# Meeting Minutes: Committee on Academic Affairs

**Administrative Committee on Academic Affairs**

April 13, 1999

Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, Georgia

**MINUTES**

The Administrative Committee on Academic Affairs held its Spring meeting on April 13, 1999 at Georgia Institute of Technology. Chairperson Michael Thomas called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. The following designated institutional representatives and guests attended the meeting: Dr. Michael Crafton, State University of West Georgia; Dr. Philip Buckhiester, North Georgia College & State University; Dr. Sara Connor, Armstrong Atlantic State University; Dr. Gerald A. McIntosh, Fort Valley State University; Dr. Robert Becker, Georgia Perimeter College, Dr. William Teska, ACE Fellow at Agnes Scott College; Dr. Thomas Haynes, ACE Fellow at Georgia State University; Dr. Tim Crimmins, Georgia State University; and Dr. Louis Levy, Valdosta State University.

The minutes of the November 12, 1998 meeting were approved as distributed.

I. **Distance Education**

   A. **Presentation**
   Following a brief progress report on the FY 2000 budget, Dr. Muyskens opened the presentation by posing the question, **"As the Board wrestles with the technology principles and we work on action items, how can we implement a coordinated, logical array of distance education or on-line programs?"** Drs. David Morgan and Kris Biesinger were charged with coordinating two task forces: Task Force #1 - Professional Development Needs (Bachelors' and Masters' programs); and Task Force #2 - Core Curriculum Offered Anytime-Anywhere.

   B. **Discussion**
   Several chief academic officers posed questions relative to the priorities of each task force. Selected issues and questions are listed below:

   ***Task Force #1: Professional Development Needs -- Bachelors' and Masters' Programs***

   1. Will admissions criteria differ? Will new transfer tracks require development?
   2. When considering programs, does each institution contribute to on-line delivery or does the institution with the most preparation and readiness offer the program? What is in the best interest of the institution that offers a unique program?
   3. What are the funding sources to support this initiative? In some cases, campuses require funding to upgrade equipment and other resources offered through traditional delivery. How will academic affairs review these types of proposals?

*Task Force #2: Core Curriculum Offered Anytime-Anywhere*

1. What is the SACS accreditation approach? What is the preferred model of collaboration? How is this method of delivery similar to independent study?
2. The core is not a single entity. There are still inherent differences between institutions concerning the core curriculum. Will these differences be coupled together and honored throughout the System? In other words, how many Area Fs have two or more institutional differences?
3. How does on-line delivery impact system EFTs?
4. In a collaborative degree situation, who maintains curricular control?

II. **Senior Vice Chancellor's Report**

A. **SACS Substantive Change for Distance Education**
Ms. Diane Chubb, OIIT Project Manager for Distance Education, posed the question, **"Accreditation and Substantive Change: How do we approach this as a System?"** Ms. Chubb informed the Committee that, if approved, Georgia would be one of the first systems to be reviewed for distance education SACS substantive change. The presentation included information on thresholds for SACS notification, federal mandates, procedures for a system coordinated visit, the institutional prospectus, and benefits and outcomes of a System coordinated visit. The benefits of a coordinated visit include the efficient use of time and money and the facilitation of SACS acceptance of future substantive change requests. Discussion ensued and it was suggested that a request be sent to Chancellor Portch advocating this type of review following the recommendation of the Chief Academic Officers.

B. **PACTS/Level 14 SET**
Dr. Jan Kettlewell introduced the faculty associates who have worked on the teacher preparation project: Dr. Judy Monsaas, Co-Director of the P-16 Initiative and faculty member at North Georgia College & State University; and, Dr. Dorothy Zinsmeister, Senior Associate and faculty member at Kennesaw State University. Dr. Kettlewell provided the group with a brief history of the initiative, an update, and question and answer session.

*History and Focus*
In 1995, Georgia embarked on the Pre-School Post-Secondary Education (P-16) Initiative that brings together the Governor, legislative leaders, the Georgia Departments of Technical and Adult Education, the Office of School Readiness, the University System of Georgia, faculty, educational administrators, school boards, communities, youth advocates and the private sector to focus on five areas: 1) to improve student achievement to high levels from pre-school through post-secondary education; 2) to help students move smoothly from one educational system to another, when movement is appropriate; 3) to ensure that all students who enter post-secondary education are prepared to succeed; 4) to improve the admission and success rates of all students in post-secondary education; and, 5) to focus the co-reform of teacher education, advanced preparation programs for educators,

and the public schools toward practices that lead to all students meeting high academic standards.

*Update*
The following documents concerning the design and partnerships for the initiative were distributed: Performance Assessment for College and Technical School (PACTS) and Level 14 Standards for Exit and Transfer (Level 14 SET), PACTS/Level 14 SET Content Standards and Benchmarks, PACTS/Level 14 SET Tentative Committee Assignments, Level 14 SET and PACTS -Action Plans and Time Lines. Faculty representing P-16 Councils developed the materials. Dr. Kettlewell asked that each institution review the learning outcomes and deliverables of each action plan; and, that the group look for ways to strengthen the connection between the pilot and the System general education component.

*Discussion*
Issues discussed concerning the Level 14 SET included: monitoring of the pilot and further stages to be developed; long-term issues for transfer credit; and solutions to transfer DTAE credit. Dr. Kettlewell explained that this pilot was developed to help the System address the question, "what is college work," that has been posed by various high schools.

C. **Revised Faculty Development Institute**
Drs. Jessica Sommers and Kris Biesinger discussed the new approach to the Faculty Development Institute. Instead of state-level summer institutes, campuses will be funded to develop their own on-campus faculty development programs. Dr. Sommers explained that the cohort of trainees who previously attended the Institute can provide leadership at their respective campuses. Dr. Sommers further explained that the campus-based approach increases faculty development participation rates, and provides added flexibility and specialized training. Dr. Biesinger explained that the modules and learning objectives incorporated in earlier seminars will assist the campuses in building learning communities. The Faculty Development Institute will still provide administrator training and sponsor conferences. Dr. Biesinger also solicited a response from the Chief Academic Officers concerning campus accountability in the use of lottery funds for the Statewide Desktop Learning Initiative.

D. **Georgia Postsecondary Education Collaborative Council/Postsecondary Options**
Dr. David Morgan presented and distributed information pertaining to the Georgia Postsecondary Education Collaborative Council. New areas of study are universal cooperative AAS degrees, a process for resolution of institutional disputes, continuing education, and enhanced data. Dr. Morgan indicated that GPECC will also be reviewing the Transfer Principles endorsed in 1998 by the Administrative Committee on Academic Affairs. He also updated the group on proposed DOE changes to the PSO program. Dr. Morgan indicated that a joint committee would bring a recommendation to the group's Brasstown meeting on PSO students' ability to satisfy the fourth math unit with a PSO college course.

III. **Presentation of Regents' Teaching Excellence Awards**

Dr. James Muyskens presented the Regents' Teaching Excellence Awards. The Regents' Teaching

Excellence Awards are designed to recognize and reward outstanding teaching by faculty, as well as the promotion and recognition of excellence in teaching and service by departments or through programs at the University System's 34 institutions. The criteria used in selecting faculty and staff include evidence of a superlative teaching record on their campus, a strong commitment to fostering the academic success of students through classroom instruction, and interaction with students outside of the classroom. Recipients each receive $5,000. The Regents' Teaching Excellence Awards were presented during the luncheon. The recipients of this year's awards were:

| Individual Faculty | Departments/Programs |
|---|---|
| Dr. Mark B. Finlay, Associate Prof. of History Armstrong Atlantic State University | Dept. of Nursing, Floyd College Ms. Belen Nora, Chair |
| Mr. J. B. Sharma, Associate Prof. of Physics Gainesville College | Dept. of Risk Management and Insurance Dr. Bruce Palmer, Chair |
| Dr. Marie Chisholm, Assistant Prof. of Pharmacy University of Georgia | Honors Program Dr. Liza Davis |

IV. **Committee Reports**

    A. **Regents Administrative Committee on Institutional Effectiveness**
Dr. Thomas Jones, Chair, reported that the RACIE Committee will be focusing on comprehensive Academic Program Review. The Committee will be meeting at Callaway Gardens May 18 - 19 to define the role of the System, the Central Office, and USG institutions in program review activities. Institutional representatives from Bainbridge College, Georgia College & State University, Georgia State University, Savannah State University, and the University of Georgia will share institutional approaches to using academic program review in institutional planning and strategic management. Dr. Jones further disclosed that Dr. Margaret (Peg) Miller, AAHE affiliate, will be the keynote speaker at the summer meeting. It is anticipated that Dr. Miller will discuss more global issues related to System program review. On September 9 - 10 a systemwide conference on Program Review will be held on the campus of Columbus State University. The two-day conference is being held in order to share ideas and policies concerning program review and accountability.

    B. **Council on Undergraduate Education**
Dr. Joan Lord, Chair, discussed the outcomes of the Ombudsperson Training held February 1999. The Ombudsperson Training was broadcast to all USG system institutions. Dr. Lord indicated that the Council had been asked by RACIE to determine common student outcomes within the core curriculum. The next meeting of the Council on Undergraduate Education will be held May 8, 1999. Dr. Lord distributed the proposed revision of the Core Curriculum Guidelines to be incorporated into the *Academic Affairs Handbook, Section 2.04.01*. The changes include taking the math and science requirements and incorporating them into the general core. The changes are being made because, in some cases, institutions have "grandfathered" core courses that do not meet the principles.

C. **Administrative Committee on Learning Disorders**

Dr. Gregory Powell, Chair, explained that only specific sections of the *Academic Affairs Handbook, Section 2.22.01,* would be revised. The following proposed changes were submitted to the Committee:

*The Accommodation of Students with Learning Disorders.* Technical standards are essentials to which all students must adhere in a program of study. Students with disabilities may be eligible for accommodations; however, these students are still required to meet all of a program's technical standards.

*Criteria for Outside Evaluations.* Secondary education eligibility reports, individualized educational plans and provision of special education services in and of themselves are not sufficient documentation for college level accommodations, although this information should be included with reports from any comprehensive evaluation. If no prior services or accommodations have been provided, this needs to be carefully explained as learning disabilities and related disorders are not typically newly identified in adulthood.

*Georgia Board of Regents Criteria for Accepting Outside Evaluations Documenting Learning Disabilities.* Documentation must be within 3 years of the student's application for assistance . . . Documentation must be comprehensive, including history, diagnostic interviews, test results, differential diagnosis, details regarding a student functional limitations, and recommendations for accommodations which are appropriate in college, graduate or professional educational settings. . . The evaluation must be signed by a professional with expertise in evaluating adult populations and appropriately licensed by the state. In addition, new sections devoted to Attention Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorders (ADHD) and Psychiatric Disorders were added to the guideline (*See Academic Affairs Handbook, Section 2.22.01*). The Committee was advised that further suggestions or changes should be e-mailed to Drs. Gregory Powell or Kathleen Burk.

V. **Business Meeting**

A. **Academic Advisory Committee on Business Administration, Management and Economics**

Dr. Morgan presented to the Committee the recommendation of the Academic Advisory Committee on Business Administration, Management and Economics a recommendation to support the requests for technology fees from the various colleges. The motion was discussed by the Chief Academic Officers. Committee members present indicated that more technology fee requests had not been requested because many campuses were complying with Central Office mandates.

B. **Other**
   1. Institutional and Technology Fees
      Committee members discussed student fee paradigms before and after implementation of the HOPE Scholarship. Dr. Muyskens explained that the System would need to see the results of

the pilot technology fees before making a presentation to the Board and encouraged committee members to review their infrastructure needs with institutional technology and fiscal officers. The Committee agreed that Georgia institutions need to maintain equipment and labs; information technology encompasses more than a portable computer; increased fees may pose a hardship to some students; and, that the System needs to analyze fees without including HOPE funds in the equation. A motion was passed unanimously by all of the members to review institutional fees.

2. Teacher Education
   Dr. Bill Bompart requested that Dr. Jan Kettlewell provide an update on Teacher Education programs. Dr. Kettlewell reported that all discussions concerning teacher education programs have been held at the campus level. Institutional reports are due May 30. Dr. Kettlewell suggested that institutions follow the principles as clear guidelines for the comprehensive review of teacher education programs. A subcommittee will report in May on the question concerning transferability and Area F requirements for students majoring in education.

3. Faculty Working in the Public School and Public Sector
   Dr. Kettlewell explained that three million dollars was available for institutions with teacher education programs and partner schools. Some of these funds will appear within institutional budgets.

4. Yamacraw Mission
   Dr. John Wolfe described the Yamacraw Mission and progress on the initiative. Dr. Wolfe explained that the University System participates in two ways: 1) eight institutions have submitted RFPs to be included in the economic development initiative and 2) the System participates, as a whole, through GCATT. The Yamacraw mission leverages Georgia's existing high-technology assets and builds on a strong foundation of research-driven economic development. The key areas of the initiative are the High-Bandwidth Communications Cluster, the Education Cluster, and the Electronic Design Center.

VI. **Summer Meeting Plans**
   Dr. David Morgan announced that the Summer meeting of the Academic and Student Vice Presidents will be held at Brasstown Valley Resort on July 25 - 27. A draft agenda was distributed. The meeting will focus on distance education, academic program review and powerful partnerships.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

---

# Coordinating On-line Programs in the University System of Georgia

**Background**

- Many institutions have piloted various efforts.
- System and Central Office Committees have developed recommendations.
- The Board of Regents has conducted an intensive study.

**Current Status**

- Technology Priniciples laying on table.
- Plan of action needed that meets state needs and provides for the best use of resources.

**Assumptions**

- Some form of State-level coordination needed to ensure state needs are met without unnecessary duplication.
- Removing geography criterion changes manner in which need is reviewed.
- State coordiantion where 50% or greater of program, upper division or lower division.
- State coordination focuses on certificate or degree programs -- not courses.

**Priorities**

- Professional Development Needs
- Bachelors and Masters Programs
- Core Curriculum Offered Anytime-Anywhere

**Professional, Bachelors & Masters Programs**
*Discussion Points*

1. Presume that all-interested four-year institutions will have an opportunity to participate in offering programs.
2. Institutions must demonstrate they have a high quality program and the ability to offer it on-line.
3. The number of similar programs approved will depend on state need and demand. Collaboration will be encouraged.
4. Central Office may identify areas of need and solicit collaborative proposals; and, will provide coordination and assist in marketing.
5. Current procedures for external program review will be updatd to include on-line mode and to reflect quality, need & compliance within review criteria.

**Professional, Bachelors & Masters**

*Possible Approaches*

a. Unique Programs Determine On-line Appropriateness
b. Similar Programs
    1. Each program offered separately.
    2. Programs offered collaborative.
        - Each offers portion of degree/Each awards degree.
        - Each offers some courses/Only designated institutions award degree.

## Core Curriculum
### *Discussion Points*

- System committed to offering on anytime-anywhere basis.
- Every institution offers core.
- Organizational structure needed which:
    - Involves as many institutions as possible.
    - Avoids unnecessary duplication.
    - Is flexible enough to respond to changing demand in a timely manner.
    - Is student-friendly (one-stop shopping).
    - Highlights marketing opportunities.

## Core Curriculum
### *Possible Approaches*

a. A small number of institutions become designated providers of the core in its entirety.
b. Collaborative: One institution of record for on-line core but with participating institutions offering courses/areas.
c. Collaborative: Multiple institutions of record for on-line core but with participating institutions offering courses/areas.
d. Collaborative B and C above, but involving only associate-level institutions.

# Coordinated Distance Education Substantive Change

**Summary of Findings**

**Thresholds for SACS Notification, Federal Mandates**

- Initial offering of a Distance Education Course
- Adoption of a New Delivery Technology
- Offering More than 50% of a Degree Program via Distance Education

**SACS Response to South Carolina Notification**

- Notation of Change in Institution's File
- Request Additional Information
- Site Visit by Review Team

**Procedures for a System Coordinated Visit**

- Form Request to COC Executive Committee by Chancellor
- Preparation of System and Institutional Prospectus
- Site Visit by SACS Team
- Follow Response to Recommendations

**Institutional Prospectus**

- Student Services Support
- Qualifications of Teaching Faculty
- Curriculum Development Procedures
- Learning Resources
- Institutional Mission
- Technology Infrastructure
- List of Distance Education Courses

**System Coordinated Visit**

- Orientation for Visiting Team Members
- Prepare System Prospectus
- Provide Template for Institutional Prospectus
- Coordinate Logistics for Visiting Team (Electronic and In-Person)
- Share Comments Among Institutions

**Benefits and Outcomes of a System Coordinated Visit**

- Efficiency in Time and Money
- "Snapshot" of Institutional Activities and Level of Readiness
- Facilitates SACS Acceptance of Future Substantive Changes
- Does Not Eliminate the Need for Future Substantive Change Notifications

**Institutional Certification in Distance Education**

- Institutions Identified as Distance Education Providers
- Technological Infrastructure, Student Services, Faculty Training, Learning Resources, and Curriculum Planning
- SACS Recognizes Certification Status to Facilitate Future Substantive Changes

**Summary**

- SACS Requires Notification of Distance Education Activities
- Potential Benefits Derived from a System Coordinated Substantive Change Review
- Issues for USG: Participation, Planning, and Management of Future Distance Education Substantive Changes for Long-term Benefits

---

# PACTS and Level 14 SET

**Components of the Georgia P-16 Initiative**

**THE PURPOSE OF PACTS AND LEVEL 14 SET**

- To align expectations for exit from high school and entrance into post-secondary work and education (PACTS).
- To align expectations for exit from the core curriculum in college with entrance into work and upper division education (Level 14 SET).

**ORIGINS**

- 1997 - Charge from Chancellor Portch, Commissioner Breeden, Superintendent Schrenko
- 1998 - PEW Grant
- 1998 - Invitation from Association of American Colleges and Universities to participate in project on outcomes of general education and the first two-years of college

**THE PARTNERS IN PACTS AND LEVEL 14 SET**

- Four local P-16 councils
    - Metropolitan Atlanta P-16 Council
    - Middle Georgia P-16 Council
    - South Georgia P-16 Council
    - Southeast Georgia P-16 Council
- The Georgia P-16 Council
    - The Level 12 Learning Standards Subcommittee
- National Partners
    - Pew Charitable Trusts
    - AAC&U

**GOALS OF PACTS**

- To ensure that students who graduate from high school are ready for college, technical school and work.
- To close the gap between what is expected to complete secondary school and what is needed for the post-secondary world.

**GOALS OF LEVEL 14 SET**

*Level 14 Standards for Exit and Transfer*

- To assess student readiness to move from lower to upper division work in college.
- To close the gap between what is expected to complete the core curriculum and what is needed for upper

division work.

*Level 14 SET (In partnership with AAC&U, Funded by FIPSE)*

- To assess student readiness to transfer from one college to another after completion of core curriculum & 1st two years of general education.

## THE COMPONENTS OF PACTS AND LEVEL 14 SET

| PACTS | LEVEL 14 SET |
|---|---|
| The Assessment System<br>- Content Standards<br>- Performance Standards<br>- Performance Assessments | The Assessment System<br>- Content Standards<br>- Performance Standards<br>- Performance Assessments (contingent upon additional funding) |
| The Admission System | |
| The Pilot Test | |

## TENTATIVE PERFORMANCE LEVELS FOR PACTS AND LEVEL 14 SET

- Advanced
- Proficient
- Partially Proficient
- Not Proficient

## COORDINATION WITH SYSTEM ADMINISTRATIVE COMMITTEES

- Any recommendations beyond pilot to existing Administrative Committees
- Representatives from Administrative Committees on PACTS/Level 14 Coordinating and National Advisory Groups
- Periodic progress reports from PACTS/Level 14 to Administrative Committees

---