Meeting Minutes: Committee on Academic Affairs

November 16, 1999
Regents' Central Office Board Room
Atlanta, Georgia

MINUTES

The Administrative Committee on Academic Affairs held its Fall meeting on November 16, 1999 at the Regents' Central Office located in Atlanta, Georgia. Chairperson Thomas Jones called the meeting to order at 10:00 a.m. Dr. Jones welcomed the Chief Academic Officers and introduced Dr. James Muyskens in his new role as CEO and Dean of the Gwinnett Center. Dr. Muyskens discussed the burgeoning areas of technology enhanced learning, promoting the scholarship of teaching, and distance education. Because of his leadership in the Central Office, Dr. Muyskens was presented with a farewell gift from the chief academic officers and Central Office academic affairs staff from Dr. Bettie Rose Horne, ACAA Chair-elect.

The minutes of the July 27, 1999 meeting were approved as distributed.

I. **Report of the Senior Vice Chancellor**

   Dr. Jones introduced Interim Senior Vice Chancellor Beheruz N. Sethna. Dr. Sethna proceeded to discuss the following topics and activities that have systemwide impacts.

   A. **Benchmarking Project**
   Dr. Sethna explained that the Benchmarking Project had been modified in consideration of the management audits that will require the participation of each state agency. The Board of Regents was the first agency to volunteer for the management audit. The management audit team is comprised of three Board of Regents staff members (i.e., Madlyn Hanes, Lindsay Desrochers, and Beheruz N. Sethna) and three individuals from OPB and related state agencies. The goal is to create a product that meets the Governor's and Board's goals. The Request for Proposal (RFP) is near completion and a consulting firm will be hired.

   The RFP is comprised of three scopes: 1) the Benchmarking Study; 2) Management Review of Central Office and Select Institutional Business Practices; and 3) Data Similarity and Transferability.

      1. *Benchmarking Study* -- The University System will be divided into four sectors. Research Universities will be benchmarked individually against peer institutions. It is projected that Regional and State Universities, as a group, will have a matched sample of peer institutions. The following remaining sectors will follow the same paradigm for comparator analysis: State Colleges and Two-Year Schools. The purpose of the Benchmarking Study is to develop a set of indicators against which comparator and system institutions will be evaluated. The indicators

include input, outcomes, and process measures. Examples include retention and graduation rates, student satisfaction, employer satisfaction, research contracts and grants, foundation support, faculty student ratios, technology availability, expenditure data, faculty and staff salaries, appropriations, etc. At the close of the project, there will be ranges of performance on a national level that would be considered the norm. Some institutions may be outliers on each of the indicators. This is not a negative phenomenon, but rather, might even be expected depending on institutional mission. Some outlying dimensions, however, might signify the need for further study and possible modifications. It was suggested that institutions currently engaged in self-directed benchmarking studies maintain these processes. These activities are sources of continuous data comparisons.

2. ***Management Review and Benchmarking Studies of Central Office and Select Institutional Business Practices*** -- The project involves reengineering and includes reviewing each functional area individually and collectively to determine needs, efficiencies, and effectiveness in terms of business practices. In addition, the project involves performing evaluations to determine outsourcing and privatization, reviewing key operational policies and procedures and their implementation as issued by the Central Office and determining if additional functions should be performed resulting in revisions, reorganizations, and consolidations. The purpose of the project is to increase efficiency and economize the expense of performing said functions.

3. ***Data Similarity/Transferability/Definitions*** -- This project involves revising current systems to enhance data extrapolation by chief executives from various state agencies for comparisons and reports.

B. **Technology Masterplanning/PeachNet2, Fees**
Dr. Sethna explained how Technology Masterplanning follows the general principles of Facilities Masterplanning. The purpose of Technology Masterplanning is to help address several questions regarding technology at the USG level, and later at the institutional level. The first phase will include development of a method of organizing and reorganizing special initiatives, to focus on critical areas of need, to manage the special initiative process, and to integrate technology with institutional renovation and construction plans. The past models have been entrepreneurial such that meaningful projects were funded (i.e., Connecting Students with Technology, Connecting Teachers with Technology, etc.). This plan will be devised at the System level. A sample survey sent to Chief Academic Officers, Chief Information Officers, OIIT, and Central Office Staff suggests that the following significant technology issues exist: 1) Stability and Bandwidth of Peachnet (There are intense demands on Peachnet. Because of changes at the federal level, another provider will be meeting the needs of DTAE, DOE, and libraries. Peachnet will become increasingly a USG centered network); 2)Staffing for IT Personnel (i.e., team to serve several campuses); and 3) Faculty Development and the Help Desk. An RFP is under development. The consultants to be involved in this project are considered neutral experts.

C. **Desktop/eCore & Academic Programs/GLOBE**

Dr. Kris Biesinger discussed eCore Development and distributed the institutional response forms concerning eCore participation. The Chief Academic Officers were briefed on eCore participation and the commitment required at the institutional level. Dr. Biesinger asked that all returned forms bear an indication of the Presiden's support and institutional readiness to participate in alternative course development. The purpose of the form was to obtain information from USG institutions regarding participation interest in four areas: 1) as an eCore home institution; 2) as a provider of faculty developers; 3) as a provider of teaching faculty; and 4) as a provider of services. In addition, the group was briefed concerning the first six eCore course development teams that would be formed and the faculty selection criteria.

D. **SACS Substantive Change for Distance Education**
Drs. Kris Biesinger and Dorothy Zinsmeister presented the findings from their SACS Substantive Change for Distance Education site visit in North Carolina. Dr. Biesinger informed the group that Virginia, South Carolina and North Carolina have participated in SACS Substantive Change for distance education at the two-year college level. Georgia would be the first multi-sector system to participate in the process. Drs. Biesinger and Zinsmeister discussed the advantages to a comprehensive SACS Substantive Change review for a system. These advantages include savings in staff time and fiscal costs as well as increased opportunities for distance education collaboratives. Georgia has the option of encouraging a comprehensive visit in Fall 2000 or Spring 2001.

During the North Carolina site visit, the team found that 38 institutions in three regions of the state participated. SACS was notified of the impending change in March 1999 and the visit was performed in October 1999. When SACS was notified, North Carolina determined that 25% of its programs were offered via distance education. North Carolina faced the challenge of determining whether distance education was separate from campus-based instruction or a fully integrated part of the didactic and clinical curricula. Another challenge involved the definition of alternative delivery (i.e., web enhancements, telecourses, on-line courses, etc.). North Carolina also addressed issues concerning the coordination of a System strategy that enhances learning, uses similar technologies, and integrates institutional effectiveness.

E. **Governor's Education Reform Study Commission**
Drs. David Morgan and Cathie Hudson discussed the activities of the Seamless Education Committee, Postsecondary Options (PSO) issues, the Accountability Committee, and the anticipated priorities of the Office of Educational Accountability. An example was distributed concerning Seamless Education Committee Issues & Alternatives. A sample describing 'seamless' includes the following: "How can coordination and cooperation between high schools and postsecondary institutions be improved?" One of the listed alternatives stated, "Require all students to complete the requirements for a dual diploma." Another sample issue involving PSO funding asked, "How can postsecondary institutions become more involved in delivering institutional services for high schools?" Again, one alternative stated, "Resolve the funding issues associated with the postsecondary options program (PSO)." Several alternatives were listed. At this time, the Committee

does not know which alternatives will be approved. There is also uncertainty concerning the responsibilities of the Office of Education Accountability and how the University System will fit under the organization.

F. **High School Feedback Project**
Dr. Cathie Hudson presented a report concerning the High School Feedback Project. Currently there are two high school feedback systems. One is an aggregate system where every high school is sent a summary of the performance of their students in the first year of college. The other system requires that data be reported on individual students and the courses and grades taken in the first year of college. Two years ago several high schools compared both sets of data with their own data and found that students who had not earned the CP or CP + vocational diploma in high school were evaluated by USG institutions as CPC complete. The University System requested use of the P-16 multi-agency linked database managed by a committee chaired by Dr. Ronald Henry to investigate this discrepancy. Students were matched across DOE and USG data files using social security numbers. Some students who received the CP seal in high school were coded as CPC incomplete; others who did not receive the CP seal were coded as CPC complete. The study points to the need for better alignment between agencies in defining the CPC. Dr. Hudson further reported that Dr. Jan Kettlewell chairs a sub-committee of the P-16 Council that negotiates the definition of the CPC between DOE and the University System.

G. **FY 2001 Budget Expectations/Formula Task Force/Health Insurance**
Dr. Sethna discussed the FY 2001 Budget Expectations, Formula Task Force and Health Insurance. The University System will experience a $33 million shortfall in the health insurance area. The budget for FY 2001 is likely to be seriously constrained due to enrollment declines in Fall 1998.

II. **Committee Reports**

A. **Regents Administrative Committee on Institutional Effectiveness**
Dr. Thomas Jones discussed the activities of the Regents Administrative Committee on Institutional Effectiveness. The **Draft University System of Georgia Academic Program Review Model** was distributed. It is recommended that the model be used for the institutional and Central Office overall accountability effort. Dr. Jones explained that academic program review is required of all system institutions; academic program review should be part of an institution's institutional effectiveness strategy; and that the model offers institutional latitude in how the review is prepared and formulated to reflect existing policies. It was further recommended that the model become effective Fall 2000. An annual report is to be submitted to the Central Office. Dr. Jones further explained that the report is to be based on a uniform set of indicators that have comparability within the System. At present a subcommittee of the Regents Administrative Committee on Institutional Effectiveness is working with Dr. Hudson to develop these indicators. The draft model is currently under review by the Central Office Academic Affairs staff.

B. **Council on General Education**

Dr. Joan Lord discussed the activities of the Council on General Education with regard to the development of common student learning outcomes. She indicated that the Council on General Education was asked by the Regents Advisory Committee on Institutional Effectiveness (RACIE) to develop a set of common student learning outcomes that might be used in workshops designed to assist institutions in assessing student learning outcomes. The Council began with the institutional student learning outcomes developed in conjunction with semester conversion curriculum development. She handed out a draft document showing the work to date. Dr. Lord indicated that both the P-16 and eCore initiatives were interested in the potential uses of the set of common student learning outcomes but she made clear that their purpose was to support RACIE's assessment efforts.

C. **Academic Committee on Teacher Preparation**
Dr. Jan Kettlewell presented the report of the Educator Preparation Academic Advisory Committee (EPAAC). Dr. Kettlewell reported that EPAAC (the education and arts and sciences deans from the universities that prepare teachers and the vice presidents for academic affairs from the two-year colleges) met to discuss the July 1998 Academic Advisory Committee recommendations concerning Area F. She called upon Dr. Joan Lord, co-chair of EPAAC, to present the **October 1999 EPAAC recommendations**. The recommendations presented for Area F included teacher preparation in early childhood education, middle grades, high school, special education, speech pathology, and physical education. The recommendations were approved by the Chief Academic Officers based on the following results: 27 - Approved, 5 - Abstained, 2 -Opposed. Dr. Bill Bompart, Vice President for Academic Affairs, discussed the conflicts between the Regents' 1998 Teacher Education Principles and the required 120 semester-hour credit limit for baccalaureate programs.

D. **Faculty Information System**
Dr. Beth Brigdon presented an update on the **New Faculty Information System.** The old system was not Y2K compliant. The new system will be web-based, retain editing windows and warehouse data, have institutional release times, require an electronic approval system, and provide users with the capability to generate informal and formal reports. Institutional use of the new FIS offers two options: 1) the institution uses the Regents FIS for its intra-institutional faculty transaction preparation and also for submission of FIS faculty transactions to the RCO and the BOR; and 2) the institution may choose to use a separate system, an institutional FIS, for its intra-institutional faculty transaction preparation and then its institutional FIS automatically submits its faculty transactions to the Regents FIS.

III. **Georgia Open Records 1999 Revisions and Interpretations**
Ms. Kathryn Allen, Sr. Assistant Attorney General, presented the 1999 Revisions and Interpretations of the Georgia Open Records Act. In 1999 the Governor sponsored a bill that revised the Georgia Open Records Act. The following three pertinent questions clarify the changes that have occurred:

1. *When must an agency provide information in response to a request?* An agency is required to provide records within three (3) business days if they are available. If the information is not readily available, it is important to respond and tell the inquirer when a response can be provided.
2. *What criminal penalties have been reinstated for violation of the Open Records Act?* Citations

can reach to fines of approximately $1,000. No representation can be provided if an agency is charged with a criminal penalty.

3. ***What private entities are covered by the Open Records Act?*** Examples of private entities include physicians at Grady Memorial Hospital, medical suppliers, foundations and others. These entities are functionally subject to the provisions of the Open Records Act, especially their records.

Under the provisions of the Open Meetings Act, in the past an agency had to be discussing official business. That has changed such that now a quorum of a committee or governing authority that discusses a public matter is covered under the Open Meetings Act. Purely functional advisory tenure committees are not subject to this Act; however, final judgement on whether tenure committees are covered under the Open Meetings Act is judged on a case-by-case basis. The best position to take is to have an "open meeting."

Under FERPA, student records are subject to privacy rights. For example, letters of endorsement for applicant admission are open records because the applicant is not a student yet. However, student medical reports are considered private.

Candidates who are interviewing for executive positions within the University System are allowed 10 days to make a final decision of withdrawal. At this time all records concerning candidates are open records.

IV. **Other Issues**

A. **Transfer to Georgia Tech**
Dr. Michael Thomas, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs of Georgia Institute of Technology, explained that the institution has received approval for an exception to the core requirements for transfer students. Dr. Thomas explained that students must come prepared with calculus courses reflected on their transcripts because program accreditation requires the completion of these courses at the undergraduate level.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

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

University System of Georgia Academic Program Review Model

DRAFT

The Regents Administrative Committee on Institutional Effectiveness (RACIE) recommends the following academic program review model for use by the University System of Georgia and its institutions.

Guidelines for Academic Program Review: The purpose of these guidelines is to establish a system for periodic review of academic programs at University System institutions. It is understood that academic program review is one component of an overall institutional effectiveness plan; other components include strategic planning, assessment of student learning outcomes, and assessment of outcomes in administrative areas.

Definitions:

Program Review   - systematic examination of a program by faculty and administrators to assess the relative value of an academic program in terms of viability, productivity, and quality (focus must be on academic programs, not academic departments).

Review Cycle   - the period of time in which all academic programs of an institution are reviewed.

Viability   - the likelihood that an academic program can be continued, given current and projected patterns of available resources, student interest and relative contribution of graduates to attainment of state and System goals.

Productivity   - the number and contributions of graduates of an academic program and/or the number of students served through service courses in light of the students and resources committed to its operation.

Quality   - measures of excellence: quality indicators may include, but are not limited to, attainment of student learning outcomes, a comparison of program elements relative to internal and external benchmarks, resources, accreditation criteria, relevant external indicators of program success (i.e., license and certification results, placement in graduate schools, job placement, and awards and honors received by the program), and other standards.

Guidelines:

Nothing in the following guidelines precludes independent studies of specific academic programs by the University System within any of its institutions. It is recommended that these guidelines be reviewed periodically to determine their effectiveness in guiding program review within the University System.

1. Each System institution shall complete a review cycle of its academic programs at least every seven (7)

years. This is intended to provide at least one review cycle between decennial reviews for regional accreditation.

2. At the beginning of each review cycle each System institution shall provide to the System Central Office a schedule of the academic programs to be reviewed in each year of the cycle and the institutional plan for conduct of these reviews. The System Central Office must approve the plan.

3. Planning and conduct of academic program reviews is the responsibility of the corps of instruction and academic administration within each institution. Where necessary, institutions will conduct training of the faculty involved to ensure that high standards of review are incorporated.

4. Planning and conduct of academic program reviews shall be used for the progressive improvement and adjustment of programs in response to findings and recommendations of the reviews ('adjustment' may include program modification or, if fully justified, consolidation or termination of the program). These responses to reviews shall be documented as part of the reporting processes of the academic program review cycle.

5. Institutional plans for academic program review must meet the requirements of the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Criteria, Section 3.1 (in part):

    The institution must develop guidelines and procedures to evaluate educational effectiveness, including the quality of student learning and of research and service. This evaluation must encompass educational goals at all academic levels and research and service functions of the institution. The evaluation of academic programs should involve gathering and analyzing both quantitative and qualitative data that demonstrate student achievement.

    Measures to evaluate academic programs and general education may include thefollowing: evaluation of instructional delivery; adequacy offacilities and equipment; standardized tests; analysis of theses, portfolios, and recitals; completion rates; results of admissions tests for students applying to graduate or licensing examinations; evaluations by employers; follow-up studies of alumni; and performance student transfers at receiving institutions. The institution must evaluate its success with respect to student achievement in relation to purpose, including as appropriate, consideration of course completion, state licensing examinations, and job placement rates.

6. Each academic program review process must provide the following.

    The program under review will **conduct a selfstudy**. This selfstudy should include relevant data (especially data responsive to System indicators) on such issues as program admissions, student credit hours, number and percentage of graduates, cost/student credit hour, and resources committed to the program. The office of institutional research of the institution should provide such information. The selfstudy should include defined expectations and a measurement of these expectations relative to internal standards and external benchmarks.

An **analysis of the self-study** and of the program by a study group of **external faculty** and **outside evaluators.** As appropriate, academic programs, which are professionally accredited, may use the selfstudy and external review processes of reaffirmation to satisfy the academic program review requirements, provided these guidelines are followed. *In support of this requirement, the University System will prepare a database of qualified external reviewers for employment by the institutions in conduct of their academic program reviews. External reviewers should be a part of the academic program review in every cycle, unless the unit has been the subject of a review for another purpose, which resulted in a competent and thorough external review of the program during the current cycle. In developing this database, the System Central Office will solicit recommendations of external reviewers from throughout the System, and as necessary, will provide training to these qualified external reviewers. In addition, institutions may recommend external reviewers for University System approval.*

A **review of the analysis** of the study group by a competent faculty governance and / or administrative body.

A commitment by faculty of the program and appropriate administrators to **act upon the findings and recommendations** of the review. Each campus will regularly report on unit progress in implementing review recommendations.

7. Appropriate input and evaluative elements of an academic program review are:

Mission -- program mission, relation to institution mission, relation to University System mission, needs of students, and demand for graduates.

Teaching and Learning, Research and Scholarship, and Service -- evaluation of these program functions should include, but may not be limited to, the following kinds of elements:

Students -- percent and number of majors and graduates, percent and number of graduates passing professional and qualifying examinations, diversity, selectivity, skills at entry, service course enrollments, credithour generation, and student learning, satisfaction and evidence of success in meeting student needs and learning outcomes.

Faculty and Staff -- numbers (part and fulltime), costs, studentfaculty ratio, average class size, faculty productivity, diversity, credentials, and professional development.

Facilities -- space (adequacy and condition), cost, technology labs, equipment, library, and other indicators of adequacy of campus infrastructure to support the program.

Curriculum -- coherence, currency, relevance to program learning outcomes and student needs, course sequencing or frequency of course offerings, and enrollment patterns.

Other Learning and Service Activities -- advising, tutoring, internships, service learning, practica, study

abroad, and career planning and placement.

Research and Scholarship -- faculty and student involvement, productivity, reputation, level of financial support, mentoring and development opportunities for new faculty.

Service -- projects completed and outcomes (program, division/ school/ college, institution, community and/or region levels) and contributions to mission.

Academic Program Review Implementation and Reporting

Step 1: Initial Submission. Each institution will submit an initial report (onetime submission, updated as needed) to the University System Central Office. The report will define the academic program review approach to be taken by the institution (program or department), outline the procedures and methods to be used, identify the institution's review cycle, and one complete review cycle schedule for all programs offered by the institution.

The contents of this report must adhere to the Academic Program Review Guidelines outlined above.

Step 2: Annual Submissions. Each institution will submit an annual report to the University System Central Office. The report will contain a list of academic programs reviewed and a summary of findings for programs reviewed during the year, and a summary of actions taken and evaluation results of previous academic program reviews (previous years, as appropriate).

The summary of findings section of the report must address two important guidelines; namely, identification of viability, productivity, and quality parameters measured, and findings relative to defined expectations (such as, internal standards, and, as appropriate, external benchmarks).

Step 3: System Review. The University System of Georgia will establish a set of key indicators (quality, productivity, and viability) that will be monitored centrally for all academic programs. Acceptable minimum standards will be established for each of these key indicators. Academic programs having indicators, which fall below these minimum standards, may be subjected to a University System review conducted by the staff of the USG Central Office.

Source: USG Academic Program Review Model Handout.

Educator Preparation Academic Advisory Committee

Minutes, October 29, 1999 Meeting

Chair and Vice Chair: Bernie Patterson, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, Georgia College & State University; Angela Lumpkin, Dean of the College of Education, State University of West Georgia.

Members Present: Virginia Nelms, Coordinator of Middle Level Education, Clayton College & State University; Bari Haskins-Jackson, representing Robert Becker, Georgia Perimeter College; Bob Anderson, Associate Dean of Arts & Sciences representing Wyatt Anderson, University of Georgia; Don Schneider, Associate Dean of Education representing Louis Castenell, University of Georgia; Elizabeth House, Dean of Arts & Sciences, Augusta State University; Robert Freeman, Dean of Education, Augusta State University; Janis Coombs Reid, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Atlanta Metropolitan College; Melinda McCannon, Chair, Business & Social Sciences Division, Gordon College; Les Crawford, Dean of Education, Georgia College & State University; Janet Fields, Assistant Dean of Education, Georgia College & State University; Richard Miller, Dean of Arts & Sciences, State University of West Georgia; Jeffrey Bonner, Acting Dean of Arts & Sciences, Georgia Southern University; Arnie Cooper, Dean of Education, Georgia Southern University; Bob Michael, Dean of Education, North Georgia College & State University; Earl Swank, Assistant Dean, Valdosta State University; Angela Lumpkin, Dean of Education, State University of West Georgia; Grace Martin, Interim Dean of Arts & Sciences, Armstrong Atlantic State University; Lloyd Newberry, Dean of Education, Armstrong Atlantic State University; Mike Stoy, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Gainesville College; John H. Kohler, Acting Dean of Arts & Sciences, Clayton College & State University; Lennet Daigle, Dean of Arts & Letters, North Georgia College & State University; Marolyn Mixon, Associate Professor, Abraham Baldwin College; James L. Hill, Dean of Arts & Sciences, Albany State University; Thomas Harrison, Dean of Education, Columbus State University; Thomas Dasher, Dean of Arts & Sciences, Valdosta State University; Paul J. Vander Gheynst, Dean of Arts & Letters, Columbus State University; Harold Nichols, Dean of Arts & Sciences, Georgia Southwestern State University; James K. Myers, Dean of Education, Georgia Southwestern State University; Bill Lightle, Instructor of History and Education, Darton College; Joan M. Lord, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Floyd College; Wilsie G. Jenkins, Interim Dean of Arts & Sciences, Fort Valley State University; Wil Campbell, Chair of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, Albany State University; Curtis E. Martin, Dean of Education, Fort Valley State University; Claude G. Perkins, Dean of Education, Albany State University; Margaret D. Smith, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Bainbridge College; T ed C. Harris, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Waycross College; H. Douglas Tuech, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Coastal Georgia Community College; Grace James, Vice President for Academic Affairs, South Georgia College; Bob Driscoll, Chair of Early Childhood Education, Kennesaw State University; Howard Stealy, Assistant Dean of Humanities & Social Sciences, Kennesaw State University; John K. Derden, Acting Vice President for Academic Affairs, East Georgia College; John B. Black, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Dalton State College; Sam Deitz, Dean of Education, Georgia State University; Cynthia Alby, Chair of the Department of Education, Macon State College.

Board of Regents Liaisons: Jan Kettlewell, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Board of Regents; Dorothy Zinsmeister, Senior Associate, Board of Regents.

Guests: Sheila Jones, Associate Director for P-16, Board of Regents; Ed Pajak, CoDirector of Georgia's Teacher Quality Grant, Board of Regents; Hannah Tostensen, Co-Director of Georgia's Teacher Quality Grant.

Dorothy Zinsmeister called the meeting to order. She explained the charge to this new academic advisory committee, gave background information about the formation of this committee, and explained that the committee would have three cochairs, representing the arts and sciences, education, and twoyear colleges, respectively. The co-chairs for the first year of the committee will be Bernie Patterson, Angela Lumpkin, and Joan Lord.

Item 1: Georgia's Title II Grant on Teacher Quality
Ed Pajak and Hannah Tostensen were introduced as co-directors of Georgia's Title 11 Grant. They gave an overview of funding opportunities for University System institutions, public schools, and schooluniversity partnerships.

Item 2: Sub-Committee B Report, Bernie Patterson, Chair
Bernie Patterson presented the report from SubCommittee B (attached). Bernie Patterson presented the report from SubCommittee B (attached). Bernie explained that SubCommittee B focused on three issues related to the degree structure, degree designation, and area F for secondary education and selected P 12 teacher certification programs.

Sam Deitz moved to amend items A and 13, as follows. Paul Vander Gheynst seconded the motion to amend.

a. *How should the degree be structured proportionate to the Arts and Sciences major and preparation in education?*
Each campus will determine the content of all (including, for example, the BS/BA in Arts and Sciences and the BS in Education) educator preparation programs as collaboratively negotiated among faculties from participating academic units.

b. *What should be the degree designation?*
The degree designation will be an institutional decision and may include degrees administered by each appropriate college. The contents of educator preparation programs must be developed collaboratively among the faculties of participating academic units regardless of the unit through which the degree is administered. The functional unit will review all issues related to undergraduate and graduate educator preparation programs. The functional unit should include equitable representation, responsibility, and authority for the preparation of educators among the academic units and school partners participating in educator preparation.

The amendment was approved. Joan Lord moved approval of items A and 13, as amended. Kirk Myers seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous.

Kirk Myers moved to amend item C as follows. Lloyd Newberry seconded the motion to amend.

c. *Define Area F to teach at the secondary level in mathematics, English, sciences, social sciences, foreign*

languages, art, music, business, and vocational education.
Area F for each secondary teaching field in BS/BA degree programs with educator certification and BS degree programs in education will be determined by each institution as defined above in the functional unit.

Area F must include the outcomes that follow. Students who have completed courses in Foundations of Education, Human Growth and Development, and Exceptional Children will have met these outcomes.

- The role of professional educator, including ethical and effective practice (Foundations of Education)
- The social, historical, and philosophical perspectives and methods of inquiry used in the analysis of education issues (Foundations of Education)
- The teaching process as it evolves from the study of human growth and development, learning, and instruction (Human Growth and Development)
- The wide range of abilities and exceptionalities representative of students in schools and teaching practices that are effective with these abilities (Exceptional Children)
- The use of current technologies which are directly relation to effective teaching (Human Growth and Development; Foundations of Education; Exceptional Children)

Item C was approved, as amended. The vote was 30 for, 5 against, and 2 abstentions. Richard Miller, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences at the State University of West Georgia, and Elizabeth House, Dean of the School of Arts and Sciences at Augusta State University, asked to have their no votes recorded.

Item 3: Sub-Committee A Report, Joan Lord, Chair
Joan Lord presented the report from SubCommittee A (attached). Joan explained that SubCommittee A focused on Area F for early childhood education, middle grades, and selected P 12 teacher certification programs.

Kirk Myers moved to amend the SubCommittee A report as follows. Bob Michael seconded the amendment.

Area F for programs that lead to educator certification in early childhood education, middle grades education, special education, speech pathology, and physical education will be developed collaboratively in the functional unit as defined above. Area F for each teaching field in BS/BA degree programs with educator certification and BS degree programs in education will be determined by each institution, and must include the outcomes that follow. Students who have completed courses in Foundations of Education, Human Growth and Development, and Exceptional Children will have met these outcomes.

- The role of professional educator, including ethical and effective practice (Foundations of Education)
- The social, historical, and philosophical perspectives and methods of inquiry used in the analysis of education issues (Foundations of Education)
- The teaching process as it evolves from the study of human growth and development, learning, and instruction (Human Growth and Development)
- The wide range of abilities and exceptionalities representative of students in schools and teaching practices that are effective with these abilities (Exceptional Children)
- The use of current technologies which are directly relation to effective teaching (Human Growth and

Development; Foundations of Education; Exceptional Children)

In addition, the guidelines for Area F will include the following:

Early Childhood

- Choose any one lower division math course (3 hours)
- Choose any two lower division courses in support of the major (6 hours)

Middle Grades

- Choose any nine hours in lower division courses to support the two content concentrations (as listed on the certification)

Special Education

- Choose any nine hours to support the major

Speech Language Pathology

- Choose any nine hours to support the major

Physical Education

- Anatomy and Physiology (68 hours)
- Additional course(s) to support the major (13 hours)

SubCommittee A report was approved, as amended. The vote was 31 for, 1 against, and 1 abstention.

Item 4: Appointment of Additional Subcommittees
It was agreed to appoint three additional subcommittees. A list of these subcommittees and volunteers are listed below. The three cochairs will finalize membership and give a specific charge to each.

1. Recommendations on teacher preparation included in the Hispanic Task Force Report approved by the Board in June 1999.

   - Bob Michael, Dean of Education, North Georgia College & State University
   - John Black, Vice President for Academic Affairs, Dalton State College
   - Tom Dasher, Dean of Arts & Sciences, Valdosta State University
   - John Derden, Acting Vice President for Academic Affairs, East Georgia College
   - Lennet Daigle, Dean of Arts & Letters, North Georgia College & State University
2. Faculty development among twoyear and fouryear campuses to foster consistent application of

contemporary theories and best practices in the preparation of teachers.

- Mindy McCannon, Chair, Business & Social Sciences Division, Gordon College
- Harold Nichols, Dean of Arts & Sciences, Georgia Southwestern State University
- Bill Lightle, Instructor of History and Education, Darton College
- Earl Swank, Assistant Dean, Valdosta State University
- Les Crawford, Dean of Education, Georgia College & State University

3. Operating procedures for EPAAC

- Paul Vander Gheynst, Dean of Arts & Letters, Columbus State University
- Bernie Patterson, Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, Georgia College & State University
- Angela Lumpkin, Dean of Education, State University of West Georgia

Item 5: Next Meetings

- December 15, 1999, 10:002:00, Macon, Joan Lord, Chair.
- February 11, 2000.10:002:00, Macon, Angela Lumpkin, Chair.

Source: USG EPACC Handout

Recommendations from the Meeting of Sub-Committee B

Recommendations from the Meeting of Sub-Committee B -- Degree Designation of Major Area F, for Secondary Education, Selected P-12 Teacher Certification Programs

October 6, 1999

Members Present

Bernie Patterson, Georgia College and State University

Betty House, Augusta State University

Richard Miller, State University of West Georgia

Angela Lumpkin, State University of West Georgia

Margaret Smith, Bainbridge College

F. D. Toth, Valdosta State University

Curtis Martin, Fort Valley State University

Michael Stoy, Gainesville College

Below are the recommendations from Sub-Committee B regarding each item within its charge. The charge is printed in **italics** followed by the sub-committee's recommendation.

1. ***How should the degree be structured proportionate to the arts and sciences major and preparation in education?***
   Each campus will determine the content of all (including the BS/BA in Arts and Sciences and the BSEd in Education) teacher preparation programs as collaboratively negotiated among Arts and Sciences and Education faculties.

2. ***What should be the degree designation?***
   The degree designation will be an institutional decision and may include degrees administered by each appropriate college.

   The degree designation does not determine ownership. The contents of teacher preparation programs must be developed collaboratively among Education and Arts and Sciences faculties regardless of the college through which the degree is administered.

   Ownership must be vested in the "functional unit," defined in the principles. The functional unit will review all curriculum issues related to undergraduate and graduate teacher preparation programs. The functional unit should include equitable representation among the colleges participating in teacher preparation and school partners, rotation of the chair among the colleges represented, and co-chairing of the functional unit by the Dean of Education and Dean of Arts and Sciences or faculty members from Education and Arts and Sciences as determined by the local campus.

3. ***Define area F for each secondary field listed above.***

   The Area F for each Arts and Sciences major will be one determined during the semester conversion by the Arts and Sciences disciplinary committees. Area F for Education majors in secondary fields will be determined by the College of Education as long as the requirements for a major in Arts and Sciences, as agreed to collaboratively among Arts and Sciences and Education faculties, are completed. The two-year colleges will advise their students to complete the Area F for the appropriate Arts and Sciences major but will be required to substitute Education courses for Arts and Sciences courses in the junior or senior years if they pursue BSEd degrees.

Source: USG EPACC Handout

Meeting of Sub-Committee A of the Academic Advisory Committee on Educator Preparation

October 8, 1999

Members Present

Joan Lord, Floyd College
Jeffrey Buller, Georgia Southern University
Rob Freeman, Augusta State University
James Hill, Albany State University
Angela Lumpkin, State University of West Georgia
Bob Michael, North Georgia College & State University

Joan Lord set the stage with the committee's charge of determining the Area F for each of these programs: early childhood, middle grades, special education, speech-language pathology, and physical education. She emphasized that students who completed Area F at two-year institutions must have the completed Area F accepted upon transfer. A question was asked about why the Area F proposal developed in May, in a meeting that included two-year college representatives and Education Deans, was rejected by the vice presidents. There were two reasons why this was rejected. First, arts and sciences representatives were not involved, so the BOR principles were violated. Second, with only the outcomes used, it was unclear what courses a student should take or how a student would be treated if Area F were not completed. The two-year institutions want to have specified courses in Area F. It is proposed that three courses would be required for each of these programs: (Lifespan) Human Growth and Development, Foundations of Education, and Exceptional Children. Field experiences of a minimum of 20 hours must be included with the Foundations of Education course. How would the five outcomes developed by the Education Deans be embedded in these three courses?

Outcomes and Associated Courses:

1. The role of professional educator, including ethical and effective practice (Foundations of Education)
2. The social, historical, and philosophical perspectives and methods of inquiry used in the analysis of education issues (Foundations of Education)
3. The teaching process as it evolves from the study of human growth and development, learning, and instruction (Human Growth and Development)
4. The wide range of abilities and exceptionalities representative of students in schools and teaching practices that are effective with these abilities (Exceptional Children)
5. The use of current technologies which are directly related to effective teaching (Human Growth and Development; Foundations of Education; Exceptional Children)

These outcomes must be included in these courses. It is suggested that these three courses (comprising nine hours) would have these standard titles. In addition, the courses or guidelines for Area F would include:

Early Childhood

Choose any one lower division math course (3 hours)

Choose any two lower division courses in support of the major (6 hours)

Middle Grades

Choose any nine hours in lower division courses to support the two content concentrations (as listed on the certification)

Special Education

Choose any nine hours to support the major

Speech Language Pathology

Choose any nine hours to support the major

Physical Education

Anatomy and Physiology (68 hours)

Additional course(s) to support the major (13 hours)

Source: USG EPACC Handout

The New Faculty Information System

FIS Information, VPAA Fall Meeting

What is the FIS?

- A system to process and record faculty personnel actions (e.g., hiring, promotion, and award of tenure) and their approvals by the BOR.
- A system to produce critical documentation (e.g., Board sub-agendas and faculty contracts.
- A system to exchange faculty information with other systems (e.g., the PeopleSoft HRMS).
- A system to provide data for central and institutional reporting (.e.g, IPEDS and Assigned Faculty Activity Reports).

Strategy for the Development of the New FIS

- Continue FIS operations using the unmodified System until the end of 1999.
- Gather functional requirements for the New FTS which must be designated, developed tested, and deployed by the end of this year.
- Ensure that the new FIS will be Y2K ready.
- Take advantage of powerful software development tools to speed the development process while ensuring conformance to requirements and design standards.

The New FIS: Service to the BOR Administration

- **The New FIS will serve the BOR Administration** by providing improved management controls on the approval and reporting of USG faculty personnel transactions.
- **The New FIS will serve the BOR Administration** by providing improved data collection and organization in the Regents Data Warehouse for analysis and reporting purposes.

The New FIS: Service to the USG Institutions

- **The New FIS will serve the Institutions** by providing facilities for the preparation of institutional faculty transactions and associated record tracking, prior to and independent of submission to the RCO.
- **The New FIS will serve the Institutions** by providing improved access to their data from the Regents Data Warehouse, for analysis and reporting.

Institutional Use of the New FIS

- **Option 1:** The Institution uses the Regents FIS for its intra-institutional faculty transaction preparation and also for submission of its faculty transactions to the RCO and the BOR.
- **Option 2:** The Institution may choose to use a separate system, an Institutional FIS, for its intra-Institutional faculty transaction preparation and then its Institutional FIS automatically submits its faculty transactions to

the Regents FIS.

Phases of Deployment

- **Phase I:** The preparation of the BOR Sub-agenda.
- **Phase 2:** Tenure and Promotion case development.
- **Phase 3:** Faculty contract production.
- **Phase 4:** AFAR and other reporting.
- **Phase 5:** Implementation of the interface between the Regents FIS and any Institutional FIS. (if necessary)
- **Phase 6:** Improved tracking by Academic Affairs of Promotion & Tenure status in the RCO.

New FIS Project Milestones (Part 1)

- **June 24 - 25, 1999:** First FIS user conference.
- **June 24 - Aug. 31:** Functional requirements gathering.
- **July 7 - Aug. 15:** Preliminary database design.
- **Aug. 1 - Sept. 15:** Completion of database design. Design of Web pages in consultation with the users.
- **Sept. 15 - Nov. 30:** Programming & implementation.
- **Nov. 1 - 30:** Functional testing of Phase 1 of the New FIS.

Project Milestones (Part 2)

- **Nov. 18:** 2nd FIS Users Conference.
- **Nov. 29:** Y2K certification testing of Phase 1 of the New FIS.
- **Sept. 15 - Dec. 16:** Legacy data conversion.
- **Dec. 16:** Completion of the January BOR Sub-agenda by the legacy FIS.
- **Dec. 17:** First production use of Phase 1 of the New FIS for the preparation of the February BOR Sub-agenda.

Project Milestones (Part 3)

- **January 2000:** Production readiness-promotion and Tenure module (Phase 2).
- **March 2000:** Production loading of the Regents Data Warehouse with data from the new FIS.
- **March 2000:** Production readiness of the Contracts Modules (Phase 3).
- **June 2000:** AFAR reporting (Phase 4).
- **July 2000:** Production readiness of the interfaces between the Regents FIS and any Institutional FIS (Phase 5).
- **Sept. 2000:** Improved P&T Tracking by Academic Affairs in the RCO (Phase 6).

Contact Information

- **Albertine Walker-Marshall** - RCO Data Steward & Functional Policy Analyst, 404-656-2220, awalker@mail.regents.peachnet.edu

- **Allan Cobb** - Director of Development & Project Manager, 706-369-5678, allan_cobb@oit.peachnet.edu
- **Dr. Beheruz Sethna** - Interim Senior Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs

---