July 11 – 13, 2004 Atlanta, Georgia Sheraton Midtown Atlanta at Colony Square

The Administrative Committee on Academic Affairs held its summer business meeting at the Sheraton Midtown Atlanta at Colony Square on Tuesday, July 13, 2004. Dr. Anne V. Gormly, Chair and Vice President for Academic Affairs at Georgia College & State University, called the meeting to order. Dr. Gormly also recognized the following executive committee members: Dr. Michael Stoy (Gainesville College), Dr. Phil Buckhiester (North Georgia College & State University), Dr. Janis Reid (Atlanta Metropolitan College), and Dr. Ronald Henry (Georgia State University). The minutes of the spring meeting (April 13, 2004) were approved with a friendly amendment.

I. Chancellor's Remarks

Chancellor Thomas Meredith provided opening remarks for the joint RACAA/RACSA conference held July 11 – 13, 2004. Chancellor Meredith stated that the top priorities in the university system were instruction in the classroom and educating the citizens of Georgia coupled with increasing academic quality and controlling costs. Upcoming information and projects to be developed at the system level include the Education GO! Get it Campaign, new methods of financing, addressing constituents quickly and efficiently, repairing areas of academic disconnect, and addressing the relationship of the Department of Technical and Adult Education with the system's two-year colleges.

II. Dr. Carol Schneider, President, Association of American Colleges & Universities

Dr. Schneider opened her remarks with two key questions: 1) What are the most promising educational practices and 2) Who are institutions engaging? Dr. Schneider discussed the Greater Expectations project and how its principles have been developed to help students become more involved in the college experience and across the curriculum. The project involves achieving learning outcomes, designing purposeful pathways, and taking responsibility for the quality of the baccalaureate degree. Dr. Schneider stressed that Greater Expectations was not a framework for the core curriculum or general education goals. Other thought-provoking questions addressed to the audience and used to illuminate the Greater Expectations project included the following: 1) What are we looking for in a well-educated graduate? 2) Do we invite stakeholders with us when developing undergraduate student learning outcomes? and 3) How are we trying to make students more intentional about education? Dr. Schneider stated that the challenges for the new century include linking courses with learning communities, integrated learning, determining who is accountable, and determining what is really meant by diversity in education. Chief Academic and Student Affairs officers then divided along sector representation to discuss the impact of Greater Expectations for the university system. The discussion questions concerned how academic affairs and student affairs help students better understand what is expected of them.

III. Sector Discussion of Implications of Greater Expectations for USG

The following administrators served as facilitators for the discussion of *Greater Expectations* in the university system: Kurt Keppler (VSU), research and regional universities; Bruce Harshbarger (GCSU), state universities, and Tom Walter (GAN), two-year colleges.

Break-out report summaries by sector were provided to the entire group of administrators.

July 11 – 13, 2004 Atlanta, Georgia Sheraton Midtown Atlanta at Colony Square

Research and Regional Universities

Research and regional institutional administrators discussed the need for more advising versus course scheduling, collaborative programs, communicating expectations clearly, establishing centers for teaching and learning, and the interdisciplinary work of learning communities. The administrators stressed the need for collaborative research on student programs and comparing instruction to retention and graduation rates.

State Universities/Four-year Colleges

Baccalaureate-degree granting institutional administrators emphasized the new SACS process, quality enhancement plans, campus-wide discussions using technology, connecting curriculum and credit hours, reward structures and reinforcement, and the prioritization of resources. State university administrators were particularly attuned to the results of recent reports concerning NSSE data, service learning, and leadership programming.

Two-Year Colleges

Two-year college administrators discussed the "hi touch/hi tech" means of advising students infused with regular discussions. Detailed discussion also included a review of who teaches at an institution and the role of early intervention, learning communities, academic survival skills, the role of faculty in advising, career preparation, the difference between advisement and class scheduling, interconnectivity and partnerships, student responsibilities, and changing culture to view learning outcomes from several lenses. Two-year college administrators emphasized the outcomes of powerful institutional partnerships between and among units as well as the importance of CASS standards.

IV. Senior Vice Chancellor's Report Part I

a. Changes in PSO

Dr. Frank Butler explained that when students were considered joint enrollees, college earned credits did not count toward 127 hours of undergraduate study. Now, the Georgia Student Finance Commission has created a new category called paid hours such that student earned credits may count toward HOPE funding with the limit on paid hours being 127 semester credits. Thus, it will be possible for students to reach the 127 hour maximum earlier and not necessarily count toward the 127 attempted hours calculated for the HOPE scholarship. In other words, paid hours (otherwise known as grant hours) enable a student to earn college credit paid for by the Georgia Student Finance Commission. The ACCEL program will only pay for high school core courses. Based on the ACCEL program, college courses do not count as HOPE attempted hours on the college side; however, these credit hours are calculated on the high school side for HOPE The Georgia Student Finance Commission is working on eligibility calculations. disseminating information and procedures through PROBE workshops and other media information. In order for students to be considered jointly enrolled, they must meet joint enrollment requirements. The system office has determined the core high school courses and appropriate courses offered at university system colleges that are considered appropriate for this program. Such information will be available fall 2004.

July 11 – 13, 2004 Atlanta, Georgia Sheraton Midtown Atlanta at Colony Square

b. Multi-Institutional Functionality (MIF)

Ms. Tonya Lam explained how the Multi-institutional Functionality project was developed twelve months ago. The primary concept behind the project was to provide access and support to students through the use of technology at their home institutions. At present, five institutions have elected to become pilot sites for the project. Electronic transcripts will be launched within each institution. MIF is not a requisite for electronic transcripts, but rather, is optional for each institution.

c. Security Training Initiative

Dr. Kris Biesinger discussed the Security Training Initiative. Dr. Biesinger noted that the following institutions had developed end-user and administrator training; Armstrong Atlantic State University, Valdosta State University, Dalton State College, Southern Polytechnic State University, State University of West Georgia, and the University of Georgia. Two courses are to be offered on July 28, 2004. Information concerning the courses has been sent to each WebCT administrator via WebCT and Vista. Course one, the end-user course, is an on-line, interactive course of study that enables the trainee to create true passwords, conduct e-mail mergers, developing testing assessments, and share files over the Internet. Course two, the administrator course, enables trainees to understand issues involving security across technology platforms. Policy development, contingency planning, and institutional customization are also included in this course.

d. SEVIS

Dr. Richard Sutton discussed the implementation of SEVIS and associated fees with regard to the electronic tracking system and resultant database. Dr. Sutton explained that all students pay fees in U.S. dollars to qualify for Visas. It was explained that SEVIS should not be used as a substitute for regular courses of entry into the institution. The implementation of SEVIS should not have an impact on fall enrollments of international students.

V. Senior Vice Chancellor's Report Part II

a. Data Warehousing

Dr. Papp explained that draft rules on data warehousing had been transmitted to each institution. Meetings will be scheduled over the next few months concerning the rules for accessing information in the data warehouse. The policies and procedures associated with the data warehouse are under development.

b. Georgia Student Finance Commission

Dr. Papp announced that an agreement had been made with GSFC on the statewide portal for education. It is to be unveiled July 15, 2004.

July 11 – 13, 2004 Atlanta, Georgia Sheraton Midtown Atlanta at Colony Square

c. Graduation Rate Task Force

Dr. Ronald Henry provided a presentation concerning the Graduation Rate Task Force. The task force was established in February 2004 to address three main components of graduation: 1) students' lack of preparation for college, 2) student characteristics, and 3) institutional characteristics. The task force was empanelled to develop a five-year plan to address the university system's low graduation rates as compared to the national average. Dr. Henry explained that better prepared students come better prepared for college. The task force has recommended eight principles as it moves forward with its charge:

- 1) Retention and increased graduation rates will be the shared responsibility of all facets of the institution.
- 2) Institutions must demonstrate their intent to improve overall retention and graduation rates by regularly and systematically collecting, reviewing and analyzing reliable data focus should be on disaggregated data with intent to narrow the gaps among ethnicity and sex groups. First-year through third- or sixth-year retention rates should be monitored and assessed.
- 3) A wide variety of academic programs and support services and proactive interventions should be provided.
- 4) Institutions should positively address those populations most vulnerable to drop-out, stop-out or failure.
- 5) An academic advising plan should be developed that includes at least the three prongs:
 - a) Offer training sessions for faculty and full-time advisors that emphasize advising as more than simply scheduling. Developmental advising has a positive impact on retention.
 - b) Provide rewards and recognition for advising. Emphasize advising as teaching and develop a program that recognizes and rewards outstanding achievement in advising.
 - c) Conduct continual assessment on the effectiveness of advising.
- 6) Rules/policies that might potentially delay graduation should be examined and modified both at the institutional and System level.
- 7) Quality of academic offerings should be examined to ensure a high level of intellectual work is required of students and there are high expectations for all students.
- 8) Quality of campus climate should be examined to ensure a positive learning environment exists for all students.

July 11 – 13, 2004 Atlanta, Georgia Sheraton Midtown Atlanta at Colony Square

d. Regents' Test Policy Revisions

Dr. Frank Butler introduced Mr. Leslie Caldwell, Director of Regents Testing. Dr. Butler explained that based on changes in federal funding, revised policies require that all students pass two courses, one in reading and the other in writing prior to the completion of 45 semester credit hours. Dr. Butler asked that all institutions continue to offer the courses and indicated that students will only be able to exit remediation by passing with a grade of satisfactory. In other words, students fail the course if they fail the test. Student financial aid is impacted by this policy. Dr. Butler indicated that although no common course descriptions were available for the courses, institutions were asked to make modifications where permissible.

VI. Information items

a. Advanced Placement/ Advanced Credit Review Committee

Dr. Louis Levy explained that his committee had reviewed institutional catalogs and websites to review AP scores, clean data, and determine what currently exists. Based on the outcomes of the review, much variability exists among institutions based on test scores and processes. Dr. Levy announced that the AP Review Committee would meet briefly after the general meeting to discuss the following: 1) taking resultant information to disciplinary advisory committees, 2) obtaining concurrence on scores for each discipline, 3) reviewing outliers and reporting out institutional scores.

b. Off-campus Instruction

Dr. Richard Sutton provided the draft report of the Committee on Off-Campus Instruction. The report is in its infancy and is the result of the committee's work to date. Neither deliberation nor system office review had taken place with regard to the report's contents. In addition, the Office of Facilities in the system office is reviewing the report and will respond to the concept of academic decisions driving citing decisions. Issues concerning SACS will be addressed separately. After the report has had some system office deliberation it will be refined and transmitted via the CAO listsery for comment.

c. Academic Advisory Committees

Dr. Dorothy Zinsmeister provided an overview of the activities of the Academic Advisory Committees to date. Dr Zinsmeister reported that the committees had provided input to the quality of K-12 education through the refined curriculum recommendations submitted to the Department of Education. The Department of Education collected information from the University System and other sources and began its second iteration of further refining the K-12 curriculum.

d. PRISM

Drs. Kettlewell and Zinsmeister announced that PRISM had been working collectively with the Department of Education and university system faculty to develop P-16 perspectives on the Georgia public school curricula in mathematics and the sciences.

July 11 – 13, 2004 Atlanta, Georgia

Sheraton Midtown Atlanta at Colony Square

e. Council on General Education

Dr. Zinsmeister explained that the Council on General Education had been asked to review the Georgia Public Schools curriculum form the perspective of student preparation before entering college. As a result, K-8 math and language were approved. Grades 9 – 12 mathematics will be reviewed. Social studies curriculum information has not been prepared for review by outside groups. Dr. Zinsmeister explained that during the last DOE board meeting, higher education participation was petitioned along with review and input on the various curricula.

f. MATH 1001

Dr. Butler announced that the Council on General Education had recommended an addition to Area A, namely MATH 1001. It is a course available to Area A of the core. Questions were transmitted to obtain feedback on this issue. Dr. Butler explained that the system office and institutional committees do not insist that this course be offered and followed. MATH 1001 is simply provided as an institutional option.

VII. Action Items: Academic Committee Recommendations

a. English Area F

Motion: Revised Motion on Defining Area F: Area F consists of 18 hours in 1000-2000 courses related to English studies and other courses which may be prerequisite to high level major courses, distributed as follows: 1) up to nine hours of foreign language courses up to the level equivalent of the fourth semester, if not otherwise satisfied; 2) at least one world literature or world literature-based humanities course, if not take in another area; and 3) additional courses relevant to English studies and other transferable courses in literature, the humanities, history and/or social sciences as specified by each institution; if applicable, another foreign language at the 1002-level and above.

Outcome: The motion carried and was approved by a committee of the whole.

b. Physical Science Area F

Motion: The Academic Committee on Physics and Astronomy recommends the deletion of this Area F from the list of approved Area Fs.

Area F Guidelines: -- Physical Science

Area F for Physical science majors consists of 18 hours of lower-division (100-and 200-level courses related to the Physical Science major and/or prerequisite to courses required in the major:

Calculus-based Physics I, II or Trigonometry-based Physics (8 hrs.)

Calculus II (excess from Area A or D)* (0-1 hr.)

Calculus II (excess from Area D) (1-4 hr.)

Calculus III (3-4 hrs.)

Additional Hours) in astronomy, mathematics, computer science or chemistry (for science majors) (1-4 hrs.)

Total 18 hrs.

Outcome: The motion carried and was approved by a committee of the whole.

July 11 – 13, 2004 Atlanta, Georgia

Sheraton Midtown Atlanta at Colony Square

c. Physics Area F

Motion: The Academic Committee on Physics and Astronomy recommends the addition of physics courses as electives in Area F.

Area F Guidelines – Physics

Area F Physics majors consists of 18 hours of lower-division (100-and 200-level0 courses related to the physics major and/or prerequisite to courses required in the major:

Calculus-based physics, I, II (8 hrs.)

Calculus I (excess from Area A or D)* (0-1 hr.)

Calculus II (excess from Area D) (1-4 hrs.)

Calculus III (3-4 hrs.)

Additional hour(s) in physics, astronomy, mathematics, computer science or chemistry (for science majors)** (1-4 hrs.)

Total 18 hrs.

Outcome: The motion carried and was approved by a committee of the whole.

d. Learning Support

Motion: The Academic Advisory committee on learning support and Developmental Studies recommends the following change be made to Section 2/209.02 in the Academic Affairs Handbook, Administrative Procedures for Learning Support Programs, IV e:

All learning support programs must be designed so that students can complete all requirements in an area in a maximum of two semesters. A maximum of twelve semester hours or three semesters, whichever occurs first, may be taken in any area.

Outcome: The motion was tabled due to a lack of clarifying materials and explicit information as to how such action would revise the Academic Affairs Handbook.

e. Health Professions

Motion: 1) To streamline the Area F guidelines in the various Radiologic sciences disciplines, the Academic Committee on Health Professions requests the deletion of the separate Area F guidelines for diagnostic medial Sonography, nuclear medicine technology, and radiation therapy technology. Instead, we request that students who wish to major in these areas or any other Radiologic sciences discipline follow the Area F guidelines for Radiologic Technology (ies). 2) We also request a change in the name of the Area F guidelines, from "Radiologic Technology (ies) to Radiologic Technologies" to reflect current professional terminology.

Outcome: The motion carried and was approved by a committee of the whole.

VIII. Ad hoc Committee Recommendations

No ad hoc committee recommendations were advanced to the floor.

July 11 – 13, 2004 Atlanta, Georgia

Sheraton Midtown Atlanta at Colony Square

IX. Nominating Committee Recommendations

Dr. Louis Levy reported that the 2004-2005 chair and chair-elect for the ACAA committee would be held by Drs. Michael Stoy and Barry Goldstein, respectively.

X. Old Business

Expressions of appreciation were offered by Dr. Frank Butler for Dr. John Black's institutional and system office service. Dr. Anne Gormly expressed appreciation to the yeoman's work exhibited by the 2003-2004 ACAA executive committee members (Dr. Ronald Henry, Dr. Janis Reid, Dr. Michael Stoy, and Dr. Phil Buckhiester). Dr. Gormly then provided remarks for the installation of incoming chair, Dr. Michael Stoy.

XI. New Business

Dr. Michael Stoy accepted the nomination for chair and announced the VPAAs who would form the 2004-2005 executive committee. The 2004 – 2005 members of the executive committee of the Administrative Committee on Academic Affairs are listed below with references to the chair and chair-elect:

Dr. Michael Stoy, Chair, VPAA, Gainesville College

Dr. Barry Goldstein, Chair-elect, VPAA, Medical College of Georgia

Executive Committee Members:

Dr. Barbara Frizzel, VPAA, Macon State College

Dr. Barry Goldstein, VPAA, Medical College of Georgia

Dr. Anne V. Gormly, VPAA, Georgia College & State University

Dr. Louis Levy, VPAA, Valdosta State University

Dr. Stoy announced that the following dates had been tentatively established for RACAA business meetings during the 2004-2005 academic year. All meetings will begin at 9:00 a.m. (registration at 8:30) and be held on the campus of Macon State College in the Rehearsal Hall (Theatre Arts Complex), Building M:

Thursday, October 21 Thursday, February 24 Thursday, April 28

Summer meeting plans are under development at this time.

XII. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 1:00 p.m. with no remaining issues to be discussed.

Respectfully Submitted, Marci M. Middleton Academic Coordinator for Program Review and Coordinator, MAP/MRO