Meeting Minutes: Committee on Academic Affairs

November 5, 2002
Macon State College

MINUTES

I. **Call to Order, Instructions, Arrangements**
The Administrative Committee on Academic Affairs held its fall meeting at Macon State College in the Foundation Board Room on November 5, 2002. Dr. Ronald J. Henry, Chair and Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs at Georgia State University, provided welcoming remarks.

II. **Minutes**
The minutes of the summer meeting (June 18, 2002) were approved as disseminated.

III. **Reports from the System Office for Discussion**

A. **Budget**
Dr. Daniel S. Papp, Senior Vice Chancellor for Academics, Faculty and Student Affairs discussed the budget for the upcoming academic year. Dr. Papp informed the chief academic officers that another percent holdback would adjust the budget from between one-half to three percent. In order to be financially conservative, Dr. Papp advised the Chief Academic Officers to delay large expenditures due to the fact that there would be no significant budget increases. Dr. Papp asked that an allocation strategies committee be developed consisting of five to six vice presidents for academic affairs and five to six vice presidents for business affairs. The purpose of the committee would be to develop a more consistent allocation strategy for the entire university system. In addition, the committee would enable academic and business affairs officer to plan institutional funding models for the entire system. Dr. Papp explained that the funding formula is an "asking formula" that the state legislature provides as a lump sum to the USG. It is not an allocation formula developed through a prescribed allocation strategy. The work of this committee will be consistent with the Board's strategic plan.

Status of Continuing Education
Dr. Papp commented that the Board had approved the GeorgiaLEADS initiative with regard to continuing education programs. This program will address continuing education in the university system and be a pivotal point for looking at how continuing education units provide funding. Based on information from the Office of Planning and Budget, Dr. Papp remarked that no additional funding would be garnered by the USG due to increased CEUs. Dr. Papp explained that there are mixed reviews of carry-over state funding with regard to CEUs.

Changes in the University System Office
Dr. Papp announced that GeorgiaGlobe would be dissolved by January 1 and fade into history. The

functions performed by GeorgiaGlobe would be subsumed by ALT and Media and Public Relations. Three staff positions would then be reassigned to distance education, special projects, and media and public relations.

Memorandum I

Dr. Papp reminded the chief academic officers that memorandum one requirements are no longer in effect. Institutions need simply to identify the qualified applicant and obtain System Office approval.

Institutional Reorganizations and Changes in Title of Senior Positions Dr. Papp informed the chief academic officers that changes to institutional organizational structures require Board approval. In addition, changes in the titles of senior positions on the campus also require Board approval.

B. **OEA Materials and Retention Targets**

Dr. Papp explained that each campus had enrollment targets in place last year. Based on recent data reports, there is more activity on enrollment targets. Revised retention targets will be reviewed by Chancellor Meredith, Ms. Shelley Nickel, and Dr. Frank Butler.

Dr. Cathie Mayes Hudson reported to the chief academic officers that the System Office has almost completed the first cycle of information for submittal to the Office of Educational Accountability (OEA). Examples of information provided involve graduate rates, retention rates, and bachelor's degrees. Reports for the OEA report card are due December 2002. Information that has not been sent to date include pass rates for NCLEX, Georgia Board of Nursing data, or reports that are delineated by gender, race, or Pell status. Because USG pass rates for law and medicine are not in system databases, information will be provided to OEA from the official body that administers the exam for Georgia. Dr. Hudson commented that not all OEA issues had been resolved. Some of the unresolved issues include PRAXIS, licensure exams, accountability report data, and regents' testing indicators (first-time testers versus those taking the test at 45 semester hours, etc.). Dr. Hudson indicated that the reports submitted to OEA had been sent electronically to the chief academic officers. Dr. Hudson recommended that the chief academic officers review the reports and work with the office of media and publications if there are any issues that need to be addressed regarding perceived weaknesses in any area as represented by the reports. Dr. Hudson suggested that certain areas to be particularly attentive to when reviewing the reports include: associate degrees, graduation rates, data anomalies, and transfer data issues.

C. **Theme, Speakers for Summer 2003 Meeting**

Dr. Ronald Henry recommended to the chief academic officers that the summer 2003 meeting consist of a two-day meeting, perhaps on July 14 - 15 at the University System of Georgia conference center located in Athens. To heed budget efficiencies, it was suggested that the conference center in Athens would enable attendees to drive in for the meeting and conduct business from at least 10:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. and allow exit on Tuesday. Ideas for a theme and speakers were to be forwarded to Drs. Henry and/or Butler.

D. **Plus/Minus Grading System** ([see attachment](#))

Dr. Frank Butler, Vice Chancellor for Academic, Faculty, and Student Affairs presented information and recommendations regarding the plus/minus grading system. Dr. Butler suggested that the chief academic officers reconsider the plus/minus grading system and discuss it with the faculty at each person's respective institution. Discussion ensued and Dr. Ronald Henry of Georgia State University suggested that the plus/minus grading system be made a local institutional option. Discussion ensued and philosophical questions concerning the efficacy of a D+, D-, A+, and A- were discussed. Dr. Butler indicated that the results of the discussion would return as a formulated motion.

The discussion served the purpose of a "first read" on the issue. Concomitant with the formulated motion, Dr. Butler indicated that measures would be taken to accomplish plus/minus in BANNER if a motion were to be delivered to the chief academic officers. In addition, consideration of other issues such as transferability, grade inflation, the integrity of grades, national standards of grading, the diminishment of GPAs, ramifications for CAPP, Department of Education and HOPE issues, analysis of and comparisons with other state systems, and transfer GPA would require much in-depth discussion by a committee of chief academic officers representing all sectors of the USG.

E. **Committee on Learning Disabilities Report on Electronic Texts** ([see attachment](#))

Dr. Anne V. Gormly, Vice President and Dean of Faculty at Georgia College & State University presented the report of the Committee on Learning Disabilities. Based on committee discussion and in response to legislative queries, a fact sheet was developed in response to legislation concerning electronic texts. The following is brief summary of the issues as indicated in the committee's fact sheet on electronic text and disabilities issues:

Issues

1. The Regents Administrative Committee on Learning Disorders (ACLD) and the Regents Center for Learning Disorders are committed to providing appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities within the University System. One of the accommodations most frequently accessed at the college level is taped texts (i.e., college texts read onto an audiotape for students with disabilities who cannot read at the pace required in college) and/or other electronic formats of textbooks (i.e., CD, scan and read).
2. The process of providing taped versions of textbooks is an extremely expensive, time consuming, and labor-intensive process that is becoming increasingly costly.
3. In Georgia, the State Board of Education passed a resolution requiring publishers to provide an e-text format for all textbooks adopted by the state of Georgia. Therefore, the state of Georgia does not adopt any K-12 textbooks that are not available in e-text.

IV. **Reports from the System Office for Information**

A. **CAPP** ([see attachment](#))

Ms. Tonya Lam, Sr. Advisor for Enrollment and Information Services, was unable to attend the fall RACAA committee meeting. Instead, the chief academic officers were directed to review the handout that was made available at the meeting and contact Ms. Lam if they had any questions concerning CAPP.

"The CAPP Project (Curriculum, Advising, and Planning Program), is in Phase Ii with the ten institutions having completed implementation training and six campuses scheduled for the first week of November. The remaining institutions are scheduled for training the first part of 2003. Phase III of this project, the electronic transfer of student educational information, is scheduled to begin on 2004."

B. **Protecting Student Privacy** (**see attachment**)

Ms. Tonya Lam, Sr. Advisor for Enrollment and Information Services, was unable to attend the fall RACAA committee meeting. Instead, the chief academic officers were directed to review the handout that was made available at the meeting and contact Ms. Lam if they had any questions concerning protecting student privacy.

"The Chancellor's Office distributed a document called 'Protecting Student Privacy' to presidents, in mid-October, encouraging institutions to develop written policies and procedures for protecting confidential information, including social security numbers. The document also encourages campuses to begin using a generic number as the student ID instead of the social security number which is current practice."

C. **4% Study Abroad** (**see attachment**)

Dr. Richard C. Sutton, Director of International Programs, reported on the four percent Study Abroad targets. Dr. Sutton provided a handout depicting institutional and sector analysis of achieving the Board of Regents new 4% study abroad target by 2007. Although no new funds are available, according to the handout, the USG aspires to have between 7, 224 to 7,177 students involved in study abroad by 2007. Dr. Sutton indicated that the quality of the experience is a further indicator that can be used when assessing student outcomes.

D. **Student Exchange Visitor (SEVIS)** (**see attachment**)

Dr. Sutton reported on the Student Exchange Visitor (SEVIS) program. Dr. Sutton remarked that only five institutions had met the initial SEVIS deadline and that only five institutions had filed for a delayed activation date. Dr. Sutton indicated that the USG, as a whole, was on target for implementing the process and documentation system. Dr. Sutton explained that the next steps in the process involve a site visit by federal authorities. Dr. Sutton requested that any institutions that have upcoming site visits notify his office of the date in order that a USG representative of the Office of International Programs be present. Dr. Sutton further explained that although the SEVIS software is somewhat premature, Ms. Beth Brigdon of OIIT would be offering an IT solution workshop concerning BANNER and third party software.

E. **Teacher Recruitment Initiative**

Dr. Jan Kettlewell, Associate Vice Chancellor for P-16 Initiatives, discussed the teacher recruitment initiative. Dr. Kettlewell explained that over the last year USG institutions had spent time raising the quality of teacher preparation. Although the USG witnessed a decrease in enrollment, simultaneously there was an increased need for teachers in public schools. Dr. Kettlewell explained that the USG initiative involved all four-year institutions and that as work began on the project, two grant opportunities became available. Dr. Kettlewell explained that to be eligible for the grants, certain public schools needed to be targeted.

F. **Faculty Workload**

Dr. Dan Papp reported on the University System of Georgia's faculty workload issue. Dr. Papp reported that faculty workload was an area of interest as expressed by the legislature with an emphasis on research universities. Dr. Papp requested that the research vice presidents for academic affairs provide him with a general, textual statement of perspectives on all faculty activities. Dr. Papp indicated that his request would later be expanded to all sectors of the University System for comment and discussion. Dr. Papp further explained the history of legislative inquiry into faculty teaching load and how the University System explained the difference between faculty teaching load and faculty workload. Dr. Papp emphasized that the objective of the query and discussion would be to develop a public, educational document to form the basis of policy.

G. **DTAE Update**

Dr. Frank Butler reported on recent meetings with administrators and officials of the Department of Technical and Adult Education (DTAE). Dr. Butler reported that two meetings had transpired between Chancellor Meredith and Commissioner Breeden. The meetings focused on the following areas: developing an on-line Bachelor of Applied Science program in management or information technology; working on a common faculty database with DTAE to review faculty credentials; and dismantling the GTREP group and to review Board Policy as it relates to DTAE. Dr. Butler requested that those institutions that currently offer a Bachelor of Applied Science degree to inform him of their interest in participating in an on-line BAS degree. In addition, Dr. Butler indicated that Board policies regarding DTAE would be reviewed to determine their relevancy and specificity with regard to current operating practices.

Dr. Papp requested that the chief academic officers provide comments and information regarding DTAE fiscal issues; especially as they relate to four-year joint degree programs. Discussion ensued and the chief academic officers indicated an interest in determining how DTAE FTES are reported under the system formula.

Dr. Papp announced that the USG would be sending a letter to all two-year presidents encouraging them to develop associate level degrees in early childhood education. Additional details are forthcoming in the letter.

H. **African-American Male RFP**

Dr. Papp reported on the activities of the African-American Male initiative and request for proposals. Dr. Papp reported that two meetings had been held to further refine the study. Consultants were asked to identify focus groups and disseminated surveys. Institutional representatives that were contacted on the various campuses had either PREP or MAP responsibilities. Dr. Papp reported that the two phases of the project involve: identification of issues and barriers and developing a marketing strategy to help attract more African-American Males into the university system. Issues to be addressed by the committee and the USG include the following:

- How will a marketing strategy attract and add new students?
- Will the Board develop more strategies to fund the initiative?
- What are the pipeline issues in terms of increasing the pool of qualified applicants and linkages to the K-12 environment as it relates to tracking and counseling?

Dr. Papp explained that the effort was more comprehensive than the marketing strategy. Dr. Papp announced that a meeting would be held next week at the System Office of the various committees to further detail the scope of the task force.

V. **Action Items**

A. **From the System Office**

1. **Regents' Quantitative Skills Test** (**see attachment**)
Dr. Kathleen Burk, Director of Regents' Testing, reported on the Regents' Quantitative Skills Test. Dr. Burk provided a proposed implementation plan regarding the requirements for the Regents' Qualitative Skills test based on committee input and feedback. Discussion ensued. Dr. Kathleen remarked that students would not be required to take the test if they graduate by Fall 2003. The motion to approve implementation of the Regents' Quantitative Skills Test was seconded and approved as recommended to the chief academic officers.

2. **Reappointment of Full-time Lecturers** (**see attachment**)
Dr. Frank Butler reported on the reappointment of full-time lecturers. Based on the report, Dr. Butler indicated that full-time lecturers would be available at the state university level. The guidelines would provide guidance on the years of service (**see attachment**). Dr. Butler emphasized that notification of non-reappointment would occur at least 30 days before the first day of classes. Dr. Butler remarked that he was aware of ongoing discussions with AAUP. Dr. Butler explained that the guidelines proposed allow for the review of decisions to avoid arbitrary decision-making. Discussion ensued and questions concerning the following were addressed: longer periods of time as lecturers, institutions adopting more generous standards, questions concerning whether the proposed policy runs counter to contractual arrangements with faculty; implications for unemployment; and entitlements and lack of a published policy on the matter. Dr. Butler indicated that the policy would be reviewed at the institutional level with special

attention to item c. that states:

Lecturers or senior lecturers who have served for six or more years of full-time service at an institution and who have received timely notice of non-reappointment shall be entitled to a review of the decision in accordance with published procedures developed by the institution.

3. **Timely Submission of Reappointments** ([see attachment](#))
Dr. Butler reported on the timely submission of reappointments and introduced a draft procedure for inclusion in the Academic Affairs Handbook. Dr. Butler explained that the draft guidelines provide for more latitude with regard to Board consideration faculty appointments. Based on discussion by the chief academic officers, Dr. Butler indicated that the guideline would be reviewed by the Board of Regents as an information item and told the group that the Chancellor can grant exceptions for faculty to be hired before the start of classes. Dr. Butler explained that the guideline establishes a practice that formalizes the Chancellor's exceptions.

B. **From the Disciplinary Advisory Committees**

1. **Recruitment and Retention** ([see attachment](#))
Dr. Janis Reid, Vice President for Academic Affairs at Atlanta Metropolitan College, provided the recommendation from the Education Preparation Academic Advisory Committee on Recruitment and Retention of faculty to teacher preparation programs in Georgia. The issues that Dr. Reid advanced concerned base salaries for teacher faculty in teacher education programs, market conditions, HOPE pay-offs for scholarships through in-service teaching; and public schools counting K-12 an college level teaching experience when determining salary.

    i. Increase base salaries (similar to what has been done in the fields of business and computer science) so that teacher ed programs can compete in today's market (e.g., with higher public school salaries) to attract and retain quality faculty.

    The recommendation was passed as a "conscience raising" issue that should be taken into consideration at the individual institutions in hiring teacher ed faculty.

    ii. Extend the HOPE payback program to positions in higher education teacher preparation programs.

    The recommendation was passed "in spirit" with the suggestion that Dr. Butler communicate with the finance commission the possibility of extending HOPE payback to positions in higher education teacher preparation programs.

    iii. Recognize K-12 teaching experience when determining rank and salary for higher ed faculty involved in teacher ed programs.

The recommendation was passed as a "conscience raising" issue that should be taken into consideration at the individual institutions in hiring teacher ed faculty.

2. **Immunization** (see attachment);
Dr. Reid provided the recommendation on immunization. The agenda item as recommended by the Educator Preparation Academic Advisory Committee (EPACC) was tabled and seconded. Further discussion was required to determine whether the Advisory Committee on Graduate Education would be interested in analyzing and debating the issue of whether graduate student teachers would be absolved from showing proof of immunization. Discussion ensued on the fairness of this recommendation towards all graduate students. In addition, a point was made concerning why students in this category had difficulty showing proof of immunization they were already teaching in the schools. Further discussion revealed that concerns were raised in terms of equity of the recommendation when considering non-traditional students.

3. **Activity Fees for Graduate Students** (see attachment)
Recommended: That the System Office review and coordinate a study of the fee structure and pro-rating of fees. Current Policy: Institutions determine fee structures for part-time students. Further recommended: That an ad hoc committee be established to examine this issue for institutions and remote sites. The committee will seek supplementary materials for baseline data from the Office of Fiscal Affairs (Mr. Bill Bowes). The committee opposed the recommendation and the motion was taken from the floor.

C. **Consent Items**

1. **Geology/Geography Advisory Committee** (see attachment)

   a. **GIS Program**
   Dr. Ronald Henry reported on the recommendation of the Geological Sciences and Geography committee offered by chairperson Dr. Harold Trendell. The following recommendations were made:

   i. The Board of Regents (BOR) should commit funds to ensure that all system institutions acquire capabilities to implement Geographic Information Systems (GIS) programs.
   ii. The BOR needs to maintain, and preferably increase, the System's contributions to the ESRI site license. This is an exceptionally good arrangement for the System and, for most of the institutions, makes it possible to have GIS programs. These programs take time to get underway and without the System-wide support many institutions would not make the commitment for long enough.

   Discussion ensued regarding the recommendations. Mr. Randall Thursby, Vice Chancellor

for Information and Instructional Technology, explained that if the site license were dropped as a system, then the cost would be up to 5 to 6 times the licensure fee for the system as a whole. The chief academic officers motioned for approval and seconded the maintenance of system level licensure. The recommendation made concerning GIS programs was considered to be a local compliance issue.

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

ACAA Meeting Minutes, Nov. 2002, Attachment

Contents

Resolution Concerning Plus/Minus Grading
Passed by the GSU Senate, April 23, 1999

Be it resolved that:
The Georgia State University Senate urges the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia to allow the implementation of the letter-grade plus/minus grading system at University System of Georgia institutions.

Motion Concerning Plus/Minus Grading

Motion:
If the Board of Regents allows the implementation of the letter-grade plus/minus grading system at University System of Georgia institutions, Georgia State University shall begin using the plus/minus grading system as soon as the necessary computer changes can be made.

Here is the letter-grade plus/minus grading system.

A = 4,00	B = 3.00	C = 2.00	D = 1.00
A- 3.67	B- = 2,67	C- = 1.67	D- = ?
B+ = 3.33	C+ = 233	D+ = 1.33	F = 0.00

Rationale:
There are several arguments in favor of adding pluses and minuses to GSU letter-grades.

1. It is unfair to reward students equally when there are large disparities in their accomplishments. For example, under the current grading system, both 81 and 89 yield grades of B, while a 91 earns an A and a 79 a C. The plus/minus system allows this difference to be expressed on grade sheets and thus allows faculty to reward the superior performance of the student who earns an 89.

2. The simple letter-grade system gives students a strong disincentive to work hard at the end of the term. A student has no reason to work hard at the end of a term if she or he has, say. an 85 average, and knows that unless s/he does extremely badly on the final examination, s/he will get a B for the course. Therefore,

there is reason to think that students will work harder and learn more if pluses and minuses are added to the grading system.

3. As noted below, adding pluses and minuses would make GSU's grades more reliable by reducing grouping error.
4. Adding pluses and minuses may aid GSU's best students in their quest to enter the most competitive graduate programs. If a student with a 4.0 from GSU is being compared by an admissions officer with a student with a 4.0 from an institution with pluses and minuses, the admissions officer would have reason to favor the other student over the GSU student. The other student's 4.0 shows that s/he got all As. The GSU student's 4.0 shows only that s/he got all As or A minuses.

History[1]

At the turn of century, the vast majority of U.S. college and universities used a decimal, 0-100, grading system. From about 1900 until the 1960s, there was a trend to using grading systems that were less and less fine-grained. Thus, at the beginning of the 1960s, most colleges and universities were using the letter-grade system that is currently in use at GSU. During the 1 960s, many schools tried to remove a perceived punitive aspect from grades. This led to many different grading systems including the pass/fail system. But this period of experimentation did not fundamentally change the basic use of the letter-grade system. From the 1970s and continuing through today, there has been a move, especially among universities and 4-year colleges, to adding pluses and minuses to the letter-grade system.

Variations in Grading Systems on a 4.0 Scale*[2]

Grading System	2-Yr Colleges (n=370)		4-Yr Colleges (n=583)		Universities (n=442)		Total	
	1982	1992	1982	1992	1982	1992	1982	1992
Simple letter	82.1	69.2	50.3	35.4	61.2	46.2	61.3	47.8
Letter with +/-	9.5	18.4	33.8	52.8	24.6	41.2	25.1	40.0
Other	8.4	12.4	15.9	11.8	14.1	12.6	13.6	12.2

Table 1

*89.8% of U.S. colleges and universities reported using the 4.0 scale

[1]The information in this paragraph is drawn from American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions

Officers, *Grades and Grading Practices: Results of* the 1992 *AACRAO Survey* (Washington, D.C., 1994).

[2] *AACRAO Survey* p.9 and 11.

Effects of adding pluses and minuses[3]

Other institutions have found that adding pluses and minuses to the letter-grade system has several effects.

1. Fewer students graduate with a 4.0 GPA because the students who have a 4.0 GPA under the simple letter-grade divide themselves into two groups--A- students and A students.
2. There are fewer students who graduate with a 2.0 GPA because those who were just barely getting by and whose Cs were C minuses, fail to remain in good standing.
3. There is no overall GPA effect on the students between 4.0 and 2.0. In other words, on average, there are as many B+ students as B- students. This is an especially important point here at GSU because it means that adding pluses and minuses can be expected to have no effect on the number of students who qualify for HOPE scholarships.
4. There is some, tentative, evidence that overall average GPA rises more slowly over time at institutions using pluses and minuses. In other words, there is some evidence that pluses and minuses reduce grade inflation.
5. Adding pluses and minuses causes an increase in the number of grade changes that Registrars have to perform. Interestingly, while some of this effect is, as one would expect, the result of more student appeals, it seems that much of it is simply due to more clerical errors made by professors on grade sheets. In other words, given more bubbles on grade sheet, professors fill in the wrong bubble more often.

The Views of Measurement Experts[4]

Scholars of measurement theory have severely criticized the simple letter-grade grading system and the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers has urged institutions to move to grading systems, such as the one proposed, which provide more possible grades than the simple letter-grade system.[5] The consensus among scholars of measurement theory is such that Admissions and Standards has been unable to find a scholarly publication which defends the simple letter-grade system, while many scholarly articles attack it.

[3]The information in this paragraph is drawn from C. James Quann, Plus (+) Minus (-) Grading: A *Case Study* and *National Implications* (Washington, D.C., 1987), a white paper produced by the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers.

[4]Unless otherwise noted, the information in this paragraph is drawn from the *AACRAO Survey* and Quann, 1987.

[5]*AACRAO Survey*, p. 25.

The fundamental argument against the simple letter-grade system is that, because it allows only 5 possible grades, it allows for too much grouping error. To simplify a bit, grouping error occurs because the mean of the actual grades within an interval will be lower than the mean of the interval. Here is an example. Suppose that a professor is computing grades on a 0-100 system and that everyone who earns a score greater than or equal to 80 and less than 90 receives a B. In effect, all those who are given a B are given the same grade--an 85 (the midpoint between 80 and 90). But, if grades are distributed on a bell curve, there will be more grades below 85 than grades above 85. So if one averaged the numerical scores that the professor used to do the grading, this average would be less than 85. The grouping error is the difference between the grade reported to the Registrar (in this case, 85) and the actual average of those in that grade interval. The effect of grouping error is to inflate the performance of weaker students and reduce the reliability of grading. For any particular given reliability of the grading basis, one can compute the reliability for grading systems with different possible numbers of grades.

Loss of Reliability From Grouping Error[6]

Reliability of Grading Basis	Reliability of Grades for Various Numbers of Possible Grades			
	2	5*	10**	15
.95	.63	.85	.92	.94
.90	.60	.80	.87	.89
.80	.53	.71	.78	.79
.70	.47	.62	.68	.69
.50	.33	.45	.48	.49

Table 2
*The simple letter-grade system provides 5 possible grades.
**The letter-grade with +1- system provides 11 possible grades.

As you can see, if the grading basis is .95 reliable, a move from a grading system which used 5 categories to one which used 10 would improve reliability from .85 to .92. Notice that the reliability of the grade given increases with the number of possible grades no matter how reliable the grading basis is.

[6]Robert Ebel, "Marks and Marking Systems," in *Measuring Educational Achievement* (Prentice Hall, 1965), p. 423.

The Views of the GSU Faculty

In February and March 1997 the University Senate Office conducted a survey of full-time faculty at Georgia State at the behest of the Admissions and Standards Committee. The following choices and results emerged from that

effort, in which 849 surveys were distributed to the faculty, and 459 were returned to the Senate Office or the Chair of Admissions and Standards:

Faculty favoring the current letter-grade system 19.6% (n=90)
Faculty favoring a system with the following grades: A,AB,B,BC,C,CD,D,F 12.4% (n=57)
Faculty favoring the letter-grades with pluses and minuses 66.0% (n=303)
Faculty favoring some other, unspecified, system 2% (n9)*
*8 of these nine which were for some type of grading system finer than the letter-grade system, e.g., decimal on a scale of 100; +1- but with A+ = 4.3, etc.

The return rate of 54.1% was very good, and sentiment was overwhelmingly (80.4%) in favor of a finer grading scale, with only 19.6% of the faculty expressing support for the current system. Among the choices offered, 66.0% preferred the +/- system and 12.4% preferred the intermediate (A, AB, B, BC, ...) system.

The Views of GSU Students

The Admissions and Standards Committee gathered student opinion in two ways. First, the opinion of a class of honors students who had studied grading systems was sought. All the honors students favored the letter-grade with pluses and minuses over any other grading system they had studied. Second, Admissions and Standards conducted a survey of 223 GSU students. Members of Admissions and Standards asked students in their classes to fill out the survey so the response rate was 100% but the sampling technique is poor. Students were first asked to rank order four possible grading systems: pass/fail, letter-grades, letter-grades with pluses and minuses and the decimal system (0-100). Here are the results concerning the grading system that was ranked number one.

Pass/fail system	10.8% (n=24)
Letter-grade	48% (n=107)
Letter-grade with +/-	26.9% (n=60)
Decimal	14.3% (n=32)

To determine the strength of student preferences, students were than asked to allocate 100 points between the four grading systems. Here is the average point score for each system.

Pass-Fail	12.3
Letter-grade	39
Letter-grade with +/-	26
Decimal	18.2

(These numbers do not total to 100 because some students did not allocate 100 points.)

Fact Sheet - Electronic Text and Disabilities Issues

Issues

1. The Regents Administrative Committee on Learning Disorders (ACLD) and the Regents Centers for Learning Disorders are committed to providing appropriate accommodations for students with disabilities within the University System. One of the accommodations most frequently accessed at the college level is taped texts (i.e., college texts read onto an audiotape for students with disabilities who cannot read at the pace required in college) and/or other electronic formats of textbooks (i.e., CD, scan and read).

   - Students with learning disabilities comprise one of the largest groups of students with disabilities on college campuses. The largest percentage of students with learning disabilities is diagnosed with reading disabilities. Use of taped or electronic formats of text is a necessary accommodation for such students.
   - Students with other disabilities (i.e., visual impairments, traumatic brain injury) who cannot utilize the printed format also require the use of taped or electronic texts.
   - Epidemiologic evidence is available to support the persistence of reading disabilities in the college population.
   - Behavioral and biological validation of the lack of fluency for the population with reading disabilities, and the need for extra time is supported in the literature.
   - Reading fluency is the single best discriminator of college students with reading disabilities.

2. The process of providing taped versions of textbooks is an extremely expensive, time consuming, and labor-intensive process that is becoming increasingly costly:

   - At the University of Georgia LDC alone, total expenditures for Books on Tape grew from $7,032 in FY 1997/1998 to $ 33, 271 in FY 1999/2000. This represents an increase of 373%. Increases continue to be documented each year. A breakout of these costs is available from the Learning Disabilities Center at the University of Georgia. (The University of Georgia figures are reported here since tracking these numbers is extremely time consuming and smaller institutions typically have only part time persons serving students with disabilities. With so few resources, these disability service providers have no time to devote to record keeping of this kind. It should be noted, however, that other colleges and universities within the University System have also reported increasing expenditures for Books on Tape.)

   * The estimated cost using e-text is approximately $15.00 per book as compared to a cost of $125 per book using the audio taping procedure currently in place. Using an estimated nine to fifteen books per year (for one student), the cost for one hundred students a year is estimated to be $112, 500 to $ 187, 500 as compared to an e-text estimated cost of $13,500 to $22, 500 per year.

   * These rapidly rising costs, in the face of current University System budget cuts, are having a tremendously negative impact on students with disabilities as well as Disability Service Providers who are

charged with providing accommodations for these students. It is critical that there be a less costly way to provide this accommodation.

3. In Georgia, the State Board of Education passed a resolution requiring publishers to provide an e-text format for all textbooks adopted by the state of Georgia. Therefore, the state of Georgia does not adopt any K-12 textbooks that are not available in e-text.

Proposed Solutions

Georgia has the opportunity to be a pioneer in this emerging frontier if legislation is constructed and implemented in a thoughtful and deliberative manner. Such legislation should include, at a minimum, the following points:

1. The legislations should specify the application of this requirement to students who have legally identified disabilities that preclude the acquisition of information through standard print formats and should delineate how those students will be identified. This would apply to students who are blind or students who have low vision, reading disorders, or physical disabilities. This requirement invokes the protections of Section 121 of the Copyright Code for the producer of the electronic text, and it also makes clear that this legislation is intended to enhance the requirements of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990.

   With the establishment of the Regents Centers for Learning Disorders in the state of Georgia, the mechanism for oversight of appropriate accommodations documentation is already established. Legislation should incorporate compliance with the Regents Centers for Learning Disorders policy governing documentation for accommodations related to specific disabilities.

2. This legislation should clearly define what materials are to be provided in electronic format and the procedure for requesting the materials. Faculty frequently chooses "non-standard" texts as either primary texts or enrichment texts. This legislation should not be construed as limiting a faculty member's freedom to choose appropriate texts as class materials. The terminology "instructional materials" or "materials used for instruction" might be considered. This would determine what materials are considered essential for the course and to require those materials in alternate format from the publisher. This would also clarify that materials may be textual or non-textual, such as mathematics or science or technical materials.

3. The format of the electronic document should be clearly defined. There is currently no standard for electronic text across the industry and therefore "electronic text" may be interpreted as xml, rtf, ASCII, OEB, or other formats that may emerge in the future. The laws already passed in other states contain language such as "compatible with commonly used Braille translation software and speech synthesis software." This makes clear the application for which the electronic text is intended and also allows for expansion as technology continues to develop.

4. The source of the "educational materials" should be expanded beyond the terminology "publisher" to

include any other organization, agency, business, or consortium that might be a source for materials used in classroom instruction.

5. The institutions that are included in this legislative umbrella should be clearly identified. This would allow the legislation to protect the traditional institutions of higher education as well as various other institutions in the state that provide post-secondary training and certification.

6. The state should retain the right to transcribe, reproduce, and distribute the material in Braille, large print, recording, or other accessible media as required by a qualified student. This expands the usability of the electronic text even beyond the standard computer-based accessibility modifications.

7. The legislation should make clear that any reproduction beyond that allowed in the previous section would be considered a violation of law. This would discourage an individual or institution from illegally copying the electronic text for uses other than those identified in the legislation.

8. The legislations should make clear that there is to be no additional expense involved to the institution or the individual for provision of the text in electronic format. Beyond the requirement that the student purchase one copy of the text, no additional fees should be allowed.

9. The legislation should make clear that failure to provide the required electronic text in a timely manner and according to other stipulations of the law will be considered an act of discrimination on the part of the entity producing the educational material. This moves the burden to the publishing entity and should alleviate any fears that faculty may have concerning selection of educational materials.

REPORT FROM STUDENT SERVICES
RACAA MEETING
November 5, 2002

CAPP The CAPP Project, Curriculum,Advising, and Planning Program, is in Phase II with the ten institutions having completed implementation training and six campuses scheduled for the first week of November. The remaining institutions are scheduled for training the first part of 2003. Phase III of this project, the electronic transfer of student educational information, is scheduled to begin in 2004. For more information on CAPP and CAPP documentation go to:
http://pegasus.rath.peachnet.edu:8087/banner/BANNER.home

Protecting Student Privacy The Chancellor's Office distributed a document called "Protecting Student Privacy" to presidents, in mid-October, encouraging institutions to develop written policies and procedures for protecting confidential information, including social security numbers. The document also encourages campuses to begin using a generic number as the student ID instead of the social security number which is current practice. Institutions are expected to complete the transition from SSN to generic ID by 2005. A copy of the document can be found at:
http://www.usg.edu/usgweb/student_svcs/

Student Support Services The GAEST Management Team endorsed a list of electronic student support services (attachment 1) recommended in the Post Implementation Analysis team report. In addition to the list of self-serve services the report also included a list of Banner related enhancements (attachment 2) that institutions indicated would help them provided the services listed on the minimum service list. The complete Post Implementation Analysis Report can be found at:
http://pegasus.rath.peachnet.edu:8087/banner/BANNER.home

For additional information contact:

Tonya R. Lam
Sr. Advisor for Student Enrollment & Information Services
Tonya.lam@usg.edu
(404) 463-0372

Minimum Student Services

Recruiting and Admissions
- On-Line Recruiting Inquiry
- On-Line Application
- On-Line Application Status Check
- On-Line Application Fee Payment
- On-Line Application Deposit Payment

Registration and Academic History
- On-Line Registration
- On-Line Transcript Look Up
- On-Line Grade Look Up
- On-Line Transcript Request
- On-Line Degree Progress with "What if" I change my program of study
- On-Line Degree Progress with "What if" I transfer to another USG institution
- On-Line Faculty Grade Entry
- On-Line Graduation Request

Location Management
- On-Line Housing and Meal Application and Registration
- On-Line Housing and Meal Status Check
- On-Line Housing and Meal Deposit Payment

Accounts Receivable
- On-Line Balance Due Look up
- Ability to pay Balance Due On-Line
- Ability to request Direct Deposit On-Line

Financial Aid
- On-Line Financial Aid Status Check
- On-Line Financial Aid Acceptance
- On-Line Hope Eligibility Status Check
- On-Line Hope GPA Check with "What if" I got these grades and credits

Attachment 2

PIA – USG Student Service Support Services

This section reflects some of the findings from the PIA interviews as they relate to requested enhancements to the current systems being used at the institutions. All items listed do not represent a commitment to develop the described software changes. Only those projects placed on the official USG product calendar will be developed. The USG reserves the exclusive right to determine, at its sole discretion, the projects to be undertaken by the USG, and the dates on which deliverables will be made available.

Recruiting and Admissions
- Application Data Download
- Consolidated Data Entry Form
- Additional Data Entry Edits

Registration and Academic History
- Web Registration Added Course Information (Pre Req, Co Req, Text)
- On-Line Student Transcript Exchange (EDI Transcript)
- Web Degree Compliance with "What if" I transfer to another USG institution
- Prescriptive Registration/LS/New/Honors
- Web Non-Course Requirements
- Web Registration Time Ticketing Enhancement

Location Management
- Events Guests not be required in administrative system
- Web Housing/Meal Application
- Apartment Style Living
- Available Rooms Query
- Enhanced Room/Roommate Matching

Accounts Receivable
- Web Student Bill
- Drop students (Who have not paid enhancement)
- Reconciliation reports
- PS Interface enhanced edits
- Student Direct Deposit

- Cashiering Enhancements for Credit Card payment at the cashier window
- Cashiering Enhancements for Departmental Deposits

Financial Aid
- HOPE/PELL Reconciliation Processing
- HOPE Eligibility/GPA Calculator
- Interface with Georgia Student Finance Commission
- More flexible Satisfactory Academic Progress Checking
- College Work Study Interface to PeopleSoft
- Summer Pell Awarding
- HOPE Residency Tracking

Technical/IR/General
- Security Enhancements (Value Based Security)
- Dual Reporting to DTAE and BOR
- Improved Data Load Matching
- Web Report Writing Tool
- Administrative Staff view of Web for Student and Faculty
- Customized data views for specific support service staff (Bookstore, Parking, etc.)
- Improved Letter Generation
- Improved Population Selection
- Communication Plan Enhancements (On-Line, E-mail etc.)

Achieving the Board of Regents New 4% Study Abroad Target by 2007:
Page 1: Institutional and Sector Analysis

		Current Participation Data				Sample Option A	Sample Option B		Sample Option C	
	Fall 2001 UG Headcount	FY01Study Abroad Participants (Fall 2000, Spring 2001, Summer 2001)	FY02Study Abroad Participants (Fall 2001, Spring 2002, Summer 2002)	Average of FY01 & FY02 Study Abroad Participants	FY01/02 Average as % of Fall 2001 Enrollments	New 4% System Target Distributed Equally Among All Institutions (based on Fall 2001 UG Headcount)	New 4% System Target Distributed Differentially by Sector	Differential Sector and Institution Target %	Sector & Institutional Aspirational Targets (Approx. Double of 2000-01 Participation Levels)	Aspirational Target % (as % of Fall 2001 Headcount)
Georgia Institute of Technology	10,904	708	754	731	6.70%	436	900	8.25%	1350	12.4%
Georgia State University	17,457	333	439	386	2.21%	698	1440	8.25%	700	4.0%
Medical College of Georgia	653	0	8	4	0.61%	26	54	8.25%	25	3.8%
University of Georgia	24,421	1,228	1,231	1230	5.03%	977	2015	8.25%	2500	10.2%
Sector Total	**53,435**	**2,269**	**2,432**	**2351**	**4.40%**	**2,137**	**4408**	**8.25%**	**4575**	**8.6%**
Georgia Southern University	12,360	93	214	154	1.24%	494	371	3%	300	2.4%
Valdosta State University	7,815	87	142	115	1.47%	313	234	3%	200	2.6%
Sector Total	**20,175**	**180**	**356**	**268**	**1.33%**	**807**	**605**	**3%**	**500**	**2.5%**
Albany State University	2,939	45	16	31	1.04%	118	88	3%	90	3.1%
Armstrong Atlantic State University	4,771	60	64	62	1.30%	191	143	3%	120	2.5%
Augusta State University	4,620	24	29	27	0.57%	185	139	3%	50	1.1%
Clayton College & State University	4,622	8	15	12	0.25%	185	139	3%	45	1.0%
Columbus State University	4,600	81	56	69	1.49%	184	138	3%	160	3.5%
Fort Valley State University	2,181	62	92	77	3.53%	87	65	3%	100	4.6%
Georgia College & State University	4,066	76	83	80	1.96%	163	122	3%	205	5.0%
Georgia Southwestern State University	1,899	35	14	25	1.29%	76	57	3%	50	2.6%
Kennesaw State University	12,323	168	168	168	1.36%	493	370	3%	375	3.0%
North Georgia College & State University	3,391	108	42	75	2.21%	136	102	3%	170	5.0%
Savannah State University	2,142	9	9	9	0.42%	86	64	3%	40	1.9%
Southern Polytechnic State University	2,875	3	11	7	0.24%	115	86	3%	30	1.0%
State University of West Georgia	7,180	107 NR		107	1.49%	287	215	3%	215	3.0%
Sector Total	**57,609**	**786**	**599**	**693**	**1.20%**	**2,304**	**1728**	**3%**	**1650**	**2.9%**
Dalton State College	3,581	6	7	7	0.18%	143	36	1%	25	0.7%
Macon State College	4,363	5 NR		5	0.11%	175	44	1%	30	0.7%
Sector Total	**7,944**	**11**	**7**	**9**	**0.11%**	**318**	**79**	**1%**	**55**	**0.7%**
Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College	2,834	2	2	2	0.07%	113	28	1%	10	0.35%
Atlanta Metropolitan College	1,880	12	4	8	0.43%	75	19	1%	15	0.80%
Bainbridge College	1,522	5	11	8	0.53%	61	15	1%	10	0.66%
Coastal Georgia Community College	2,000	2	1	2	0.08%	80	20	1%	10	0.50%
Darton College	3,041	12	10	11	0.36%	122	30	1%	25	0.82%
East Georgia College	1,264	0	6	3	0.24%	51	13	1%	10	0.79%
Floyd College	2,362	2	6	4	0.17%	94	24	1%	10	0.42%
Gainesville College	3,573	20	9	15	0.41%	143	36	1%	40	1.12%
Georgia Perimeter College	14,830	23	41	32	0.22%	593	148	1%	150	1.01%
Gordon College	3,054	40	25	33	1.06%	122	31	1%	50	1.64%
Middle Georgia College	2,141	31	32	32	1.47%	86	21	1%	40	1.87%
South Georgia College	1,077	10	19	15	1.35%	43	11	1%	15	1.39%
Waycross College	682	18	5	12	1.69%	27	7	1%	25	3.67%
Sector Total	**40,260**	**177**	**171**	**174**	**0.43%**	**1,610**	**403**	**1%**	**410**	**1.0%**
University System Total	**179,423**	**3,423**	**3,565**	**3494**	**2%**	**7,177**	**7224**	**4.0%**	**7190**	**4.0%**

SEVIS—the Student and Exchange Visitors Information System Update for University System of Georgia Institutions

SEVIS is an Internet-based tracking system that will maintain current information on non-immigrant students and scholars (and their dependents). SEVIS will automate the manual data collection process that schools and exchange visitor programs are already performing to gather information on their international students, scholars, and exchange visitors. Individuals to be tracked in the SEVIS program account for only 2% of all non-citizens who enter the U.S. each year.

Recent History and Current Timeline Projections

1996	**Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (IIRIRA) mandates SEVIS (then called CIPRIS)**
26 Oct 2002	**USA PATRIOT (Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and Obstruct Terrorism) Act becomes law**
7 March 2002	*SEVIS Briefing for Chief Academic Officers (Atlanta)*
18 June 2002	*SEVIS Briefing for Chief Academic Officers & Chief Student Affairs Officers (Sea Palms)*
1 July 2002	Publication of INS SEVIS Preliminary Enrollment Rule Beginning of optional enrollment period for SEVIS SEVIS available on-line for item-by-item processing (real-time interactive)
11 Sept 2002	**Dept of State implements ISEAS—Interim Student & Exchange Authentication System**
23 Sept 2002	Beta-testing for batch-file transfer (F- & M-visa functionality)
25 Sept 2002	**Interim Certification Rule issued by INS**
11 Oct 2002	*USG Workshop on I-17 re-certification (Albany State University)*
18 Oct 2002	*USG Workshop on I-17 re-certification (Macon State College)*
29 Oct 2002	*SEVIS Briefing to USG Chief Student Affairs Officers (Atlanta)*

1 Nov 2002	**USG deadline for voluntary filing of I-17 re-certification with INS**
5 Nov 2002	*SEVIS Briefing to USG Chief Academic Officers (Macon)*
15 Nov 2002	INS deadline for 75-day window to adjudicate certification and conduct site visit prior to 30 January 2003 deadline
15 Nov 2002	Beta-testing for batch-file transfer (J-visa functionality)
Fall 2002??	Proposed regulations for J-visas to be published in *Federal Register*
Fall 2002??	SEVIS batch processing available
30 January 2003	**INS deadline for mandatory filing of I-17 re-certification**
30 January 2003	**SEVIS participation mandatory**

- *Institutions not approved by INS by 30 January 2003 will not be able to issue I-20 forms to admit (or otherwise manage) international students in F- or M-visa status.*

- *Currently enrolled students at non-certified institutions must transfer to another approved institution by the end of the spring semester.*

QUICK GLOSSARY:

F Visa: standard visa held by most international students pursuing degree study at U.S. institutions under authority granted to them by INS

M Visa: similar to F visas, but for vocational non-academic study

J Visa: held by visiting exchange students and scholars under programs authorized by the U.S. Department of State

DSO: Designated School Official—institutional administrator in charge of F & M visa programs, and the only individual authorized by INS to issue I-20 Forms.

RO: Responsible Officer—institutional administrator is charge of J-visa programs, and the only individual authorized by DOS to issue IAP-66 Forms.

INS: U.S. Immigration & Naturalization Service (currently undergoing reorganization)

DOS: U.S. Department of State

Proposed Implementation of Requirements for the Regents' Quantitative Skills Test

Students entering the University System as first-time freshman in Fall, 2003 or later will be required to pass the Regents' Quantitative Skills Test as a requirement for a transfer associate or baccalaureate degree. (As with the current test, institutions may choose to require the RQST for career associate degree students.).

Students who attended college before Fall, 2003 and earned transferable college credit (not including joint enrollment or AP) will not have to pass the test as a requirement for graduation if they graduate by Spring Semester, 2009.

After Spring Semester, 2009, the test will be a graduation requirement for the transfer associate and baccalaureate degree for all students, regardless of when or where they first attended college.

The testing and remediation requirements under current Regents' Test policy will apply. Students who have not passed the test by the time they have accumulated 45 credit hours will be required to take remediation. However, it is anticipated that diagnostic information can be provided so that students who fail the test may be required to take remediation only in certain areas.

ACAA Meeting Minutes, Nov. 2002, Attachment

To:	Institutional Presidents
From:	
Date:	_____
Subject:	Reappointment of Full-time Lecturers and Senior Lecturers

In accordance with Board Policies 803.03 and 803.0301, and until further notice, the following guidelines will be in effect for the reappointment of full-time lecturers and senior lecturers:

A. Full-time lecturers and senior lecturers are appointed by the institution on a year-to-year basis.

B. Lecturers and senior lecturers who have served full-time for the entire previous academic year have the presumption of reappointment for the subsequent academic year unless notified in writing to the contrary as follows:

    i. For lecturers with less than three years of full time service, institutions are encouraged to provide reappointment information as early as possible but no specific notice in required.

    ii. For lecturers with three or more years but less than six years of full-time service, at least 30 calendar days prior to the beginning date of the first day of classes at the institution.

    iii. For senior lecturers, or lecturers with six years or more of full-time service, at least 180 calendar days prior to the beginning date of the first day of classes at the institution.

C. Lecturers or Senior Lecturers who have served for six or more years of full-time service at an institution and who have received timely notice of non-reappointment shall be entitled to a review of the decision in accordance with published procedures developed by the institution.

D. In no case will the service as lecturer or senior lecturer imply any claim upon tenure or reappointment under other conditions than those above.

Recommendation from the University System of Georgia Academic Committee

DRAFT	**DRAFT**	**DRAFT**

Academic Affairs Handbook, Section 4.01.04

Submission of Appointments

SUBJECT: Timely Submission of Appointment Recommendations

REFERENCE: Memo from the Chancellor to the Presidents (Date)

EFFECTIVE DATE: 01.01.03

PROCEDURE

In order to ensure that faculty appointments are considered by the Board in a timely fashion, the Chancellor must receive the necessary recommendations at least two weeks in advance of the monthly Board meeting in which approval is sought. Recommendations for approval of full-time faculty and administrative appointments requiring Board approval must be submitted by the presidents in accordance with the following expectations:

I. Every effort must be made to submit each appointment request early enough to have it considered by the Regents before the effective date of the appointment.

II. For full-time faculty, in those cases where approval prior to the commencement of duties is not possible, approval must be sought according to the following schedule

   a. appointments beginning in the fall semester, no later than two weeks prior to the October Board meeting,
   b. appointments beginning in the spring semester, no later than the two weeks prior to the February Board meeting, and
   c. appointments beginning at all other times, no later than two weeks prior to the subsequent Board meeting.

III. Faculty may receive payment for services rendered pursuant to System and institutional guidelines prior to Board approval. However, in no case may faculty or administrative employees receive compensation for services not yet performed.

Recommendation from the University System of Georgia Academic Committee

DRAFT - 11/4/02

Committee On: Educator Preparation Academic Advisory Committee (EPACC)

Chairperson: Janis Reid

Date: September 13, 2002

RECOMMENDATION: Recognize that the difficulty in recruiting and retaining higher ed faculty to teacher preparation programs in Georgia has created the need to identify teacher preparation professionals as a critical shortage area. The following recommendations are intended to make college/university teacher ed positions more attractive.

1. Increase base salaries (similar to what has been done in the fields of business and computer science) so that teacher ed programs can compete in today's market (e.g., with higher public school salaries) to attract and retain quality faculty.
2. Extend the HOPE payback program to positions in higher education teacher preparation programs.
3. Recognize K-12 teaching experience when determining rank and salary for higher ed faculty involved in teacher ed programs.

RATIONALE: Concerns were raised at a recent EPACC Executive Committee meeting that some colleges and universities have been having problems recruiting and retaining teacher ed faculty for the following reasons:

1. Market conditions are such that college/university salaries are no longer competitive with public school teacher salaries, especially for more experienced faculty/teachers. Over the summer a survey was sent to all EPACC members to determine the extent to which this issue was a statewide problem. The results from respondents of that survey indicated that the average beginning salary for Assistant Professors in higher ed teacher preparation programs was $41,000. However, the state salary schedule for beginning doctoral-level teachers is $42,204 and the average beginning doctoral-level teacher salary across eight counties where teacher education programs exist is $45,041 (see attached). As you can see, salaries for beginning doctoral-level teachers are $1,200 to $4,000 higher than what we offer faculty coming into teacher ed programs. This gap widens when you compare more experienced faculty. The beginning salary for associate professors at the institutions responding to the survey was $47,500. However, the average state salary for doctoral level teachers with 6-10 years experience is $50,540 and the average salary across eight counties with teacher ed programs was $53,517. As you can see, universities are even less competitive when it comes to recruiting and retaining experienced teacher (higher ed salaries are $3,000 to $6,000 less in this case). Finally 62% of those responding to our survey told one or more anecdotal stories about losing quality faculty to public school positions because of higher salaries. A similar percentage expressed difficulty in recruiting faculty to their programs for similar reasons.

2. HOPE allows K-12 educators to "pay-off" their scholarship by teaching in the public schools, but does not allow educators in higher ed teacher preparation programs to do the same. As a consequence Ph.D. HOPE Scholarship Graduates are returning to K-12 schools instead of coming to higher education.
3. Public schools will count K-12 **and** college/university teaching experience when determining salary, but colleges and universities typically do not count K-12 experience. Recognizing K-12 years of service might increase our ability to attract quality teachers to higher education.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:

- Attached:
    - EPACC Survey
    - Spreadsheet comparing salaries by creditable years of service in several counties where teacher ed programs are located.
    - **Average salaries of T-7 certified teachers** (PDF 120k) in counties where teacher ed programs are located

Dear Colleagues:

At the July meeting of the EPACC Executive Committee we discussed the issue of salary inequities between doctoral level public school faculty and faculty in higher education teacher preparation programs. A few of us expressed serious concerns that we are having some difficulty recruiting and retaining qualified teacher ed faculty at our institutions because of more attractive (i.e., higher) salaries in the public school systems. I suggested to the Executive Committee that I try and collect some preliminary information on whether or not this is a system-wide issue. I would greatly appreciate your responses to a couple of questions below. I will compile your responses and present them to the Executive Committee for possible consideration at our September EPACC meeting.

1. What is the usual starting salary for doctoral level teacher ed faculty at your institution at the following ranks?
    Assistant Professor
    Associate Professor
    Professor

2. How do your salaries compare with salaries in your local school system for faculty with a Ph.D. and a similar number years of experience associated with the ranks identified in question #1? In other words:

    a. What would a beginning doctoral level public school teacher make in your region compared to a beginning assistant professor?
    b. What would one make in the public schools after 5-7 years experience compared to an associate professor?
    c. Finally, what would one make after 10-13 years experience compared to a full professor?

3. Do you have any individual examples of problems you have had in recruiting or retaining faculty because of higher salaries in the public school system?

4. Is this more of an issue in some specialty areas than others, e.g., the critical shortage areas like special education, math, science, language arts?

5. Any other comments or suggestions?

Thank you for your time and attention to my request.

Average Salaries of Teachers with T-7 Certificates: 2001-2002

(Source: Georgia Department of Education)

University of Georgia	Clarke County	60,826.38
Kennesaw State Unvi. &	Cobb County	63,814.66
Southern Poly Univ.	Marietta City	68,327.16
State U. of W. Georgia	Carroll County	64,945.67
	Carrollton City	65,122.50
Georgia State University	Fulton County	63,031.46
& GA Tech Univ	Atlanta City	67,027.49
Georgia Southern Univ.	Bulloch County	60,496.05
Columbus State Univ.	Muscogee County	63,048.75
Valdosta State Univ.	Lowndes County	64,366.22
Georgia College & State	Baldwin County	58,635.44
Clayton State Univ.	Clayton County	59,957.59
Albany State Univ.	Dougherty County	59,281.64
Armstong Atlantic Univ.	Chatham County	59,379.58
Savannah State Univ.	Chatham County	59,379.58
Augusta State Univ.	Richmond County	58,566.74
Fort Valley State Univ.	Peach County	62,503.00
Georgia SW College	Sumter County	61,180.00
Macon State Univ.	Bibb County	62,854.13
N. GA College & State	Lumpkin County	63,285.18
Abraham Baldwin Coll.	Tift County	75,177.10
Atlanta Metro Coll.	Fulton County	63,031.46
	Atlanta City	67,027.49
Bainbridge College	Decatur County	61,491.48
Coastal Georgia College	Glynn County	69,772.52
Dalton State College	Whitfield County	65,224.95
	Dalton City	62,630.40
East Georgia College	Emanuel County	46,608.00
Floyd College	Floyd County	63,882.00
	Rome City	62,565.60
Gainesville College	Hall County	64,912.24
	Gainesville City	62,081.30
Georgia Perimeter Coll.	Dekalb County	65,026.76
	Decatur City	65,786.45
Gordon College	Lamar County	70,943.88
Middle Georgia Coll.	Bleckley County	60,653.00
S. Georgia College	Coffee County	61,513.00
Waycross College	Pierce/Ware County	No T-7 Teachers

Recommendation from the University System of Georgia Academic Committee

COMMITTEE ON: EDUCATOR PREPARATION ACADEMIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE

CHAIRPERSON: JANIS REID

DATE: SEPTEMBER 13, 2002

RECOMMENDATION

THE REQUIREMENT FOR GRADUATE STUDENTS TO SHOW PROOF OF IMMUNIZATIONS SHOULD BE REMOVED AS A REQUIREMENT FOR ADMISSION TO USG INSTITUTIONS FOR ALL AMERICAN CITIZENS RESIDING FOR THE LAST 12 MONTHS IN THE UNITED STATES.

RATIONALE

The EPAAC questions the requirement for immunizations for *graduate students.* The BOR requirement was mandated for all students at Georgia Universities several years ago because of an outbreak in undergraduate populations. Now it is viewed as an obstacle to attending public universities and serves as a motivator to attend out-of-state institutions.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

The Summary of Notifiable Diseases, United States located at the following website, **http://www.cdc.gov /mmwrhtml/mm4753al.htm**, indicates the following for 1998 (last year available):

Total cases reported in the United States	
Tetanus	41
Measles	100
Mumps	666
Rubella	364
Polio	1

Total cases report in GA	
Tetanus	0
Measles	1
Mumps	2
Rubella	0
Polio	0

At the December 7, 2001 EPAAC meeting, the body voted unanimously to "*ask the Board of Regents to evaluate the need for this requirement and consider removing it*". At the May 13, 2002 meeting a sub-committee was asked to draft an action item to present to the BOR at its June meeting.

Since that time there has developed a shortage of vaccine and the concern of adult students has increased.

Graduate students often have to make multiple trips to their doctor and are told that the limited vaccine is being reserved for unprotected infants and youth.

DOCUMENTATION FROM THE PROFESSIONALS
American College Health Association (web site)
From the ACHA Vaccine-Preventable Diseases Task Force:
"There is currently a serious shortage of tetanus toxoid due to production issues. The CDC has issued guidelines on use of toxoid during the shortage, anticipated to last 12-18 months. Also, Aventis Pasteur, the only manufacturer of tetanus toxoid, has made special arrangements to give college health centers in the U.S. the same priority level for ordering vaccine as hospitals.

As of 4/26/01, all TD orders, except for emergency situations, are on backorder until 5/15/01. Aventis Pasteur will ship immediately to fulfill the need of emergency immunizations."

FROM THE CDC (WEB SITE)
Questions about vaccine shortages? CDC and IAC web sites offer answers:

Shortages persist for five important vaccines: DTaP (diphtheria, tetanus, and pertussis), Td (tetanus and diphtheria), MMR (measles-mumps-rubella), varicella (chickenpox), and PCV7 (pneumococcal conjugate). Although shortage information and instructions come piecemeal from various sources, it's hard to keep up.

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) has created a web page titled "Current Vaccine Shortages" that will be updated weekly. This page answers such basic questions as: Which vaccines are currently in shortage? Why are there shortages? What should be done in the meantime? Who can I contact to answer my questions?

General questions can be answered by the CDC immunization hotline at (800) 232-2522.

The Immunization Action Coalition (IAC) also has posted a related web page on its site. The "Vaccine Shortage Information" page provides references and links to articles and recommendations on shortages in general and specific vaccine shortages. It also lists phone numbers of vaccine companies to call for the most current information.

To see CDC's Current Vaccine Shortages web page, go to: **http://www.cdc.gov/nip/news/shortages**
To see JAC's Vaccine Shortage Information web page, go to: **http://www.immunize.org/vacshortage**

NOTE: Quote from web site above **"Td supply is becoming available to providers other than hospitals. However. supply is not sufficient at this time to return to routine booster doses".**

An article on the CDC website suggested that many adults are not adequately immunized. However of those listed as health risks for adults, no references were made to MMR, Td, etc. as health risks.

270 Washington Street, S.W., Atlanta, GA 30334

U.S.A.

Recommendation from the University System of Georgia Academic Committee

Committee On: Educator Preparation Academic Advisory Committee (EPACC)

Chairperson: Janis Reid

Date: September 13, 2002

RECOMMENDATION:

There are certainly many factors and perspectives involved in graduate student fee charges, but based upon the complexity of the issue, EPAAC requests that a system-wide review of this issue be conducted. While a large percentage of graduate students in Georgia are in education, the concerns and issues that we have for these students may be considerably different for graduate students in other fields. A study across all graduate programs at all levels could lead to clarification or revision of the policy for graduate student fees to distinguish between full time and part time graduate students and their required fees.

This request for review supports a similar request presented by Dr. Steve Ross to the Administrative Committee on Graduate Work. In addition, while interest in this graduate fee issue has been posed in at least two committees, it is requested that the Regents office coordinate the investigation of this question at the system level with sufficient representation from across the system to include Educator Preparation and Graduate Work committee representatives.

RATIONALE:

The concern of many of the members of the Educator Preparation Academic Advisory Committee (EPAAC) is that graduate students are generally considered full time at 9 semester hours, but there is no "uniform" or "system-wide" fee adjustment below the 9 hours, other than the allowance for such an adjustment: "institutions may prorate mandatory fees on a per credit hour basis for students taking less than 12 credit hours. Institutions may elect to reduce Board-approved mandatory fees for students enrolled in summer courses." (BOR Policy Manual, 704.021 Mandatory Student Fees)

During the regular academic year, many education graduate students take one or two courses. Thus, by definition, these are part time graduate students but they often are paying full time fees, unless at least one of the two courses is off campus, in which case only three hours are counted for fee consideration, thus allowing the students to have their fees waived.

The feeling among EPAAC members is that a system-wide alternative fee structure for part time graduate students (many who are working adults) should be considered. This is most obvious in terms of the health fee assessment for graduate teacher education students. Almost all of these students are employed by public or private P-12 schools, and the employing school systems provide full health insurance benefits. While the health fee provides access to institutional health care facilities and services, and while we did not examine the use of

these facilities in terms of undergraduate and graduate students, it is reasonable to assume that graduate students in teacher education programs generally are completing their course work at night and would need these services only in the case of a dire emergency. Otherwise, if they are ill or require some form of psychological service, they would more than likely obtain these services from their own providers through their work-provided insurance. (One consideration is making the health care fee--and other appropriate fees, such as the yearbook fee--optional.)

The student activity and athletic fees create interesting concerns and discussions. Some graduate students readily admit that they utilize no student activity opportunities and do not attend athletic events. The issues of being a "fee-paying" member of an educational community and the payment of student fees as a type of "student tax" has not been discussed at any great length, but they do raise concerns. In addition, anecdotal evidence reveals that the graduate students' payments into the student activity funds are not utilized proportionately for graduate student-related activities (speakers, conference participation, etc.) Some of this may be a function of the general perceived lack of participation of graduate students in these extracurricular activities.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:

In a quick survey of the 15 educator preparation programs, it appears that graduate students fees are waived (except for technology fees) at a specific number of hours (e.g., for one institution, graduate fees we waived for students taking less than 6 hours, at another institution fees are waived for less than 4 hours). In both cases, students could take only one graduate course (typically 3 hours) before the fees took effect. During this period of intense pressures and extensive efforts to recruit new teachers and to retain current teachers, an incentive for continuing a teacher's professional development through graduate studies could be considered. Such an incentive could be a system-wide policy either waiving or supporting the waiver of graduate fees for a graduate student taking two courses (6-8 semester hours) or less at the graduate level.

Recommendation from the University System of Georgia Academic Committee

COMMITTEE ON: GEOLOGICAL SCIENCES AND GEOGRAPHY

CHAIRPERSON: Dr. HAROLD R. TRENDELL

DATE: 7/15/02

RECOMMENDATION

1. The Board of Regents (BOR) should commit funds to ensure that all system institutions acquire capabilities to implement Geographic Information Systems (GIS) programs.

2. The BOR needs to maintain, and preferably increase, the System's contributions to the ESRI site license. This is an exceptionally good arrangement for the System and, for most of the institutions, makes it possible to have GIS programs. These programs take time to get underway and without the System-wide support many institutions would not make the commitment for long enough.

RATIONALE

The Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia has long been in support of the use of Geographic Information Systems technology on a statewide basis. The viability and flexibility of this applied mode of technology has proven to be a boon to researchers and students at institutions of higher learning throughout the state. The BOR initially made this technology available to its institutions by wholly funding site licenses for GIS technology from the Earth Systems Research Institute (ESRI). The intent was to keep the colleges and universities of Georgia at the forefront of the technological revolution. However, with changing times, changing policies and redirection initiatives, the BOR currently funds half the annual statewide site license fee. Therefore, schools across the state must contribute collectively, $50,000 of the $100,000 yearly ESRI site license fee.

Concerns were raised by Committee members that the discretionary funding at the institutional level, because of redirection initiatives and local policies could jeopardize the continued use of GIS technology and necessary equipment upgrades as the technology evolves. The University System of Georgia and the Georgia State Legislature are on record as being committed to providing its citizens with the means to compete in a technology driven future. Therefore, Geographic Information Systems technology at colleges and universities across the state should not only be maintained, but also fully supported as a viable academic and practical tool for learning, research, analysis, and innovation.

Current GIS departmental site licenses held at USG institutions:

Bainbridge College
  Business Affairs
  Plant Operations
Columbus State University
Fort Valley State University
  Geography
  History
  Political Science
  Agricultural Instruction (PLSCI)
Gainesville College
Gordon College
  Plant Operations
Georgia Institute of Technology
  City Planning
  Civil and Environmental Engineering
  Earth and Atmospheric Sciences
  Public Policy
  International Affairs
  Building Construction
  GTRI
  Facilities Office
Georgia State University
  Geography
  Geology
  Instructional Research Center
  Policy Studies
  Political Science
  Risk Management & Real Estate
Georgia Southern University
  Geography
  Geology
Georgia Southwestern State University
  Geology
  Physics
Kennesaw State University
  Sociology
  Anthropology
  Geography
  Burruss Institute
State University of West Georgia
  Biology
  Geography
  Geology
  Information Technology Services
  Geosciences

Valdosta State University
  Physics
  Astronomy
  Geosciences
University of Georgia
  Agriculture and Applied Economics
  Anthropology
  Artificial Intelligence
  Arts & Science
  Architectural Planning
  Biological & Agricultural Engineering
  Botany
  College of Education
  Coastal Plains Experiment Station
  Crop & Soil Sciences
  Economics
  Ecology
  Engineering
  Environmental Design
  Facilities Planning
  Family & Consumer Sciences
  J.W. Fanning Institute
  Forestry
  Geography
  Housing & Consumer Economics
  Institute of Government
  Institutional Research & Planning
  Information Technology Outreach
    Services
  Journalism
  Marine Institute
  Marine Sciences
  NESPAL
  Office of Information Technology
  Office of Legal Affairs
  Real Estate
  Recreation & Leisure Studies
  SANREM CRSP / International
    Agriculture
  Savannah River Ecology Lab
  Terry College of Business
  UCNS
  University Architects
  Veterinary Medicine