

Minutes BOR Academic Committee on Chemistry Spring 2005

This year the meeting was held via e-mail and a VISTA Discussion board to assess the feasibility of holding meetings via the internet versus traveling to a distant meeting site. Several members expressed interest in this method to avoid the time away from the classroom and minimizing the expense of travel.

While the individual discussions will be distributed, the information will be condensed for the minutes.

1. The minutes from last year's meeting were viewed and no changes were suggested, so the minutes were approved.
2. By Law were prepared and distributed. Based upon comments received, email voting on resolutions was generally acceptable. However, in order to pass a resolution, a positive vote must be received on the resolution (no yes by default votes). Distribution of information must be via both discussion board and email. There was some opposition to voting via email. This topic needs to be revisited next year.
3. A discussion over the learning outcomes was posted. Abe Ojo commented that since the outcomes have been unanimously accepted that there are no new corrections or suggestions to be made currently.
4. The discussion on AP credit resulted in the following:

Credit for CHEM 1211 and CHEM 1211L for a score of 3 on the AP

Floyd College – Harvey Moody

At SPSU, Then we call their high school instructor to verify that the AP course they took included a laboratory. So, both conditions must be met before we award credit. – John Sink

AASU -- Richard Wallace

Albany State University -- Louise Wrensford

At Georgia Southwestern, – Greg Thomas

SSU -- Olaronge Olubajo

Bainbridge College awards -- Abe Ojo

AP credit is awarded on the following scores

score of 3 credit for CHEM 1151

score of 4 credit for CHEM 1211

score of 5 credit for CHEM 1211 & 1212

Dalton State College – Vicki Guarisco

Gainesville College -- Tim Howell

Middle Georgia College no rule on a score of 2 but same for 4 or 5, credit is given for CHEM 1012 and 1022 - Ron DeLorenzo

South Georgia College no rule on 3 but 4& 5 same as above -- Lisa Arnold

AP credit is awarded on the following scores

AP score of 2 - awarded CHEM 1211

AP 3 get both CHEM 1211/12.

At Gordon College: Policy has not been reviewed in over 8 years - Dalton's criteria looks more appropriate. – Allen Gahr

Other Comments:

Olaronge Olubajo --The committee should decide on the AP score that would be acceptable for credit in all the institutions. I will recommend that the credit should be for 1211 only.

Paulos Yohannes -- We do give the ACS standard exam for a student to get an exemption from taking CHEM 1211. However, since we have joint enrollment students, our curriculum committee is currently discussing this issue. We do not have a clear working procedure for this.

Barry Miburo -- At Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College, AP results are not considered for Chemistry.

Mark Cunningham We, Atlanta Metropolitan College, accept AP courses for the equivalent college courses providing the student has taken the AP Exam that accompanies the course.

Richard Wallace -- I was wondering how your institutions handle IB credit also.

The overall result of the survey is

OPTION 1 of Credit for CHEM 1211 and CHEM 1211L for a score of 3 on the AP exam

or

OPTION 2 of AP credit is awarded on score of 3 credit for CHEM 1151, score of 4 credit for CHEM 1211 and a score of 5 credit for CHEM 1211 & 1212

An email survey was made with no one liking Option 1 but the majority in favor of system wide adoption of Option 2. One person indicated that the option should be left to the individual schools.

5. On the topic of the top 3 issues in chemistry, discussions ensued and the top 3 issues and more resulted. The topics are as follows:

1. Teaching Load – Over the past several years, many discussions have focused on the credit hour vs. contact hour determination of teaching loads. The consensus of this committee is that contact hours rather than credit hours should be utilized when teaching loads are determined for those faculty teaching laboratory courses. (Andrea Wallace, Paulos Yohannes, Mark Cunningham, Vicki Guarisco, Olaronge Olubajo)

2. (Tied) Lack of Preparedness -- Students entering courses are not prepared for chemistry from high school due to a lack of mathematic and problem solving skills (Barry Milburo, Abe Ojo, Ron DeLorenzo, Louise Wrensford, Mark Cunningham, Greg Thomas)

2. (Tied) Course Transferability – An email discussion sparked much input over the course transferability across the system. The outcome was a recommendation that our group insist the Georgia Tech comply with the BOR mandate that all universities offer students the

same freshman level courses so that students are not penalized for taking CHEM 1211 at one school and then not having the ability to take CHEM 1212 at Tech. At the meeting for semester conversion, the committee worked hard to prepare common courses and numbering so that students were assured transferability. (Paulos Yohannes, Tom Hanley, Larry Bottomley, Leon Combs, Mark Cunningham, Paul Franklin, Vicki Guarisco)

4. Other Student Issues – Topics that need to be addressed in the future or opened up for further discussion include:

The need for information and or course on Forensics and other needed areas
Students lack of communication skills and focus on the visual rather than reading or studying.

Pedagogical issues involved in the home labs done by students in E-core.

The lack of interest by students in entering the field of chemistry

5. Academic Freedom – Faculty should have the ability to bring into class real life examples (chemistry concepts making the news) as without being accused of terrorism, illicit drug trade etc. (Tom Crute, Abe Ojo)

6. Thoughts on meeting via the internet:

The attempt to hold a meeting via the internet was an experiment with mixed results. I was rather disappointed in the lack of number of responses of members of the committee. However, the people who did respond gave very thoughtful and insightful input. In some ways, the discussion was better because everyone who took part got to say everything they wanted without being interrupted. Discussion boards would be a very good alternative to travel both with respect to time and money, but input would have to be mandatory somehow.

Most of those who responded preferred a combination of meeting in person and via email. Because everyone has a preference, the information was to be passed both via discussion board and e-mail. One person was very much opposed to meetings online.

Two comments from members that need to be passed on:

1. I like the idea of meeting on the internet. We have to just get used to it AND we need to see that things are done and that we should participate. Tis' rather like not voting and then complaining about the officials elected — if we don't participate we can't complain about what is done.

2. The good thing about this discussion board is that people get a chance to think more thoroughly about the issues, look up relevant information so that, as you've pointed out, thoughtful responses could be made. I personally like this idea, because it has the potential to produce more results. We're not limited by meeting time, and everyone can contribute (everyone may not be able to attend the meeting). On the flip side since its not a face to face interaction it may take some time and instruction for people to accept this as a 'real' meeting that requires the input of the entire committee. If accountability towards committee duties could be enforced somehow, I think this is a viable alternative, with even greater participation than at the meeting . I for one would probably have contributed less if I attended the meeting (just my personality). I would have probably let the more outspoken members carry the discussion.