

Meeting Minutes: Committee on Academic Affairs

Administrative Committee on Academic Affairs Spring 2003 Minutes/Conclusions

April 22, 2003, Macon State College

The Administrative Committee on Academic Affairs held its spring meeting at Macon State College in the Foundation Board Room on April 22, 2003. Dr. Ronald J. Henry, Chair and Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs at Georgia State University, called the meeting to order. The minutes of the fall meeting (November 5, 2002) were approved as disseminated.

I. Senior Vice Chancellor's Report

A. Budget Update

Dr. Daniel S. Papp, Senior Vice Chancellor for Academics, Faculty and Student Affairs, discussed the budget for the upcoming academic year. Dr. Papp informed the chief academic officers that the budget was not yet approved. Dr. Papp commented that a 27 million reduction was added to the 184 million reduction previously passed. The possibility of fund rollovers from fiscal year to the next was under discussion in committee.

B. Faculty Workload Report for Legislature

Dr. Papp explained that the System Office did not have a system workload policy. A subcommittee of chief academic officers would be formed to address this issue. Chief Academic Officers who were interested in serving on the committee should contact either Drs. Papp or Butler. Issues to be addressed by the committee include the difference between faculty workload and teaching load, complexities of faculty member roles, and educating various publics on what is meant by scholarship, teaching, and public service across institutional sectors.

C. Right for Faculty/Staff to Appeal to BOR

Dr. Papp stated that faculty and staff have the right to appeal to the Board of Regents after presidential action has taken place and appropriate institutional processes and procedures have been followed.

D. Schedule of Meetings Per Year (also under action items)

To address initiatives, actions, and other items, the chief academic officers, led by Dr. Papp, discussed the possibility of meeting four times per year instead of three.

E. Social Security Numbers and Student Privacy

Dr. Papp referenced the points made in the Chancellor's letter to Presidents as of March 20, 2003 (see attached) in which practices, procedures, and timetables were summarized concerning the replacement of social security numbers. Although the tenets of the letter will be implemented systemwide at a future date, the timetable for completion of institutional revised business practices

and procedures has been delayed. [[Letter to Presidents, March 20, 2003](#)]

F. MAP/MRO Conference Summary

Dr. Papp commented that the Minority Advising Program/Minority Recruitment Office (MAP/MRO) meeting held in Augusta was successful. The MAP/MRO professionals were concerned about issues ranging from the regents' test to the USG budget. Dr. Papp and Ms. Marci Middleton requested that all chief academic officers support the activities of MAP/MRO offices and facilitate interinstitutional support among faculty, administrators, and other units of their respective institutions.

G. Regents' Test

Dr. Papp explained that the Board of Regents agreed to change the Regents' Testing policy. A student who passed a national test at a level where the data history shows a 95% score or higher would qualify to be considered as passing the Regents' Test. The quantitative version of the test would be made available for those institutions that elect to use it for institutional purposes and counseling students. [[Regents' Test of Quantitative Skills - memo](#)]

H. African American Male Initiative

It was reported that the African American Male Initiative would present a preliminary report of its recommendations to the Board during the April Meeting. Final recommendations would be forthcoming during the May meeting.

I. Credit-hour Cap on Certificate Programs w/Core Curriculum

Dr. Papp explained that issues requiring due diligence with regard to credit-hour caps include paraprofessional programs and the general education component of these programs. Chief Academic Officers were advised to contact Dr. Frank Butler to resolve any student issues that resulted from core curriculum or credit hour cap concerns.

J. Status of OEA and Accountability

It was stated that the Office of Educational Accountability (OEA) would be a point of discussion during the upcoming legislative session. As the current administration in the Governor's office commences reviewing each state agency, additional details would be forthcoming concerning the existence and role of OEA's activities.

K. Review of B Codes and Personnel Categories (Walk-on Item)

It was announced that reviews of the B Codes were underway to determine whether individuals were accurately reported in the Peoplesoft human resources/financials system according to function. Such a review has ramifications for the under (or over) - reporting of workload for several categories of personnel at a given institution. Reminder: Memo 1 no longer exists. [[IPEDS/Occupational Class Table](#)]

L. Non-resident Tuition Waivers (Walk-on Item)

Dr. Papp provided an example of one waiver [out of several] that qualifies a non-resident for in-state tuition. This waiver states that at least one parent must be a resident of Georgia. Chief Academic Officers were encouraged to review Board Policy. It was stated that the Governor discussed the possibility of a uniform residency policy for the purposes of HOPE.

II. Discussion Items

A. CPR Update from RACIE (Votes Required)

Dr. Robert Haney provided an overview of the ten RACIE recommendations with regard to Comprehensive Program Review. It was moved and seconded that the RACIE "suggestions" concerning comprehensive program review be submitted to the System Office of Academic Affairs for review by the staff and Dr. Papp. The review of general education was discussed as a part of comprehensive review. It was moved and seconded that general education be included as part of comprehensive review. One vote opposed the recommendation. The staff and Dr. Papp will also review this recommendation. The recommendations can be accessed electronically through the attached document. [[RACIE Summary of Recommendations](#)]

B. Use of Regents' Quantitative Test

The use of the Regents' Quantitative Test was discussed in terms of using components at an institutions' discretion for the general education assessment. Drs. Papp and Burk explained that no public reporting of the data would occur as part of a report or report card. Thus, local utilization of the test was discussed in an effort to aid and enhance student success in such disciplines as mathematics and science. [[Number of Institutional SATs \(or ACTs\) Administered](#)]

III. Action Items

A. Four Meetings Per Year

It was moved and seconded that the RACAA committee meet four times per year.

B. Faculty Workload Subcommittee

Dr. Frank Butler, Vice Chancellor for Academics, Faculty and Student Affairs, requested that those persons interested in serving on the Faculty Workload Subcommittee contact his office expressing an interest as the subcommittee would soon be formed and receive its charge.

C. Plus/Minus Grading

The motion for plus/minus grading was rejected by the entire body. [[Resolution Concerning Plus/Minus Grading, April 2003](#)]

D. Recommendations from Advisory/Administrative Committees

1. Transfer Ombudsperson Enhancement

Discussion concerning the recommendation ensued and was further clarified in terms of whether mandatory education was needed for transfer ombudspersons or whether the true issue concerned whether the policy itself was not being followed and institutions were not

accepting credit from other institutions. The motion was seconded and approved with one opposing vote. The full recommendation can be accessed electronically. [[Ombudsperson Issues](#)] Below is a brief summary:

Rationale: Goal 3, Recommendation 4 of the Strategic Plan states that the USG will encourage more collaboration between two-year and four-year institutions in the revision of curricula and the refinement of course objectives.

Recommendation: The institutional transfer ombudspersons should be re-tasked to provide assistance to transferring students prior to transfer with the aim of facilitating their success at the receiving institutions. The ombudspersons should receive regular training and have direct access to their registrars and chief academic officers.

Implementation: With the endorsement of the Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs, the University System Office will sponsor a workshop for the ombudspersons. An initial meeting is tentatively scheduled for June 2003.

2. EPACC Recommendation on Counselors Prep

Dr. Janis Reid, Vice President for Academic Affairs at Atlanta Metropolitan College and EPACC Co-Chair, presented the recommendation concerning the Regents' Principles for the Preparation of School Counselors. Discussion ensued over the fact that recommendations in the past have dealt with teacher preparation, principle preparation, and now the third in the trilogy is that of counselor preparation. The intent of the Principles is to improve schools by setting standards for the preparation of educators who can ensure the academic success of every child. The motion was seconded and approved. A detailed explanation of the recommendation is attached. [[EPACC Recommendations on Counselors](#)]

IV. Information Items

A. Credit-Hour Cap for Early-and Middle-Grades

Dr. Jan Kettlewell, Associate Vice Chancellor of P-16 Initiatives, commented that EPACC had appointed a subcommittee to review whether early and middle-grades education programs need a degree waiver to the 120-semester hour cap. Because this is a system issue, recommendations garnered from the subcommittee will be discussed at the next regularly scheduled meeting with a follow-up recommendation to the RACAA committee.

B. Summer Conference

The summer conference is scheduled for July 14 - 15 in Athens, Georgia at the University of Georgia's Continuing Education Center. The keynote speaker will be Dr. Al Guskin. To find out more about the project for the future of higher education access the following URL: www.pfhe.org. Additional details and agenda plans will be provided electronically.

C. Executive Committee Action on Lecturers (Appeal Issue)

Dr. Frank Butler presented a draft recommendation on the reappointment of full-time lecturers and senior lecturers. Discussion ensued on the language, appeals, perceived contractual obligations, AAUP stance and guidelines, and other issues regarding lecturers. Dr. Butler indicated that additional follow-up would be undertaken to clarify these issues and perhaps, develop a single system policy. [[Reappointment of Full-time Lecturers and Senior Lecturers - draft](#)]

D. International Education

Dr. Richard Sutton, Director of International Affairs, presented information items concerning the Office of International Education. Dr. Sutton explained that the 2007 international education targets were derived in response to the system strategic plan. [[USG Study Abroad Enrollments and 2007 Targets](#)] The following announcements were provided:

- New funding allocations for international education would be tied to the FY '04 budget.
- At least 33 of 34 institutions have implemented SEVIS.
- Requests for J, F and M visa student information also applies to students enrolled in cooperative programs.
- With regard to SARS, all trips to Asia have been postponed. Each institution is responsible for the assessment of its programs with regard to health and safety issues.

E. Immunization Policy in Graduate School

Dr. John T. Wolfe, Vice Chancellor for Faculty Affairs, announced that the Administrative Committee on Graduate Work had established an ad hoc committee to review the immunization policy. A follow-up report would be provided at the fall meeting.

F. Student Affairs

Ms. Tonya Lam, Senior Advisor for Student Services and Information Systems announced that summaries and documents regarding standards for counseling centers, professional standards in career services, adding B Code classification for counselors, meningitis threat communication, critical incident response management plan, and SAC's restructuring can all be found at the website: http://www.usg.edu/student_services/committees/

Respectfully Submitted,
Marci M. Middleton, MBA, MS
Director, Academic Program Coordination
USG

© [Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia](#)

270 Washington Street, S.W., Atlanta, GA 30334
U.S.A.

MAR 24 2003




MAR 26 2003

BOARD OF REGENTS
OF THE
UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA

OFFICE OF THE CHANCELLOR
370 WASHINGTON STREET, S.W.
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30334

PAC
MIKE RUSSELL
JERRY MOCK
TOM MACKEL
PHONE (404) 556-2202
FAX (404) 687-6979

MEMORANDUM

TO: USG Presidents
FROM: Thomas C. Meredith, Chancellor 
DATE: March 20, 2003
RE: Update on the Use of the Social Security Number

On September 25, 2002, I sent you a document entitled "Protecting Student Identity- Principles of Good Practice, University System of Georgia." This document encouraged institutions to implement the necessary business practices and procedures to replace the use of the social security number as the primary student identification number beginning in Summer 2003, with a transition at all institutions finalized by Summer 2005. This document contained excellent work by many individuals throughout the USG and should continue to guide the creation of policies and procedures for collection, use, and disclosure of student ID and social security numbers.

However, over the last five months, several issues have arisen that have led me to conclude that we must rescind the timetable for transition from the social security number as the primary identifier to other methods of primary identification. These issues include the cost required to make the transition, the need to coordinate efforts to create new student identifiers within institutions, and the need to coordinate efforts to create new student identifiers across the University System.

In addition to rescinding the timetable, please place any plans for transition that you may have on hold until we develop and implement a review process for institutional plans. Elements of such a plan will include the implementation process, identification of information systems affected, estimated cost, and related factors. Over the next few months, a combined campus and system office team will develop the details of what will be required in institutional plans. However, if your institution was planning to make the transition to a non-SSN student identifier in Summer 2003 and you believe that your

OVER

MAR 21 2003

Update on the Use of the Social Security Number
Page Two
March 20, 2003

institution is too far advanced in this process to place the effort on hold, please forward to me the details of your transition plan.

These changes in timetable and process should in no way be viewed as lessening the importance of or our dedication to student privacy and the security of student data. Both remain vitally important to the USG.

Thank you for your many efforts as we work through these challenging times.

TCM/tj




OFFICE OF THE CHANCELLOR
270 WASHINGTON STREET, S.W.
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30334

PHONE (404) 656-2202
FAX (404) 657-6979

MEMORANDUM

TO: Presidents, University System of Georgia

FROM: Thomas C. Meredith, Chancellor 

DATE: February 11, 2003

SUBJECT: Regents' Test of Quantitative Skills

Continued discussion about the development and use of the Regents' Quantitative Skills Test will be held this semester. If a decision were made to implement the test as a requirement for graduation, it would apply at the earliest to new students entering in Summer 2004. Alternatively, the decision could be to use the test for general education assessment but not to implement it as a graduation requirement for students.

Meanwhile, we hope to continue with plans for on-line essay and reading test administration and scoring. We also will take to the Board of Regents the recommendation that students will be considered as having fulfilled a Regents' Test requirement if they have a score on another standardized test indicating a 95% chance of passing the Regents' Test. For example, almost all students with SAT Verbal scores of at least 510 pass the reading portion of the test on the first attempt, so they would be counted as having fulfilled the reading requirement without having to take the reading section of the Regents' Test.

Attached is an answer key for the sample Regents' Quantitative Skills Test distributed at the meeting on January 16.

Please contact Dr. Frank Butler if you have any questions or suggestions about the Regents' Test.

TCM/tdm
Attachment

cc: Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs
Vice Presidents for Student Affairs
Dan Papp
Frank Butler
Kathleen Burk
Cathie Mayes Hudson

Institution	Full-Time Faculty According to IPEDS Fall 2002	Full-Time Faculty According to Occupational Class Fall 2002	Difference
Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College	90	78	12
Albany State University	164	125	39
Armstrong State University	228	187	41
Atlanta Metropolitan College	49	35	14
Augusta State University	178	163	15
Bainbridge College	36	29	7
Clayton College & State University	162	107	55
Coastal Georgia Community College	56	41	15
Columbus State University	205	173	32
Dalton State College	112	108	4
Darton College	89	67	22
East Georgia College	42	23	19
Floyd College	72	71	1
Fort Valley State University	171	125	46
Gainesville College	91	93	-2
Georgia College & State University	277	277	0
Georgia Institute of Technology	879	766	113
Georgia Perimeter College	381	286	95
Georgia Southern University	604	569	35
Georgia Southwestern State University	106	91	15
Georgia State University	955	958	-3
Gordon College	82	73	9
Kennesaw State University	384	341	43
Macon State College	136	108	28
Medical College of Georgia	687	351	336
Middle Georgia College	70	71	-1
North Georgia College & State University	171	115	56
Savannah State University	126	104	22
South Georgia College	32	30	2
Southern Polytechnic State University	140	129	11
State University of West Georgia	356	259	97
University of Georgia	2,490	1,577	913
Valdosta State University	442	397	45
Waycross College	21	20	1
TOTAL	10,084	7,947	2,137

Regents Administrative Committee on Institutional Effectiveness

Summary of Recommendations

The following recommendations come from the January 23, 2003, and April 3, 2003, meetings of the Regents Administrative Committee on Institutional Effectiveness. The University System workshops on comprehensive program review conducted in the closing days of fall semester 2002 revealed that some aspects of program review are misunderstood and that other aspects of the process have not been implemented as planned. Of special concern was a group of issues raised by faculty and administrators from two-year institutions. RACIE has considered feedback provided by Dorothy Zinsmeister and Bettie Horne from these workshops and today makes the following recommendations. Where appropriate, these recommendations have been incorporated into a recommended revision of the *Academic Affairs Handbook* section on the process for review of programs identified as not meeting thresholds.

(1) *Understanding the developmental nature of the comprehensive program review process, we appeal to the University System Office to take the following actions. If these actions are implemented there will be no need to revise the thresholds themselves as stated in the Academic Affairs Handbook:*

- a. to implement section E (first two sentences) in BOR policy 205.01, by requiring a list of academic programs reviewed and a summary of findings for programs reviewed rather than extensive summaries of reviews;
- b. to implement section F in BOR policy 205.01, by initiating dialogue with Chief Academic Officers on programs identified as not meeting performance indicators;
- c. to bring closure to the threshold reports; and
- d. to develop a reporting format for institutions that would move toward our first recommendation.

(2) *Two-year institutions should receive clarification of System intent with regard to comprehensive program review; they should be asked specifically to review the following:*

- a. career programs, including cooperative programs with DTAE
 - b. A.A. and A.S. programs (may be combined with reviews of the transfer mission and of general education)
 - c. the transfer mission overall
 - d. general education
- [Area F's are elements of the transfer mission and are not to be reviewed as "majors."]

(3) *All institutions should receive clarification that, for purposes of CPR, general education is a program to be reviewed within the institution's cycle of reviews. There are no thresholds for general education programs.*

(4) *This year's format for reporting the results of CPR should be simplified as follows with the goal of moving toward the format outlined in (1) above:*

- a. an executive summary of each review that includes statements on (1) quality, (2) viability, and (3) productivity, and
- b. future plans for improvement/progress toward the program's strategic plan

(5) Certificate programs should not be reviewed this year.

(6) Successful CPR practices should be solicited from the chief academic officers and considered for the Regents' best practices web site. Examples of stellar reviews should be shared in a future workshop sponsored by RACIE, focusing on best practices in CPR.

(7) Notification of required reviews of threshold programs should come in spring each year for the following year's review cycle.

(8) While institutions should continuously review the effectiveness of Learning Support programs, Learning Support is not defined as a program under the comprehensive program review policy, and no thresholds are defined for this program.

(9) While institutions are responsible for cyclical comprehensive program review of doctoral and professional programs, there are no thresholds for those programs at this time.

(10) Where performance indicators are stated in terms of pass rates on licensure examinations, institutions should monitor their performance in light of state averages, or regional averages if no state comparator exists.

April 14, 2003

University System Office Process

[Current]

The University System Office will review and approve the program review schedule for the current year and the report on programs reviewed the previous year. The University System Office will report to the Board of Regents as appropriate.

Triggered Program Review Process

System Office Process

A. The System Office will monitor annually a small number of indicators or "triggers" listed below in order to identify programs which may require additional study. The monitoring process is intended to begin a conversation between the University System Office and the campus about the health of the program(s) in question. Data already reported by the institutions to the System will be used to monitor the indicators². Indicators will be reviewed periodically and revised as necessary. While institutions are responsible for cyclical review of doctoral programs, there are no triggers for doctoral program review at this time.

1. Graduate Programs

- a. Graduate enrollment in the major (average over the past three years) is less than 10.
- b. Graduate degrees awarded in the major (average over the past three years) is less than five.

2. Bachelor's Programs

- a. Pass rates on licensure examinations is more than 10 percent below the state or regional average, if applicable.
- b. Enrollment in the major (average over the past three years) is less than 15.
- c. Degrees awarded in the major (average over the past three years) is less than 10.

3. Associate Transfer Programs

- a. Less than half of associate-seeking students are still enrolled, have transferred to another System institution, have transferred to a career program, or have earned an associate degree within four years of matriculation.
- b. Transfers have a 2.0 grade point average or above at the receiving institution one year after transfer.

4. Career Programs: Certificates and Associates³

- a. Enrollment in the program (average over the past three years) is less than 10.
- b. Degrees or certificates awarded (average over the past three years) is fewer than five.
- c. Pass rates on licensure examinations is more than 10 percent below the state or regional average, if applicable.

B. When performance falls below the indicators described above, the University System Office will begin a dialogue with the institution as outlined below:

1. The University System Office will ask the Chief Academic Officer of the home institution about the state of the programs in question.
2. Based on the institution's response, the University System Office and the Chief

Academic Officer may agree to add that program to the current or next year's schedule of programs it will review, thus altering the institution's overall plan for the review cycle.

3. If a full review of such a targeted program is conducted, a separate report on the results of that program review will be submitted to the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

- C. The annual review of key indicators by the University System Office may also reveal questions about program effectiveness in one or more discipline areas across institutions and programs. When general questions about programs in a particular discipline arise, the following will occur:
1. A general review of the programs in that specific discipline at all USG institutions may be requested.
 2. A separate report from each institution on the results of the targeted program review may be requested by the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.
- D. In the event that either Section "B" or "C" has been invoked, the institution's schedule of programs to be reviewed that year will include the programs specified by the University System Office in addition to those scheduled by the institution.

Institutional Process

When contacted about programs which fall below the indicators monitored by the University System Office, the institution will analyze the relevant data and provide reasons for the indicated results. Most questions will be resolved at this level; examples include programs which do not require course offerings beyond those already in place for high-demand programs with strong performance, unique programs, programs for which there is a statewide or regional need, and programs central to the mission of the institution. When the institution finds cause to examine the program further, the Chief Academic Officer and the University System Office will agree to add the program to the current or following year's cycle of program reviews.

Footnotes:

1. Or other national/regional organization standards/guidelines as appropriate if specialized accreditation is not available or appropriate for the program.
2. In addition to the indicators listed in this section, loss of special purpose accreditation or placement on probationary status will trigger an immediate review.
3. These triggers apply to certificates of at least one year and career associate programs. They do not apply to programs offered in cooperation with DTAE colleges or to DTAE programs at Bainbridge College, Clayton College & State University, Coastal Georgia Community College, or Dalton State College.

Last Updated: 10/30/2000

The University System Office will review and approve the program review schedule for the current year and the report on programs reviewed the previous year. The University System Office will report to the Board of Regents as appropriate.

Process for Review of Programs Identified as Not Meeting Thresholds

System Office Process

A. The System Office will monitor annually a small number of indicators or thresholds listed below in order to identify programs which may require additional study. The monitoring process is intended to begin a conversation between the University System Office and the campus about the health of the program(s) in question. Data already reported by the institutions to the System will be used to monitor the indicators². Indicators will be reviewed periodically and revised as necessary. While institutions are responsible for cyclical review of doctoral and professional programs, there are no thresholds for those programs at this time.

1. **Master's and Specialist Programs**

- a. Graduate enrollment in the major (average over the past three years) is less than 10.
- b. Graduate degrees awarded in the major (average over the past three years) is less than five.

2. **Bachelor's Programs**

- a. Pass rates on licensure examinations is more than 10 percent below the state average (or regional average if no state comparator exists), if applicable.
- b. Enrollment in the major (average over the past three years) is less than 15.
- c. Degrees awarded in the major (average over the past three years) is less than 10.

3. **Associate Career Programs³**

- a. Enrollment in the program (average over the past three years) is less than 10.
- b. Degrees or certificates awarded (average over the past three years) is fewer than five.
- c. Pass rates on licensure examinations is more than 10 percent below the state average (or regional average if no state comparator exists), if applicable.

4. **Other Programs to Be Reviewed by All Institutions [no defined thresholds]**

- a. A.A. and A.S. Programs [Two-year Institutions (review may be combined with General Education and the Transfer Mission)]
- b. General Education
- c. Cooperative programs with DTAE institutions

B. When performance falls below the indicators described above, the University System Office will begin a dialogue with the institution as outlined below:

1. The University System Office will ask the Chief Academic Officer of the home institution about the state of programs in question.
 2. Based on the institution's response, the University System Office and the Chief Academic Officer may agree to add that program to the current or next year's schedule of programs it will review, thus altering the institution's overall plan for the review cycle.
 3. If a full review of such a targeted program is conducted, a separate report on the results of that program review will be submitted to the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.
- C. The annual review of key indicators by the University System Office may also reveal questions about program effectiveness in one or more discipline areas across institutions and programs. When general questions about programs in a particular discipline arise, the following will occur:
1. A general review of the programs in that specific discipline at all USG institutions may be requested.
 2. A separate report from each institution on the results of the targeted program review may be requested by the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.
- D. In the event that either Section "B" or "C" has been invoked, the institution's schedule of programs to be reviewed that year will include the programs specified by the University System Office in addition to those scheduled by the institution.

Institutional Process

When contacted about programs which fall below the indicators monitored by the University System Office, the institution will analyze the relevant data and provide reasons for the indicated results. Most questions will be resolved at this level; examples include programs which do not require course offerings beyond those already in place for high-demand programs with strong performance, unique programs, programs for which there is a statewide or regional need, and programs central to the mission of the institution. When the institution finds cause to examine the program further, the Chief Academic Officer and the University System Office will agree to add the program to the current or following year's cycle of program reviews.

Footnotes:

1. Or other national/regional organization standards/guidelines as appropriate if specialized accreditation is not available or appropriate for the program.
2. In addition to the indicators listed in this section, loss of special purpose accreditation or placement on probationary status will require an immediate review.
3. These thresholds apply to certificates of at least one year and career associate programs. They do not apply to programs offered in cooperation with DTAE colleges or to DTAE programs at Bainbridge College, Clayton College & State University, Coastal Georgia Community College, or Dalton State College.

Number of Institutional SATs (or ACTs) Administered

INSTITUTION	JULY 2001 - JUNE 2002	JULY 2002 - PRESENT
Georgia Institute of Technology	0	0
Georgia State University	44	77
University of Georgia	176	147
Georgia Southern University	24	19
Valdosta State University	49	49
Albany State University		
Armstrong Atlantic University		
Augusta State University	178	152
Clayton College & State University	288	238
Columbus State University	67	90
Fort Valley State University	340	157
Georgia College & State University	25	16
Georgia Southwestern State University	72	18
Kennesaw State University	257	249
North Georgia College & State University	262	181
Savannah State University	28	20
Southern Polytechnic State University	0	0
State University of West Georgia	77	10
Dalton State College	228	235
Macon State College	485	554
Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College	79	136
Atlanta Metropolitan College	258	129
Bainbridge College	199	108
Coastal Georgia Community College		
Darton College	394	330
East Georgia College	55	58
Floyd College	230	194
Gainesville College	175	138
Georgia Perimeter College	1509	1185
Gordon College		
Middle Georgia College	142	66
South Georgia College	264	186
Waycross College	110	103
TOTAL	6015	4845

**Resolution Concerning Plus/Minus Grading
April 2003**

Be it resolved that:

The Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia allows the implementation of the letter-grade plus/minus grading system at University System of Georgia institutions.

Motion Concerning Plus/Minus Grading

Motion:

If the Board of Regents allows the implementation of the letter-grade plus/minus grading system at University System of Georgia institution, then all institutions will use any subset of the following letter-grade plus/minus grading system:

A = 4.00	B+ = 3.33	C+ = 2.33	D+ = 1.33
A- = 3.67	B = 3.00	C = 2.00	D = 1.00
	B- = 2.67	C- = 1.67	F = 0.00

Notes:

1. An institution can choose to continue their current practice of A, B, C, D, F grades. Or an institution can use the full range A, A-, ..., D, F.
2. There is no impact on transfer GPA calculation for a student from a sending institution that continues to use the current A, B, C, D, F grading system.
3. If the sending institution is using a plus/minus system, the receiving institution has the option to set its own rules for calculation of transfer GPA. For example, if a student has a B+, the receiving institution could enter 3.00 or 3.33, depending on its local policy.
4. There is no impact on an initial HOPE scholarship calculation for a student from a high school that uses an A, B, C, D, F grading system.

Rationale:

There are several arguments in favor of adding pluses and minuses to letter-grades:

- (1) It is unfair to reward students equally when there are large disparities in their accomplishments. For example, under the current grading system, both 81 and 89 yield grades of B, while a 91 earns an A and a 79 a C. The plus/minus system allows this difference to be expressed on grade sheets and thus allows faculty to reward the superior performance of the student who earns an 89.
- (2) The simple letter-grade system gives students a strong disincentive to work hard at the end of the term. A student has no reason to work hard at the end of a term if s/he has, for example, an 85 average, and knows that unless s/he does extremely poorly on the final examination, s/he will get a B for the course. Therefore, there is reason to think that students will work harder and learn more if pluses and minuses are added to the grading system.

(3) Adding pluses and minuses would make grades more reliable by reducing grouping error.

Example of Grouping Error:

Student 1 takes four classes and gets the following grades on a scale of 0-100: 80, 80, 80, and 80.

The student gets four Bs.

The student's average is 80

The student has a GPA of 3.0

Student 2 takes four classes and gets the following grades on a scale of 0-100: 79, 89, 89, and 89

The student gets three Bs and a C.

The student's average is 86.5

The student has a GPA of 2.75

Notice that the student with the *higher* average has the *lower* GPA.

If plus/minus were used, student 1 would get 4 B minuses for a GPA of 2.67.

Student 2 would get a C plus and three B pluses for a GPA of 3.17.

Plus/minus grading corrects the problem.

History¹:

At the turn of century, the vast majority of U.S. college and universities used a decimal, 0-100, grading system. From about 1900 until the 1960s, there was a trend to using grading systems that were less and less fine-grained. Thus, at the beginning of the 1960s, most colleges and universities were using the letter-grade system that is currently in use at GSU. During the 1960s, many schools tried to remove a perceived punitive aspect from grades. This led to many different grading systems including the pass/fail system. But this period of experimentation did not fundamentally change the basic use of the letter-grade system. From the 1970s and continuing through today, there has been a move, especially among universities and 4-year colleges, to adding pluses and minuses to the letter-grade system.

Variations in Grading Systems on a 4.0 Scale*²

Grading System	2-Yr Colleges (N=370)		4-Yr Colleges (N=583)		Universities (N=442)		Total	
	1982	1992	1982	1992	1982	1992	1982	1992
Simple letter	82.1	69.2	50.3	35.4	61.2	46.2	61.3	47.8
Letter with +/-	9.5	18.4	33.8	52.8	24.6	41.2	25.1	40.0
Other	8.4	12.4	15.9	11.8	14.1	12.6	13.6	12.2

Table 1

*89.8% of U.S. colleges and universities reported using the 4.0 scale

¹ The information in this paragraph is drawn from American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers, Grades and Grading Practices: Results of the 1992 AACRAO Survey (Washington, D.C., 1994).

² AACRAO Survey, p. 9 and 11.

The fundamental argument against the simple letter-grade system is that, because it allows only 5 possible grades, it allows for too much grouping error. To simplify a bit, grouping error occurs because the mean of the actual grades within an interval will be lower than the mean of the interval. See an example listed above in the section on Rationale (3) [page 2]. The effect of grouping error is to inflate the performance of weaker students and reduce the reliability of grading. For any particular given reliability of the grading basis, one can compute the reliability for grading systems with different possible numbers of grades.

Loss of Reliability From Grouping Error⁶

Reliability of Grading Basis	Reliability of Grades for Various Numbers of Possible Grades			
	2	5*	10**	15
.95	.63	.85	.92	.94
.90	.60	.80	.87	.89
.80	.53	.71	.78	.79
.70	.47	.62	.68	.69
.50	.33	.45	.48	.49

Table 2

*The simple letter-grade system provides 5 possible grades.

**The letter-grade with +/- system provides 11 possible grades.

As you can see, if the grading basis is .95 reliable, a move from a grading system that used 5 categories to one that used 10 would improve reliability from .85 to .92. Notice that the reliability of the grade given increases with the number of possible grades no matter how reliable the grading basis is.

⁶ Robert Ebel, "Marks and Marking Systems," in Measuring Educational Achievement (Prentice-Hall, 1965), p. 423.

Ombudsperson Issues
(As Recommended by the Council on General Education)
February 2003

Rationale

Goal 3, Recommendation 4 of the Strategic Plan states that the USG will: Encourage more collaboration between two-year and four-year institutions in the revision of curricula and the refinement of course objectives.

Developing more effective collaboration between two-year and four-year institutions in the revision of curricula will require more effective communication, a greater degree of commitment to the needs of students, and a broader understanding of the natural differences in mission and perspective that exist between two-year and four-year institutions. Moving beyond current practice with respect to inter-institutional collaboration will also require a clearly articulated set of expectations on the part of the University System. At the heart of this strategic plan recommendation is the desire to establish greater consistency and continuity in the undergraduate curriculum to eliminate any obstacles to transfer of credit. The key to achieving this desired outcome lies within the University System core curriculum, its operational apparatus, and the spirit with which it is embraced at the institutional level.

Recommendation

The institutional transfer ombudspersons should be re-tasked to provide assistance to transferring students prior to transfer with the aim of facilitating their success at the receiving institutions. The ombudspersons should receive regular training and should have direct access to their registrars and chief academic officers.

Actions

1. Ombudspersons move from the "fire department" model to a proactive role in working with department chairs, senates, advisers, admissions office and registrar's office personnel, etc., to clarify policies associated with student transfer.
2. Each institution place a statement in the college catalog reflecting the role of the ombudsperson, including contact information.
3. Institutions provide transfer students with information by including a statement on these documents indicating that the student should see the ombudsperson if there are legitimate problems with transferability of courses:
 - a) transcript request form and/or transcript
 - b) admission letters for transfer students
 - c) CAPP website
4. Professional development opportunities will be provided for ombudspersons to see the "big picture," to support the transfer of the core curriculum, and to act as advocates for students in issues related to the core curriculum.

Implementation

With the endorsement of the Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs, the University System Office will sponsor a workshop for the ombudspersons. An initial meeting is tentatively scheduled for June 2003.

4/22/03



MEMORANDUM

DATE: March 27, 2003
TO: Regents' Administrative Committee on Academic Affairs
FROM: Educator Preparation Academic Advisory Committee
SUBJECT: *Regents' Principles for the Preparation of School Counselors*

Attached for your consideration are the proposed *Regents' Principles for the Preparation of School Counselors* as recommended by the Educator Preparation Academic Advisory Committee (EPAAC). The intent of the *Principles* is to contribute to school improvement through enhancing the preparation of school counselors who are able to help every child be successful in school.

The proposed *Principles* were developed by the University System Advisory Committee on the Preparation of School Counselors, consisting of counselor educators (nominated by the education deans), school counseling practitioners, representatives from EPAAC, and individuals from the Georgia Department of Education and the University System Office. The *Principles*, approved by EPAAC on March 26, 2003, are presented to RACAA for consideration.

USG Advisory Committee Members:

Brent Snow, Professor and Chair
Department of Counseling and Educational
Psychology
State University of West Georgia

Richard L. Hayes, Professor
Department of Counseling and Human
Development Services
University of Georgia

JoAnna White, Professor and Chair
Department of Counseling and Psychological
Services
Georgia State University

Teddi Cunningham, Associate Professor
Program Coordinator, School Counseling
Valdosta State University

Carolyn Gates, Assistant Professor
School Counseling
Columbus State University

Derek Mpinga, Vice President & Dean
Academic Affairs and Student Services
Waycross College

Barbara Holmes, Education Dean
Albany State University

Lucindia Chance, Education Dean
Georgia Southern University

Yiping Wan, Education Dean
Kennesaw State University

Jacqueline Melendez, Program Specialist,
Guidance/Counseling and School Social Work
Department of Education

Vickie Watts, Coordinator of School Counseling
Gwinnett County Public Schools

Pat Iverson, Senior Counselor
Lowndes County High School

Joey Brewer
Counselor Educator
Piedmont College

Judy Monsaas, Director, P-16 Evaluation
University System of Georgia

Jan Kettlewell, Associate Vice Chancellor
University System of Georgia

BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA

Regents' Principles and Actions for the Preparation of School Counselors

In 1998, the Board of Regents approved the *Principles for the Preparation of Educators for the Schools*. The intent of the *Principles* is to improve schools by setting standards for the preparation of educators who can ensure the academic success of every child. In that same year, the Board approved Section I: *Principles for the Preparation of Teachers*. In 2001, the Board approved Section II: *Principles for the Preparation of Educational Leaders* (superintendents and school principals). What follows for consideration is Section III: *Principles for the Preparation of School Counselors*. All sections of the *Principles* feature three themes: Quality Assurance, Collaboration, and Responsiveness.

When teachers, administrators, and school counselors complete their university preparation programs and begin working in schools, their collective success will impact the extent of school improvement. Therefore, during their preparation programs, these future educators need to understand their unique and collective roles and responsibilities for implementing successful school improvement strategies. The success of school improvement strategies depends on clear definitions and understandings of the professional roles of each educator and the implementation of a collaborative plan to fulfill them.

School counselors are largely responsible for the social, emotional, and career development necessary for the academic success of all children and should serve in a leadership role to create conditions that support student and teacher success. Creating the conditions for academic success of every P-12 student is the shared responsibility of schools, families, and communities. Within the communities where their candidates are prepared, universities must work with the schools and communities to provide models of the effective provision of school and community services to all children and to prepare high quality school counselors.

The preparation of school counselors is the shared responsibility of universities and the schools. Universities will stand by the quality of graduates from their approved programs and continue to support school counselors in continued professional development.

Principle 1: The University System will guarantee that any school counselor it prepares is able to promote the academic success, career preparedness, and social/emotional development of all students.

The Guarantee

The University Ensures that Any Candidate Recommended for Certification as a School Counselor will be able to:

- Enhance the academic success and increase the social/emotional development, and career preparedness of all students.
- Advocate for school policies, programs, and services that are equitable and responsive to cultural differences among students.
- Advocate for rigorous academic preparation of all students to close the achievement gaps among demographic groups.
- Coordinate a school to career transition plan for each student.
- Provide leadership in the development, implementation, evaluation, and revision of a comprehensive school counseling plan that contributes to school renewal by promoting increased academic success, career preparedness, and social/emotional development for all students.
- Use student outcome data to facilitate student academic success.
- Provide individual and group counseling and classroom guidance that promote academic success, social/emotional development, and career preparedness for all students.
- Collaborate with other professionals in the development of staff training, family support, and appropriate community initiatives that address student needs.
- Assess student needs and make appropriate referrals to school and/or community resources.
- Demonstrate mastery and application of the content knowledge in each of the following eight core areas of counseling recommended by the Council for the Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP): (1) Professional Identity and Orientation; (2) Social and Cultural Diversity; (3) Human Growth and Development; (4) Career Development; (5) Helping Relationships; (6) Group Work; (7) Assessment and Evaluation; and (8) Research and Program Evaluation.

Actions

- The Board of Regents will hold institutions accountable for ensuring that all school counselors recommended for certification will meet the “guaranteed” performance outcomes and for providing additional training to any counselor who has completed an approved program within the previous four years who does not meet those expectations within the first two years of practice as a school counselor in Georgia schools. When necessary, the additional training will:
 - a) Be provided at no expense to the counselor or the school.
 - b) Consist of an individualized plan agreed upon between the school district and the university.

- c) Be provided by the university that recommended the counselor for certification. In cases of geographic inconvenience, training may be provided through distance technology or through arrangements mutually agreed to by a local institution.
- The Board of Regents will require all institutions that prepare school counselors to have their school counseling program accredited through (CACREP).
- The Board of Regents will hold institutions accountable for having at least an 80% annual pass rate on certification exam(s) for school counselor candidates from each reportable demographic group by 2006, and a 95% pass rate by 2010. Universities that prepare school counselors will submit annual progress reports to the System Office toward meeting the targeted pass rates on PRAXIS II.
- A sub-committee of the University System Educator Preparation Academic Advisory Committee (EPAAC) will meet with representatives of Professional Standards Commission (PSC) to seek mutually acceptable resolution of issues related to PRAXIS II examinations. The issues include:
 - a) Development of a system of accurate reporting of institutional pass rates.
 - b) Resolution of issues about the validity of some of the tests.
 - c) Institutional access to data from the Educational Testing Service for use in program improvement.
- The University System Office will provide opportunities for sharing among institutions by featuring national and state models of best practice at annual meetings of the P-16 Network.

Principle 2: The school counselor preparation program must demonstrate that it has faculty resources of appropriate quality and sufficiency to satisfy the Regents' Principles and Actions for the Preparation of School Counselors.

Actions

The school counselor preparation program must have an identifiable full-time core faculty responsible for its leadership who:

- Are sufficient in number for their academic and professional responsibilities.
- Are qualified to prepare candidates to satisfy the *Regents' Principles for the Preparation of School Counselors*.
- Have relevant preparation and experience in their assigned area(s) of instruction.
- Are multi-culturally competent and committed to preparing school counselors who are responsive to cultural differences among P-12 students.

Principle 3: Institutions will collaborate with school systems and community partners to strengthen both counselor preparation and practice to improve schools and P-12 student academic success.

Actions

- Each institution will utilize the partner school model (or Board of Regents' approved alternative) to work with area school systems and their community partners on the following goals:
 1. To increase P-12 student academic success and high levels of learning.

2. To mentor beginning school counselors during their first two years of practice.
 3. To provide school counselor candidates with supervised field experiences of at least 700 clock hours, in which candidates demonstrate the outcomes of the Regents' Guarantee.
 4. To collaborate in the preparation and professional development of school counselors.
 5. To encourage practitioner research by providing appropriate training in research on school improvement.
 6. To produce quality school university partnership research aimed at the improvement of schools and counselor preparation programs.
- Each institution will invite area school systems to enter into negotiated agreements to work on these goals. Negotiated agreements for partner schools (or other approved alternative) will include commitments to:
 1. Collaborate toward achieving these goals, with the first goal receiving the highest priority.
 2. Create a school environment that enables counselor candidates to meet performance outcomes of the Regents' Guarantee.
 3. Provide school counselor education faculty time to work with partner schools on these goals.
 4. Provide school counselors with time to participate in the delivery of instruction in university preparation programs.
 5. Share responsibility for mentoring beginning counselors.
 6. Use data for program improvement.
 7. Promote collaboration and enhance communications among school personnel and human service workers in service to all school-aged children.
 8. Ensure that parents are informed about and have full access to publicly supported services provided to families with school-aged children.
 9. Establish family-friendly policies and practices that increase the potential for every child to be successful in school.
 10. Engage in collaborative research with school and community partners that improves our understanding of the institutional and organizational barriers to, and the identification of conditions that support, the full utilization of available school and community services for school-aged children and their families.
 11. Evaluate the impact of the partnership on program improvement of schools and universities.
 - Each institution will maintain a practitioner-based advisory committee to provide ongoing feedback as to the success of graduates in meeting the outcomes of the guarantee and to suggest strategies for continuous improvement.

Principle 4: The institution will ensure collaboration in the preparation of counselors, leaders, and teachers that is focused on the interrelated roles of all school personnel in improving student academic success.

Actions

- This collaboration will focus on:
 - a) An understanding of the unique roles of all educators in school improvement.
 - b) An understanding of the shared responsibilities of all educators for school improvement.
 - c) Joint research strategies to improve schools.
 - d) Integrated field experiences and/or internships.
- Each institution will ensure that all education personnel have the knowledge and skills necessary to plan and implement a collaborative school improvement plan and to understand their professional roles in that plan.

Principle 5: All educator programs, including school counselor programs, will be the shared responsibility of a collaborative governance unit that includes education, other academic areas as appropriate, and school and community partners.

Actions

- The collaborative governance unit will be responsible for successful implementation of the *Regents' Principles and Actions for the Preparation of School Counselors*.
- The collaborative governance unit will be responsible for generating, revising, and amending policies in compliance with the *Regents' Principles*.
- The collaborative governance unit shall include a representative(s) from the school counseling program.

Principle 6: Institutions will proactively respond to the needs of school districts for increased numbers of high quality, school counselor candidates who reflect the racial/ethnic diversity represented in the school-age population of the institution's service area.

Actions

- Institutions will work with their school partners to identify the demand for counselors in high need schools.
- Institutions will set recruitment policies that ensure the academic qualifications of students going into school counselor preparation programs are at least comparable to graduate student qualifications for the institution as a whole.
- Institutions will increase the number of high quality applicants from each demographic group represented in the school-age population of their service areas.
- Institutions will ensure the number of school counselor graduates reflect the racial/ethnic diversity represented in the school-age population of their service areas.

Principle 7: Institutions will recognize and reward counselor educators for their work in improving P-12 schools.

Actions

- Each institution's president, academic vice president, deans and department chairs will place faculty participation in school counselor preparation and in P-12 school improvement efforts high on the list of institutional priorities.
- Institutions will give visible support and recognition to this work, as demonstrated through decisions in areas such as promotion and tenure, salary increases, workload, professional development, and allocation of resources.
- Institutions will encourage and expand collaboration among university faculty and school and community partners in counselor preparation and in research and service that can be translated into best practices for school improvement.

To: Institutional Presidents
From:
Date:
Subject:
Reappointment of Full-time Lecturers and Senior Lecturers
(Revised 4/22/03)

In accordance with Board Policies 803.03 and 803.0301, and until further notice, the following guidelines will be in effect for the reappointment of full-time lecturers and senior lecturers:

A. Full-time lecturers and senior lecturers are appointed by the institution on a year-to-year basis.

B. Lecturers and senior lecturers who have served full-time for the entire previous academic year have the presumption of reappointment for the subsequent academic year unless notified in writing to the contrary as follows:

- i) For lecturers with fewer than three years of full time service, institutions are encouraged to provide reappointment information as early as possible but no specific notice is required.
- ii) For lecturers with three or more years but less than six years of full-time service, the institution will provide reappointment information at least 30 calendar days prior to the beginning date of the first day of classes at the institution.
- iii) For senior lecturers, or lecturers with six years or more of full-time service, the institution will provide reappointment information at least 180 calendar days prior to the beginning date of the first day of classes at the institution.

C. Lecturers or Senior Lecturers who have served for six or more years of full-time service at an institution and who have received timely notice of non-reappointment shall be entitled to a review of the decision in accordance with published procedures developed by the institution. *Additional appeal procedures are contained in Section VIII of the Bylaws of the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia.*

D. In no case will service as lecturer or senior lecturer imply any claim upon tenure or reappointment under conditions other than those above.



Office of International Education
University System of Georgia

**USG Study Abroad Enrollments
and 2007 Targets**

	1998-99	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02	2007 Target
Georgia Institute of Technology	484	489	708	755	1079
Georgia State University	259	405	333	439	688
Medical College of Georgia	9	0	0	8	12
University of Georgia	784	942	1,228	1,231	1662
Research University Total	1536	1836	2269	2433	3461
Georgia Southern University	70	91	93	214	368
Valdosta State University	146	177	87	142	272
Regional University Total	216	268	180	356	640
Albany State University	37	0	45	16	88
Armstrong Atlantic State University	18	18	60	64	96
Augusta State University	58	8	24	29	44
Clayton College & State University	11	12	8	15	23
Columbus State University	36	49	81	56	183
Fort Valley State University	30	17	62	92	138
Georgia College & State University	42	41	76	83	201
Georgia Southwestern State University	30	29	35	14	21
Kennesaw State University	224	205	168	168	425
North Georgia College & State University	50	66	108	76	185
Savannah State University	1	6	9	9	54
Southern Polytechnic State University	18	22	3	11	32
State University of West Georgia	110	78	107	126	189
State University Total	665	551	786	759	1828
Dalton State College	6	9	6	7	40
Macon State College	3	1	5	6	20
State College Total	9	10	11	13	60
Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College	3	0	2	2	14
Atlanta Metropolitan College	26	26	12	4	5
Bainbridge College	2	3	5	11	17
Coastal Georgia Community College	6	3	2	1	20
Darton College	3	1	12	10	15
East Georgia College	0	0	0	6	9
Floyd College	2	1	2	6	46
Gainesville College	11	4	20	9	34
Georgia Perimeter College	38	0	23	41	141
Gordon College	0	27	40	25	38
Middle Georgia College	0	12	31	32	20
South Georgia College	14	15	10	19	21
Waycross College	1	8	18	5	8
Two-Year College Total	106	100	177	171	388
University System Total	2532	2765	3423	3732	6177

University System Target (25% of FY02 undergraduate degrees awarded) 6315



Office of International Education

University System of Georgia

USG Study Abroad Enrollments as % of Undergraduate Degrees Awarded In that same year

	1998-99	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02	2007 Target (as % of FY02 degrees awarded)
Georgia Institute of Technology	23.9%	24.1%	34.8%	35.0%	50.0%
Georgia State University	9.6%	15.4%	13.5%	17.4%	27.2%
Medical College of Georgia	2.3%	0.0%	0.0%	2.5%	3.8%
University of Georgia	15.0%	19.4%	25.4%	22.8%	31.2%
Research University Total	14.8%	18.6%	23.5%	23.4%	33.3%
Georgia Southern University	4.0%	4.9%	5.0%	12.6%	21.7%
Valdosta State University	10.4%	12.9%	6.8%	11.1%	21.3%
Regional University Total	6.9%	8.3%	5.7%	12.0%	21.5%
Albany State University	11.2%	0.0%	12.3%	4.4%	24.1%
Armstrong Atlantic State University	3.3%	3.1%	11.3%	10.9%	16.4%
Augusta State University	10.7%	1.8%	4.6%	5.8%	8.7%
Clayton College & State University	2.0%	2.1%	1.5%	2.5%	3.8%
Columbus State University	4.9%	8.3%	15.1%	11.2%	36.5%
Fort Valley State University	11.5%	22.7%	21.8%	41.1%	61.6%
Georgia College & State University	5.2%	5.4%	10.7%	12.9%	31.2%
Georgia Southwestern State University	9.9%	7.8%	11.0%	4.3%	6.6%
Kennesaw State University	12.7%	12.7%	10.2%	10.6%	26.7%
North Georgia College & State University	8.3%	10.5%	18.5%	12.5%	22.2%
Savannah State University	0.4%	2.4%	3.7%	3.9%	23.6%
Southern Polytechnic State University	5.0%	5.7%	0.8%	2.9%	8.3%
State University of West Georgia	12.3%	9.0%	11.4%	13.5%	20.3%
State University Total	8.3%	7.3%	10.4%	10.1%	21.8%
Dalton State College	2.2%	3.3%	2.4%	2.5%	14.3%
Macon State College	1.0%	0.4%	1.5%	1.4%	4.6%
State College Total	1.5%	1.8%	1.9%	1.8%	8.4%
Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College	0.6%	0.0%	0.5%	0.4%	3.0%
Atlanta Metropolitan College	18.4%	27.4%	8.6%	2.9%	4.3%
Bainbridge College	2.4%	4.1%	6.7%	21.2%	31.7%
Coastal Georgia Community College	3.6%	2.2%	1.4%	0.6%	12.7%
Darton College	1.1%	0.3%	3.8%	2.9%	4.3%
East Georgia College	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.0%	10.5%
Floyd College	1.0%	0.5%	1.0%	2.9%	21.9%
Gainesville College	3.6%	1.2%	5.9%	2.3%	8.6%
Georgia Perimeter College	3.6%	0.0%	2.7%	4.1%	14.3%
Gordon College	0.0%	8.4%	11.2%	6.8%	10.2%
Middle Georgia College	0.0%	5.0%	14.2%	12.2%	7.6%
South Georgia College	7.8%	7.6%	5.4%	13.2%	14.6%
Waycross College	0.9%	5.7%	17.8%	5.9%	8.8%
Two-Year College Total	2.9%	2.8%	5.2%	4.6%	10.5%
University System Total	9.9%	11.2%	14.0%	14.8%	24.5%
University System Target	(25% of FY02 degrees awarded = 6315)			25%	