The Administrative Committee on Academic Affairs held its spring meeting at Macon State College, Performing Arts and Theater Rehearsal Hall on April 13, 2004. Dr. Anne V. Gormly, Chair and Vice President for Academic Affairs at Georgia College & State University, called the meeting to order. The minutes of the fall meeting (December 23) were approved as distributed.

#### I. Information Items from the Senior Vice Chancellor's Report A. Ad Hoc Committee Reports

# 1. Workload Policy

Dr. Daniel S. Papp, Senior Vice Chancellor for Academics and Fiscal Affairs reported on the outcomes of the workload policy committee. The committee was empanelled one year ago to address workload issues across each institutional sector of the university system. Due to other impending issues that required system office and board action, further action on the draft report was delayed until the legislative session closed. The committee anticipates concluding its work by the end of the fall 2004 semester.

# 2. Advanced Credit Review

Dr. Papp explained that the advanced credit review policy resulted from the Chancellor's request and from constituent feedback. Outcomes of advanced credit review revealed that system institutions are inconsistent in the type of credit awarded. A proposal will be developed to reduce inconsistencies within the System. Drs. Louis Levy (Valdosta State University) and Bob Boehmer (University of Georgia) provided analysis on information collected to date regarding AP credit and found much variability in terms of practice and the awarding of credit. The advanced credit committee met during lunch to determine next action steps for the summer 2004 joint meeting.

### 3. Certificate Review

Dr. Papp explained that we, as a system, use the term, "certificate" indiscriminately with regard to its definition and the criteria for administrative approval or information only reporting purposes. During the afternoon session, specific recommendations from the Certificate Review Committee will be discussed. Dr. Dorothy Zinsmeister explained that the revised recommendation on certificates (see handout) incorporated suggestions and discussion points from the December 2003 meeting. Based on the revised recommendation, Dr. Zinsmeister asked that USG institutions submit an institutional policy or procedure outlining their certificate review process to the system office by December 15, 2004. Spring 2005 was discussed as the target date for campus implementation of an internal process.

Questions and issues that remained concerning the revised certificate recommendation included the following: 1) Will the minima and maxima hours for certificates be changed with regard to information only or administrative approval processes? 2) A certificate should be defined by the institution and not by the students; 3) Certain details with regard to certificates are not enforceable under the recommendation; 4) A grace period is urged for the process of taking inventory of certificates; and 5) Has a grandfather clause been developed for certificates already in place?

# 4. Off Campus Instruction

Dr. Richard Sutton provided an update on the work of the committee reviewing off-campus instruction. Since its initial charge, the committee has worked to clarify what is considered a campus or site in the university system. Upcoming action items for the committee include the development of criteria and guidelines for determining whether institutional outreach can be classified as campus, instructional site, or branch campus. A matrix (see handout) was developed to address the gradations in categories according to policy and specific rubrics including authorization, mission, academic programs, instructional facilities, budget, local community investment, faculty, student services, and administration. Additional aspects of the matrix that have yet to be deliberated include the instructional delivery plan and use of distance education. The committee's recommendations will be provided during the summer 2004 meeting. Questions and issues that remain to be addressed with regard to a draft guideline on off-campus instruction include: 1) defining service area, location, and geographic boundary; 2) determining SACS implications: 3) determining and documenting interand intra-institutional discussion and reviewing adverse impact implications; 4) considering joint degree programs; and 5) considering expanded access without duplication.

# 5. Learning Support

Dr. Kathleen Burk reported that the group had not met since December 2003. However, ad hoc reports indicate that a few institutions are mixing exit data with system-defined data. The Learning Support Review Committee, during its last meeting, recommended a change in the guidelines to enable student appeals for a fifth semester of coursework. Based on a mini-survey, at least half of the system institutions elected to allow students completion of a fifth attempt. This process is not included in the overall comprehensive program review. In terms of policy implications, a student can only appeal in one discipline area (English or mathematics, not both).

If a student has two deficit areas after attempting to complete learning support satisfactorily after four times, then the student may only receive an extension in one disciplinary area. A remaining issue to be resolved with learning support is whether tracking will be enacted at the system level to determine if the appeal policy met its objective and is beneficial to students.

### 6. System Calendar

Ms. Tonya Lam reported that the system calendar guidelines were reviewed and input was obtained from both student and academic affairs administrators. The ad hoc committee determined that the policy established before migration to the semester calendar met overall system needs but required minor revisions. Based on the recommendations of the committee, the revised guideline will be placed in the Academic Affairs Handbook. The key component of the system calendar guideline is the requirement of a minimum of 750 minutes of instruction per credit hour (or the equivalent). The guidelines can be interpreted as 75 class days per semester, or 15 calendar weeks in the semester. Questions that remain to be resolved include how such requirements translate in terms of distance education delivery and the translation of such requirements in the case of credit-approved internships.

A second part of the guidelines involves the earliest starting date and latest starting date for the calendar 2004 through 2014. Because some dates vary across institutions, Ms. Lam requested that chief academic officers publish key dates concerning semester deadlines. The start and end dates have not changed for years 2004 through 2008; however, for years 2008 through 2014, the earliest starting date falls on a Monday and the latest ending date concludes on a Saturday.

### **B.** Multi-institutional Functionality (MIF)

Dr. Papp opened the discussion concerning the Multi-institutional Functionality Project (MIF). The MIF project enables students to take courses from different institutions in order to complete requirements for a degree while retaining one home institution for their records, registration, financial aid, and tracking. The focus of the project is the electronic mechanisms that allow students to conduct this process between and among institutions. Ms. Tonya Lam, Dr. Kris Biesinger, and Mr. Randall Thursby explained that the timeline is being followed closely with regard to building the applications, infrastructure, and networks required in SCT and BANNER. By August 2004, specific institutions will use the product and become prototypes for analysis, review, and recommendation in terms of broader system development. Beta-testing will commence by spring 2005 including the use of electronic transcripts. The projected cost is one million dollars. Issues that remain to be resolved regarding this project include: 1) the

impact to campus budgets and costs v. revenues; 2) factors involving additional costs for students; 3) data to make definitive decisions about the project before prototype institutions commit to the endeavor; and 4) system and institutional responsibilities with regard to fees, tuition, credit hour generation and tracking, course availability and general institutional negotiations. Follow-up action with regard to the MIF project includes reviewing the parameters of the project from student and institutional frameworks; developing a flowchart of decision points during the operation of the process; determining MIF coordination for each institution participating in the prototype; determining transfer articulation agreements and processes within BANNER; and the integration of CAPP for advising.

# C. Budget and Other Items

Dr. Papp presented the outcome of the budgeting process for the University System. Based on state appropriations, a 2.5% reduction will be implemented during the current fiscal year with a 5% reduction next year, specifically to encompass a 2.6% reduction to the instructional part of institutional budgets. Special Funding Initiatives incurred the largest budget cuts. During summer 2004, presidents will be asked to serve on a budget planning committee to plan the fiscal agenda and presentation of the budget to the legislature. Salary increases of 2% of the base will not be awarded until January 2005. For fiscal year 2005, salary increases will be awarded on an average of 1.5%.

### D. SAT I Essay

Dr. Papp explained that the new SAT test would include an essay portion. Some institutions have included it as part of the admissions process. However, at this time, a policy will not be established by the system office on use of the essay portion of the SAT.

### E. Degrees & Majors Search Engine

Dr. Papp announced that the Degrees and Majors search engine is now available to the public. The search engine will later be linked to the Ga Easy website.

# F. Regents' Testing Program

Dr. Papp explained that the federal government is no longer paying for the regents' testing program remediation courses. An ad hoc, internal system office committee will be developed to address the question, "How does federal action with regard to the regents' test affect other courses on campus?"

#### G. Centers and Institutes

Dr. Papp provided a list of the university system centers and institutes to the chief academic officers. The information is collected each July but does not include information such as the Liberty Center. The list includes academic and research centers.

#### H. Instructional Faculty Who Did Not Teach

Dr. Papp discussed the summative report on "Instructional Faculty Who Did not Teach in FY 03." Based on survey outcomes, administrators, deans, and department chairs were involved in course instruction. According to the report, "those instructional faculty members who did not teach were engaged exclusively in research, clinical, or pubic service work and were funded from a noninstructional budget or externally generated, non-state funds." The data indicate that the following administrators taught courses during years 2002 through 2004:

Classification	2002 – 2003 % Taught Courses	2003 – 2004 % Taught Courses
Presidents	32%	18%
Vice Presidents for Academic Affairs	50%	35%
Deans	75%	60%
Department Chairs	95%	95%

\*Similar descriptive statistics will be collected again in January 2005.

### I. Greater Expectations (Breakouts by Sector)

The Chief Academic Officers divided themselves by sector to discuss the Greater Expectations National Panel Report and its implications for the University System. The goal of each sector was to prioritize action steps associated with the priorities outlined in the report. Mini-reports were provided by sector with priorities associated with assessment, graduation rates, curricular concerns, and SACS principles. Below is a list of action steps outlined in the report:

### Issues Identified in the Executive Overview

- 1) Curricular changes to promote learning
- 2) Increasing graduation rates and meaningful performance by students
- 3) Meeting the needs of greater numbers of very diverse learners
- 4) Mixed public expectations of higher education
- 5) Disconnect between high school and college expectations for learning
- 6) Removing curricular barriers to excellence
- 7) Creating a core curriculum to create intentional learners
- 8) Models for a learning-centered New Academy
- 9) Creating a meaningful end-of-program assessment
- 10) Preparing faculty to assess student learning

### Research and Regional Universities

Dr. Ronald Henry (Georgia State University) reporting for research and regional universities recommended that RACAA discuss the following at future meetings: Issue 1, Curricular changes to promote learning; Issue 10, Preparing faculty to assess student learning; and Issue 5, Disconnect between high school and college expectations for learning. Dr. Henry indicated the group considered Issues 1 and 10 linked and gave the linkage (both issues) their number one priority for discussion. Issue 5 was their second choice.

#### **State Universities**

Dr. Anne Gormly (Georgia College & State University), representing the state universities, noted a similar pattern as she revealed Issue 10 as her group's first choice followed by Issues 1 and 5. Dr. Joseph Silver (Savannah State University) shared Savannah State University's use of principles similar to Greater Expectations in an intensive cross-campus effort to promote excellence, which began last fall. Dr. Silver reported a positive acceptance and an encouraging enthusiasm by all facets of the Savannah State University community.

#### Two-Year Colleges

Dr. Michael Stoy (Gainesville College) reported that the two-year colleges grouped the 10 issues (see attached) into two groups. Group 1 was made up of issues 1 through 5 and group 2 consisted of issues 6 through 10. They linked, for future discussion, issues 3 (Meeting the needs of greater numbers of very diverse learners) and 5 (Disconnect between high school and college expectations for learning) and made the linkage their first priority. Issue 4, Mixed public expectations of higher education, was ranked second and Issue 2, Increasing graduation rates and meaningful performances by students, was ranked third.

Issue		Research & Regional	State	Two-Yr.
No.	Action Steps/Issues	U.	U.	Colleges
1	Curricular changes to promote learning	#1	#2	
2	Increasing graduation rates and meaningful			#3
	performance by students			
3	Meeting the needs of greater numbers of very diverse			#1
	learners			
4	Mixed public expectations of higher education			#2
5	Disconnect between high school and college	#2	#3	#1

#### Schematic of Sector Priorities *Priorities (Rank Order = 1, 2, or 3)*

	expectations for learning			
6	Removing curricular barriers to excellence			
7	Creating a core curriculum to create intentional			
	learners			
8	Models for a learning-centered New Academy			
9	Creating a meaningful end-of-program assessment			
10	Preparing faculty to assess student learning	#1	#1	

# II. Information Items (continued)

# A. Graduation Rate Task Force

Dr. Ronald Henry (Georgia State University) reported that the Graduation Rate Taskforce had met one time and designed a survey instrument that had been distributed to each campus. On April 26, 2004, the Taskforce will meet to study the survey results. Dr. Henry reviewed the Taskforce charge, which is in brief, "to present to the Chancellor and to the Board a plan to increase the System's six-year graduation rate to at least the national average." This appears to be approximately a 10% increase but, as Dr. Henry pointed out, the national average is expected to rise. The Taskforce will attempt to identify 'best practices' in states with higher graduation rates and will also look at program assessment data. The final report is due Summer 2004.

### **B.** Education Reform

1. K-12 Curriculum Revision

Dr. Papp outlined the system's response to the Department of Education's (DOE) request for input on the proposed GPS curriculum. Nine system academic committees reviewed the parts of GPS relative to their specific disciplines. The reports ranged from laudatory to critical. The reports were summarized and the summaries were included in a letter from the Chancellor to State Superintendent Kathy Cox. The full reports were provided to DOE in both printed and electronic form. Dr. Papp congratulated DOE on its effort to improve the K-12 curriculum and pledged the System's cooperation as both agencies work for a more educated Georgia.

2. Electronic Texts, HB 712

Dr. Kathleen Burk reported briefly on HB 712, Electronic Texts. The bill was not approved by the senate partially because there was an understanding by some members of the senate that the bill would compromise academic freedom. Apparently, HB 712 was also confused by some with a bill that would limit the number of times a text could be changed. Since HB 712 appears to be useful to students with disabilities, it was suggested that the System watch carefully for the

introduction of a similar bill in the next General Assembly and provide information to clarify questions pertaining to academic freedom.

# III. General Assembly Session Update

Mr. Tom Daniel, Sr. Vice Chancellor for External Activities and Facilities, opened his remarks by stating that "the USG is held in high regard by the legislature" and he extended his thanks to the vice presidents and staff for their hard work that allows the System to maintain this continuing respect. Mr. Daniel then discussed the changes made in the HOPE Scholarship. Requiring high schools to be evaluated on a 4.0 scale instead of a numerical average will decrease the number of students qualifying and save an estimated 42 million dollars annually. This and other changes to assure the future of HOPE will go into effect during Summer 2007. However, fees supported by HOPE are fixed at their current rate.

While the General Assembly is faced with a special session to balance the FY 05 budget, the System will receive its full formula generated enrollment funding of \$108 million. In addition, it is anticipated that \$55 million for MRR, \$8.2 million for maintenance and operation of new square footage, \$4.8 million for health and life insurance for new retirees, and \$1.5 million to cover rate increases in the optional retirement plan will be included. The General Assembly also allotted \$18.8 million to provide salary increases for faculty and staff effective January 2005. While the economy appears to be slowly recovering, deep cuts continue to be necessary. The 2.5% cut for FY 04 will be realized but the FY 05 cut will probably be closer to another 2.5% rather than the projected 5%. This is good news and indicates how well the USG is appreciated by the General Assembly.

# IV. Action Items: Discipline Committee Recommendations and Certificate Committee Recommendations

## A. Academic Advisory Committee on Mathematics

A proposal from the Academic Advisory Committee on Mathematics creating a new Area A course for non-science majors was presented for information by Kathleen Burk. A copy of the proposal will be distributed on the listserv.

### **B.** Academic Advisory Committee for Computing Disciplines

Two recommendations from the Academic Advisory Committee for Computing Disciplines were presented by Kris Biesinger; both dealt with Area F changes. A motion was M/S to approve. The motion passed.

# C. Academic Advisory Committee on English

A recommendation from the Academic Advisory Committee on English was presented by Kathleen Burk. It dealt with a redefinition of Area F. After discussion centering on the foreign language requirement, a motion was M/S to table until clarification could be obtained from the Advisory Committee. The motion passed.

#### **D.** Certificate Review Committee

A motion was made to approve the recommendation of the Certificate Review Committee (see handout). The motion was seconded. The motion passed.

#### V. Old Business/New Business

Dr. Daniel Papp recognized Dr. Kathleen Burk (System Office, Regents' Testing) on her impending retirement and thanked her for service to the USG. Dr. John Black recognized Dr. Grace James on her retirement at the end of June and thanked her for service to South Georgia College and the USG. Dr. Frank Butler recognized Dr. Phil Buckhiester on his retirement at the end of June and thanked him for his service to North Georgia College & State University and to the USG.

The joint summer meeting will be held July 11 - 13 in Atlanta at the Sheraton Colony Square hotel. Dr. Gormly reminded everyone that the meeting would begin with a Sunday evening (July  $11^{\text{th}}$ ) dinner in the Crown Room on the  $27^{\text{th}}$  floor overlooking the Atlanta skyline. The theme of the meeting will be Greater Expectations. Dr. Carol Schneider will be the featured speaker. Additional Details will follow later as the next committee meeting date approaches.

#### VI. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 3:45 p.m. with no remaining issues to be discussed.

Respectfully Submitted, Marci M. Middleton and John Black (action items)