and ensure that such policies are appropriately disseminated and followed.**

**Suggestion:**

The committee suggests that policies and procedures regarding fund raising be broadly disseminated.

**Response:**

The University is in the beginning stages of planning a second capital campaign. The Foundation's *Policies and Procedures Manual* will be reviewed and expanded in preparation for the campaign. It is anticipated that this document will be used as a dual manual for both the Foundation and the University. By the Fall 2003, the updated manual will be available in print form and will also be posted on the University's web site.

## 6.4 PHYSICAL RESOURCES

**Physical resources, including buildings and equipment both on and off campus, must be adequate to serve the needs of the institution in relation to its stated purpose, programs, and activities.**

### **Suggestions:**

1. The committee suggests that the University develop a long-range plan to address the inadequacies in technical resources identified by the units.
2. The committee suggests that strategies to resolve parking complaints identified in unit reports be communicated to faculty, staff, and students.

### **Response to Suggestion 1:**

A significant institutional commitment during recent years has resulted in the acquisition and availability of improved technology for students, faculty, and staff. However, implementation of a formal institutional plan to replace aging hardware and software is needed to ensure that this process continues, even during periods of funding constraints. Based on the current inventory of more than 1700 personal computers and several hundred peripherals on campus, a three-year replacement plan will require the purchase of approximately 570 computers annually. Using a \$1400 average system replacement cost (some of the systems will include printers, others will not), an annual allocation of approximately \$800,000 will be required to support an adequate plan to “acquire and retire” technology in departments throughout the campus. This does not include a significant inventory of mid-range computers, the mainframe computer that processes the University administrative applications, and the network infrastructure.

The chair of the University Budget Committee has charged the Planning Subcommittee with the responsibility of developing a formal institutional plan to maintain adequate technical resources for the University. The plan will include components to identify inadequacies and recommend funding sources to upgrade technology on a consistent, recurring schedule.

The University has placed a high priority on providing technical resources for faculty and staff. Long-range plans will be developed in order to bring more consistency and focus to the provision of technical resources. The plan will be presented to the Budget Committee in Spring 2003, for use with budget development.

### **Response to Suggestion 2:**

The University is evaluating available parking across campus and will increase parking spaces as soon as funds become available. The plans include additional parking between Stone Center and Rowe Hall and the

west side of Daugette Hall. Other sites are also under consideration. The plans will be communicated to the campus community through the Chanticleer, the local newspaper, the JSU web site, and electronic messaging to the faculty and staff.

Two additional police officers were hired to provide part-time parking oversight on campus. Bi-weekly reports of parking violations that include type of violation, location, and time of day provide insight into the areas where parking is a problem.

In addition to ongoing studies by the UPD on parking, a committee comprised of a cross section of university stakeholders studied the parking problem and made recommendations to the administration. Some recommendations (increased parking fines, more faculty/staff parking spaces) have been implemented. Others are still under consideration.

---

### 6.4.3 Safety and Security

**The institution must take reasonable steps to provide a healthful, safe and secure environment for all members of the campus community.**

**Recommendation:**

The committee recommends that the University provide appropriate space for the safe storage of housekeeping supplies.

**Response:**

The University has identified the deficiency for adequate space for housekeeping supplies. These deficiencies have been listed in previous years in the Physical Plant's Deferred Maintenance Plan. The Deferred Maintenance Plan is basically a 5-10 year detailed plan of maintenance needs, major renovation projects and proposed new construction projects. Listed in the plan under Year 2004 - Miscellaneous Projects - Building Services - Metal Storage Building - \$85,000 awaits funding. This deficiency has been clearly identified, corrective action programmed, and will be completed no later than June 2005. Until a building replacement occurs, the deteriorated portion of the building has been sealed off to keep personnel out of the area.

Additionally, the University is presently exploring the possibility of obtaining storage space at the old cotton mill from the City of Jacksonville. This new storage space would negate the need for a new metal storage building for housekeeping supplies if this real estate transaction occurs.

**Suggestion:**

The committee suggests that the University take actions to improve the quality of Housekeeping Services.

**Response:**

The University has taken positive and proactive steps in an attempt to remedy the housekeeping quality issue as follows:

1. In Fall 2002, an additional housekeeper was hired for the evening housekeeping crew, which cleans academic buildings after classes.
2. Quality supplies, materials and equipment are being purchased to improve the cleaning operation of University facilities.
3. In Spring 2003, the evening housekeeping crew's work schedule was changed in an attempt to reduce absenteeism, provide visibility and coverage during evening class periods plus more convenient time for additional supervision and oversight. Previously, the evening crew reported to work at 9:00 p.m. and ended their shift at 6:00 a.m. Monday through Friday and 4:30 p.m. to 12:30 a.m. on Friday. The revised evening schedule is 5:00 p.m. to 1:30 a.m. Monday through Friday.

The improvements in quality of cleaning services has been accomplished with additional personnel, supplies, equipment plus better working hours for housekeepers along with more supervision.

# ATTACHMENTS

## Attachment 1.2

### JACKSONVILLE STATE UNIVERSITY Division of Academic and Student Affairs SUBSTANTIVE CHANGE POLICY

- SUBJECT:** Proposals for Curriculum Changes and New Degree Programs or Majors
- Purpose:** To provide faculty and administrators with instructions on substantive change requirements, including preparation of proposals for external approval of curriculum changes and new degree programs or majors.
- Evaluation:** A review of all new programs and other substantive changes will be evaluated annually to determine compliance with reporting requirements and quality of program proposals.

**Responsible Entity:** Institutional Effectiveness Committee

**Procedure:**

Proposals for curriculum changes and new degree programs or majors should originate within the academic department or college proposing the change. Internal review and approvals are processed through the University Curriculum Committee (undergraduate changes/programs) or the Graduate Council (graduate changes/programs).

Units should notify the Director of Institutional Effectiveness of proposed new degrees, programs (majors, minors, or concentrations), instructional sites, or course delivery methodologies. The Director, in consultation with the IE Committee, will review the proposal and report to the Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs.

#### Substantive Changes

1. The Commission on Colleges (COC) defines substantive change as “a significant modification or expansion of the nature and scope of an accredited institution” (<http://www.sacscoc.org/commpub.asp>). Prior to initiating any curriculum change proposals, the type of change should be reviewed in relation to the standards for substantive change to determine whether the change must be reported to the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS).
2. All substantive changes that must be reported require either prior notification or prior approval. The timeline for contacting the COC before initiating the changes is established as either (a) prior to implementation, (b) six months before implementation, or (c) twelve months before implementation.
3. Substantive changes may require submission of a prospectus and, in some cases, a site visit.

#### New Degree Programs or Majors

1. Departments proposing new degree programs or majors should contact the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs to obtain guidelines for preparation of the proposal. The department should also allow adequate time to complete the approval process through the University, the Alabama Commission on Higher Education, and any accrediting agencies included the SACS COC.
  - 1.1 Proposals for new majors and new degrees must follow the format for *New Program Notifications and Proposals* (1999) developed by the Alabama Commission on Higher Education.
  - 1.2 If the new degree/major constitutes a substantive change, a prospectus will be required (see Appendix B of the SACS Substantive Change Policy).
  - 1.3 New minors only require approval through the level of the Vice-President for Academic and Student Affairs (VPASA).
  - 1.4 New concentrations must be approved through the level of the VPASA and submitted to ACHE for review/approval.

# Jacksonville State University

## Institutional Effectiveness Calendar 2002-2003

(Planning, Assessment, Budgeting, Program Review)

September 2002	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Administrative Council</b> submits Institutional 5-yr goals to President for approval</li> </ul>
October 2002	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>President</b> and <b>Board of Trustees</b> approve Institutional Goals</li> <li>• <b>Board of Trustees</b> approve budget</li> </ul>
November 2002	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Institutional Effectiveness Committee</b> begins revision of <i>Planning Guide</i> and <i>Institutional Effectiveness Manual</i> to reflect new goals, calendar and web-based template (PRISM)</li> </ul>
December 2002	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>President</b> charges the University Budget Committee</li> <li>• <b>Budget Committee</b> begins work</li> <li>• <b>I.E.</b> implements revisions to the <b>PRISM</b> system to address self-study recommendations: (including administrative review comments, approval mechanism, prioritization and budget expansion requirements)</li> </ul>
January 2003	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>I.E.</b> revised planning guide distributed to all planning units (by Jan 3<sup>rd</sup>)</li> <li>• <b>ALL units</b> with involvement of faculty and staff revise/develop and enter into PRISM administrative goals, objectives, evaluation measures and expansion (new) funding requests for 2003-2004 year that support the Institutional Goals</li> </ul>
February 2003	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Deans/Directors</b> review unit plans and funding request and provide feedback to unit planners</li> <li>• <b>Deans/Directors</b> approve unit plans and approve funding request contingent upon revenue</li> <li>• <b>VPASA</b> decision to purchase system (TracDat) or revise PRISM to include expected educational outcomes</li> <li>• <b>President in conjunction with VPASA</b> develops broad research and service goals for the University</li> </ul>
March 2003	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>VPs and Division heads</b> review/ approve College/Division plans and expansion (new) funding requests</li> <li>• <b>Budget Committee</b> recommends tuition and fees to the President</li> </ul>
April 2003	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>All units enter approved</b> funding requests into BU01 budgeting system</li> <li>• <b>President</b> recommends tuitions and fees to the Board of Trustees</li> <li>• <b>Dept Heads and Deans</b> develop/revise with faculty expected student outcomes and measures for assessing expected outcomes for the 2003-2004 year</li> <li>• <b>ACADEMIC PROGRAMS ASSESSMENT PLANS</b> entered in common electronic database</li> <li>• <b>Each Dean</b>, with involvement of <b>faculty and staff</b>, revise/develop and enter into common database expected research/service outcomes for 2003-2004 year that support the University's research/service goals</li> </ul>
May 2003	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>All Units</b> begin preparing 2002-2003 annual reports (two sections: significant accomplishments (Word format) and Institutional Effectiveness Report (PRISM template))</li> <li>• <b>VPASA</b> develops process for establishment of General Education outcomes for evaluating success in meeting the outcomes and developing strategies to achieve the outcomes</li> <li>• <b>Budget Committee</b> reports its recommendations to the President</li> </ul>
June 2003	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>V.P.'s and Division heads</b> review, finalize and approve budget recommendation. Budget managers notified of approved budget.</li> <li>• <b>All Units</b> reports on Significant Accomplishments due to Division head and VP's mid June</li> <li>• <b>Institutional Effectiveness Office (I.E.)</b> develops draft procedures and schedule for 5yr cycle of <i>Program Review</i> and submits to Academic Council for approval/forwarding to Admin Council</li> </ul>
July 2003	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>President</b> finalizes and approves budget. Budget managers notified of any budget changes.</li> <li>• <b>Administrative Council</b> recommends and <b>President</b> approves procedures/5yr schedule <i>Program Review</i></li> <li>• <b>Board of Trustees</b> approves interim budget</li> <li>• <b>VP's and Division Heads</b> submit by <b>July 15<sup>th</sup></b> 2002-2003 significant accomplishments report to I.E.</li> </ul>
August 2003	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>All Units</b> 2002-2003 Institutional Effectiveness Report completed in PRISM template</li> <li>• <b>I.E. committee Report on Institutional Goals</b> to President and Administrative Council with recommendations (if any) for revision of the goals</li> </ul>
<b>Guidelines for Annual Program Review Timeline in Future Calendars</b>	
By April 1st	Units scheduled for upcoming program review notified
August-October	Units conduct internal self-study
September	Program Review team appointed
October-February	Program Review team conducts review and writes report
March	Units receive and review report for factual content and provide clarification to the report
April-May	Units develop implementation plan to address report findings
By June 30th	Report and Implementation plan submitted

NOTE: All dates are the end of the month unless other wise noted