

7-14-16 RECOMMENDATIONS (DISCUSSION AGENDA)

RECOMMENDATIONS PRESENTED AT PRIOR CIC MEETINGS NEEDING FURTHER DISCUSSION

OWG 4: Business:

(reviewed & NOT supported by Abiodun Ojemakinde and Tom Ormond):

(reviewed & supported by Elizabeth Perkins NOT supported by Funke Fontenot):

Recommends that MATH 1001 serve as a prerequisite for ECON 2105 and 2106. Additionally students must have exited ENGL 0989 or have test scores high enough to place directly into co-requisite remediation:

A.Ojemakinde: Disagree - Econ 2105/2106 should have no prerequisite (as it is, currently, at ASU). Though basic arithmetic is required, Econ 2105/2106 may have Math 1001 OR 1101 as prerequisite. Since majority of students don't take ENGL 0989, requiring that as a prerequisite will be problematic for electronic registration when the system could not find ENGL 0989 in the students' record. Simply put, ENGL 0989 should not be a prerequisite.

T. Ormond DON'T AGREE – NEED TO ADD A MORE SUBSTANTIAL RATIONALE FOR ADDITION OF PREQUISITES.

Currently, different prerequisites exist for these courses at each institution. As these courses may be added to the core curriculum, they cannot have “hidden prerequisites” that might preclude students from being able to take them. Area A math will allow for MATH 1001 as the lowest level course offered (to our knowledge), which will open up ECON courses for students in any major, though business majors are the primary audience. We further recommend that this change if approved be shared with the General Education OWG.

Response from E. Perkins (OWG Co-Chair, DSC):

1. ASU currently does have a pre-requisite for ECON 2105 and 2106, and that pre-req, as listed in the only version of a catalog that could be found for ASU, is MATH 1111. That course is a higher-level course and therefore more exclusionary course than MATH 1001. Dr. Ojemakinde's first claim is incorrect, which provided incorrect information to Dr. Ormond, whose objection to the addition of pre-requisites to a course without them is based upon incorrect information. Below is the information received from the 2015-2016 list of course descriptions at ASU (page 23):

- a. ECON 2105 - Principles of Macroeconomics (3): Introduces students to concepts that will enable them to understand and analyze economic aggregates and evaluate economic policies. Prerequisite: MATH 1111 or 1111A. Offered: Fall, Spring and Summer.
 - b. ECON 2106 - Principles of Microeconomics (3): Introduces students to concepts that will enable them to understand and analyze the structure and performance of the market economy. Prerequisite: MATH 1111 or 1111A. Offered: Fall, Spring and Summer.
2. The recommendation should actually read "...MATH 1001 or higher math serve..." MATH 1001 is currently the lowest-level credit-bearing course. This recommendation was created to *increase* access to the course, not to limit it. Currently, DSC requires MATH 1001 (again, the lowest-level credit-bearing course) and ASU requires MATH 1111. Because not all students take MATH 1111, the current pre-req in the ASU catalog is exclusionary of students. The OWG faculty members (who happen to teach ECON and agreed with this pre-req) did want students to have a basic understanding of mathematical concepts before attempting to take the course. Regardless, a student should never be set up for failure just to increase access, and if the faculty who teach the course and assess the students feel like MATH 1001 at a minimum should be required, I defer to their judgment. Also, I am very confused as to why the disagreement statement would begin with noting that no pre-reqs should be had and then followed up with a statement that they should have a pre-req?
3. When determining if a student meets the standards and pre-reqs to take a course, Banner searches for SAT, ACT, and COMPASS scores; SOATEST codes; major codes; and previous classes. If the course is entered correctly in Banner, the registration problem will not exist. In fact, all or nearly all of our courses in the core curriculum and transfer program are set up and coded in this way, as we do have a large LS population. **A student does not have to take and complete a course for it to serve in a pre-requisite function, but if learning support students should not be in a course, the pre-requisite should be listed.** Upon closer examination, you will see that the recommendation actually states "or have test scores high enough to place directly into co-requisite remediation." In other words, this pre-requisite as entered in Banner would include a C or higher for ENGL 0989; SAT, ACT, or COMPASS scores high enough to not require foundational learning support English/reading; or LSE/LSR codes of 4 or higher in SOATEST as the full and complete pre-requisite (and, of course, a passing grade in MATH 1001 or higher if the information above is rectified).

The recommendation should actually read "...MATH 1001 or higher math serve..." MATH 1001 is currently the lowest-level credit-bearing course. This recommendation was created to increase access to the course, not to limit it. Currently, DSC requires MATH 1001 (again, the lowest-level credit-bearing course) and ASU requires MATH 1111. Because not all students take MATH 1111, the current pre-req in the ASU catalog is exclusionary of students. The OWG faculty members (who happen to teach ECON and agreed with this pre-req) did want students to have a basic understanding of mathematical concepts before

attempting to take the course. Regardless, a student should never be set up for failure just to increase access, and if the faculty who teach the course and assess the students feel like MATH 1001 at a minimum should be required, I defer to their judgment.

FF: Reason: Pre-requisites serve the function of preparing students for more advanced skills needed for the course(s) to which they are attached. They are “lower division courses required by the degree program; courses that are pre-requisites to major courses at higher levels” (<http://core.usg.edu/uploads/CorePolicy2009-09-23.pdf>)

A review of different institutional practices show that some require MATH 1101 or its equivalent as a pre-requisite (University of Alabama –MATH 100 or equivalent) but many others do not (within the USG system-GC). The question is whether the prerequisite proposed serves any real purpose of providing some of the foundational competencies needed to succeed in ECON 2105 and 2106. In this case, the OWG is suggesting a prerequisite--MATH 1001 that would supposedly “open up ECON courses for students of any major” as opposed to the MATH 1101. The logic seems to be, “*we want a prerequisite, not because it provides the foundational knowledge necessary to succeed in ECON 2015 and 2016, but if we must have one, then we will settle for MATH 1001.*” My reservation is not whether or not we need a prerequisite, but that the rationale for doing so seems at odds with the function that a prerequisite serves.

EMGP: APPROVED – (I did write the lengthy response). However, the recommendation should read “MATH 1001 or higher math.”

OWG 7: Math:

(reviewed & supported by Abiodun Ojemakinde & Tom Ormond):

ORIGINAL RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Recommends implementing the following changes to current DSC classes:

- **Discontinue CSCI 2200 – *Internet Technologies***
- **Discontinue CSCI 2500 – *Discrete Structures***
- **For COPR/CSCI 2235 – *Database Management Systems***
 - Discontinue cross-list as CSCI 2235
 - Update course title to reflect focus on healthcare fields such as *Database Management for Health Sciences* (actual title TBD):

CSCI 2200 is a low-enrollment class not required in any program of study. It has no equivalent class at ASU.

CSCI 2500 is an upper-level class at ASU (CSCI 3111). The upper-level class will remain. Database is an upper-level class at ASU (CSCI 3132) but a lower-level database class is necessary for Darton's Health Information Technology two-year degree. The course title change is to prevent confusion with the upper-level ASU class. COPR 2235 will be a non-transfer class.

Reason for Return: Discontinue CSCI 2500 – Discrete Structures is this “best practices” and in concert with USG Area F?

Committee Response: To clarify, the course number CSCI 2500 is being discontinued, the course itself will remain using the current ASU designation for Discrete Structures, CSCI 3132. The course was designed for the 3000 level identification and is utilized in various degree pathways as a required or elective upper level course

ORIGINAL RECOMMENDATIONS:

2. Recommends implementing the follow course change at ASU:

- **Discontinue MATH 1101: Mathematical Modeling**
- **Include MATH 1001: Quantitative Reasoning:**

The BoR requires each USG institution to offer either MATH 1001 or MATH 1101 as an alternative to the college algebra pathway, specifically designed for non-STEM programs of study. The committee agrees that having a common alternative math pathway to algebra is preferable over having two non-algebra pathways.

MATH 1101: Mathematical Modeling has low enrollment with very few sections available at ASU. MATH 1001: Quantitative Reasoning has high enrollment with over a dozen sections each regular semester and about half as many in the summer sessions. Foundations for Quantitative Reasoning (MATH 0987) and Support for Quantitative Reasoning (MATH 0999) have already been developed and implemented.

Reason for Return: Discontinue MATH 1101: Mathematical Modeling-will still be available via eCore. How will that be addressed if discontinued?

Committee Response: A new recommendation (recommendation 14) is being created to further address MATH 1101. The class will still be available as an eCore only course for students that have no LS Math requirements. i.e. There are no LS courses available on eCore so a student could not take this course unless they place into it directly. Note: The course is not a recommended pathway unless no other options are available for a given student, due to the increased costs associated with eCore classes and the lack of on institutional support for the course.

ORIGINAL RECOMMENDATIONS:

4. Recommends implementing the following common prerequisite designations:

- **MATH 2411 – Introduction to Statistics**
Prerequisites: MATH 1001, 1111 or 1113
- **MATH 2111 – Linear Algebra**
Prerequisites: MATH 1211 (Calculus I):

MATH 2411 prerequisites reflect current USG recognized mathematics pathways. MATH 2111 prerequisites reflect common course content taught in Linear Algebra, the removal of Calculus II as a prerequisite is to reflect that multi-variable calculus is not required for the successful completion of Linear Algebra.

Reason for Return: Need MATH 1101 as prerequisite to MATH 2411 – Introduction to Statistics Prerequisites: MATH 1001, 1111 or 1113 if still available via eCore?

Committee Response: Change MATH 2411 prerequisites to: “MATH [1001](#), [1111](#), [1113](#) or approved equivalent.” A line will be added to the course description of MATH 1101: Mathematical Modeling – eCore only to indicate that MATH 1101 is an approved course equivalent for MATH 1001. MATH 1101 will not be offered outside of eCore and it is not an available pathway for students with a LS Math requirement.

[OWG 7: Math:](#)
[\(reviewed & supported by Funke Fontenot concerns/suggestions from Elizabeth Perkins\):](#)

6. Recommends incorporating the following course descriptions for all math courses 2000 level:

Courses Included in Recommendation:

- MATH 0987, 0989, 0997, 0999 (Learning Support Math)
- MATH 1101 – eCore Only, 1401 – eCore Only and 1501 – eCore Only (eCore Collegiate Courses)
- MATH 1001, 1111, 1113, 1211, 2008, 2111, 2112, 2213 and 2411 (Collegiate Courses)

Note: The recommendation for the course description of MATH 2008 has already been submitted and approved. The description is included in this recommendation in order to provide a complete list for all math courses through the 2000 level:

Math Course Descriptions

1. MATH 0987 Foundations for Quantitative Reasoning

Description: A course designed to help students learn the basics of algebra and other topics necessary for Math 1001 - Quantitative Skills and Reasoning; including the study of elementary algebra, real number sets, set operations, linear equations, and introductory probability and statistics.

Prerequisites: None. **Corequisites:** None. **Offered:** All semesters.

EMGP: DISCUSSION: This description does not line up with the one presented for 0989 in that it does not list the exit requirements, need for co-req after completion, etc. The 0989 description is more comprehensive and clear for students. Additionally, the description for 1001 does not include the word “algebraic.” Does this course need to include this information if these skills are not present in the 1001 description (they may be needed and/or taught – just asking for clarification). Also, it should likely be added that a student may only have two attempts in the course. Finally, for full catalog information, please provide lecture-lab-credit hours.

2. MATH 0989 Foundations for College Algebra

Description: Math 0989 is the study of elementary algebra, which will include the study of signed numbers, linear equations, polynomials and factoring. This course is a first semester developmental course which will prepare the student for Math 1111 and its co-requisite course Math 0999. After successful completion of MATH 0989 with an A, B, or C, students will be required to register for MATH 1111 and MATH 0999 in their next semester of enrollment.

Prerequisites: None. **Corequisites:** None. **Offered:** All Semesters

EMGP: APPROVED –(However, it should likely be added that a student may only have two attempts in the course. Also, for full catalog information, please provide lecture-lab-credit hours).

3. MATH 0997 Support for Quantitative Reasoning

Description: This course provides an introduction to the algebraic concepts and techniques necessary for MATH 1001. This course will focus on additional support for MATH 1001 assignments and will serve as a continuation of the information covered in the MATH 1001 classroom. The topics covered include performing basic operations with rational and real numbers, representing mathematical relationships symbolically, set notation, evaluating expressions, plotting and graphing in the Cartesian coordinate system, using percentages, and solving linear equations.

Prerequisites: MATH 0987 or required scores for co-requisite remediation placement.

Corequisites: MATH 1001.

Offered: All Semesters.

EMGP: APPROVED – However, for full catalog information, please provide lecture-lab-credit hours. Additionally, the description for 1001 does not include the word “algebraic.” Does this course need to include this information if these skills are not present in the 1001 description (they may be needed and/or taught – just asking for clarification).

4. MATH 0999 Support for College Algebra

Description: This course provides an introduction to the algebraic concepts and techniques necessary for MATH 1111. This course will focus on additional support for MATH 1111 assignments and will serve as a continuation of the information covered in the MATH 1111 classroom. The topics covered include performing basic operations with rational, real, and complex numbers, simplifying expressions, solving algebraic equations (linear, quadratic, polynomial, exponential, logarithmic), factoring polynomials, operating with rational and radical expressions and equations. Appropriate applications with the graphing calculator will be included. A TI-83 Plus or TI-84 graphic display calculator is required.

Prerequisite: MATH 0989 or required scores for co-requisite placement.

Corequisite: MATH 1111.

Offered: All Semesters

EMGP: APPROVED –However, for full catalog information, please provide lecture-lab-credit hours.

5. MATH 1001 Quantitative Reasoning

Description: This course emphasizes quantitative reasoning skills needed for informed citizens to understand the world around them. Topics include logic, basic probability, data analysis, and modeling from data. A TI 83 or 84 graphing calculator is required for this course. Students receiving credit for MATH 1001 cannot receive credit for MATH 1101 or 1111.

Prerequisite: MATH 0099, MATH 0987, MATH 0989 or satisfactory math scores to place into co-requisite remediation or higher.

Offered: All Semesters

EMGP: However, for full catalog information, please provide lecture-lab-credit hours.

6. MATH 1101 Introduction to Mathematical Modeling – eCore only

Description: This course is an introduction to mathematical modeling using graphical, numerical, symbolic, and verbal techniques to describe and explore real-world data and phenomena. Emphasis is on the use of elementary functions to investigate and analyze applied problems and questions, supported by the use of appropriate technology, and on effective communication of quantitative concepts and results. Students receiving credit for MATH 1101 cannot receive credit for MATH 1001 or 1111.

Prerequisites: Satisfactory math placement score.

Offered: All Semesters

EMGP: Addressed in a recommendation above.

7. MATH 1111 College Algebra

Description: This course provides an in-depth study of the properties of algebraic, exponential and logarithmic functions as needed for calculus. Emphasis is on using algebraic and graphical techniques for solving problems involving linear, quadratic, piece-wise defined, rational, polynomial, exponential, and logarithmic functions. A TI 83 or 84 graphing calculator is required. Students receiving credit for MATH 1111 cannot receive credit for MATH 1001 or MATH 1101.

Prerequisite: MATH 0099, MATH 0989 or satisfactory math scores to place into corequisite remediation or higher.

Offered: All semesters.

EMGP: APPROVED –However, for full catalog information, please provide lecture-lab-credit hours.

8. MATH 1113 Precalculus

Description: This course is an intensive study of the basic functions needed for the study of calculus. Topics include algebraic, functional, and graphical techniques for solving problems with algebraic, exponential, logarithmic, and trigonometric functions and their inverses. A TI 83 or 84 graphing calculator is required.

Prerequisite: MATH 1111 or one year of high school trigonometry and satisfactory math placement score or consent of Division Dean.

Offered: All Semesters

EMGP: APPROVED –However, for full catalog information, please provide lecture-lab-credit hours. Also, I would clarify what this satisfactory score is—it can mean different things to different people, and that does not create fairness or consistency for students, and it can also cause problems with adequate preparation.

9. MATH 1211 Calculus I

Description: This is a beginning course in calculus. Topics include differentiation and integration of algebraic and trigonometric functions and applications of differentiation and integration. A TI 83 or 84 graphing calculator is required.

Prerequisite: MATH 1113

Offered: All Semesters

EMGP: DISCUSSION: While I understand that eCore has a different number and description, the name is the same. This should be reconciled to be one name/number system or use different names.

10. MATH 1401 Introduction to Statistics – eCore only

Description: The course is a course in basic statistics. Topics include descriptive statistics, probability, distributions, hypothesis testing, inferences, correlation, and regression.

Prerequisites: Math 1001 Quantitative Reasoning, Math 1101 Mathematical Modeling, Math 1111 College Algebra, or Math 1113 Precalculus. **Offered:** All Semesters

EMGP: DISCUSSION: While I understand that eCore has a different number and description, the name is the same. This should be reconciled to be one name/number system or use different names.

11. MATH 1501 Calculus – eCore only

Description: Topics to include functions, limits, continuity, the derivative, antidifferentiation, the definite integral, and applications.

Prerequisites: Math 1113 - Pre-calculus or its equivalent. **Offered:** All Semesters

EMGP: DISCUSSION: While I understand that eCore has a different number and description, the name is the same. This should be reconciled to be one name/number system or use different names.

12. MATH 2008 Foundations of Numbers and Operations

Description: This course is an Area F introductory mathematics course for teacher education majors. This course will emphasize the understanding and use of the major concepts of number and operations. As a general theme, strategies of problem solving will be used and discussed in the context of various topics.

Prerequisites: MATH 1001, MATH 1111, MATH 1113 or approved equivalent.

Offered: All Semesters

EMGP: ADDRESSED ABOVE

13. MATH 2111 Linear Algebra

Description: This course concentrates on operations with vectors, matrices, systems of linear equations, determinants, vector spaces, linear transformations, eigenvalues and eigenvectors.

Prerequisite: MATH 1211.

Offered: Fall and Spring.

EMGP: APPROVED –However, for full catalog information, please provide lecture-lab-credit hours.

14. MATH 2112 Calculus II

Description: This course is a continuation of Calculus I. Topics include differentiation and integration of transcendental functions, techniques and applications of integration, improper integrals, parametric equations, sequences and series.

Prerequisite: MATH 1211.

Offered: Fall and Spring.

EMGP: APPROVED –However, for full catalog information, please provide lecture-lab-credit hours.

15. MATH 2213 Calculus III

Description: Topics include vectors, the calculus of vector-valued functions, polar coordinates, spherical coordinates, function of several variables, directional derivatives, Lagrange multipliers, multiple integrals and applications of multiple integrals.

Prerequisite: MATH 2212.

Offered: Fall and Spring.

EMGP: DISCUSSION: The pre-req of 2212 must be a typo? Or the Calc II course is listed with a wrong number?

16. MATH 2411 Introduction to Statistics

Description: This is an elementary course in descriptive and inferential statistics. Areas covered include frequency distributions, graphing techniques, the normal distribution, descriptive measures, probability, hypothesis testing, correlation, linear regression, and confidence intervals. A TI 83 or 84 graphing calculator is required.

Prerequisites: MATH 1001, MATH 1111, MATH 1113 or consent of Division Dean.

Offered: All semesters.

EMGP: DISCUSSION: While I understand that eCore has a different number and description, the name is the same. This should be reconciled to be one name/number system or use different names.

[OWG 9: Science:](#)

[\(reviewed & supported by Abiodun Ojemakinde and Tom Ormond\):](#)

ORIGINAL RECOMMENDATIONS:

Recommends that Chemistry courses common to both institutions have the following course numbers, names, and descriptions:

CHEM 1151K, Survey of Chemistry I, “This course is the first in a two-semester sequence covering elementary principles of general and organic chemistry and biochemistry designed for allied health profession majors. Topics to be covered include elements and compounds, chemical equations, nomenclature, and molecular geometry. Laboratory exercises will supplement the lecture material.

Prerequisite(s): Completion or exemption of all learning support and English requirements; MATH 0099, MATH 0987, MATH 0989, or satisfactory math scores to place into co-requisite remediation or higher.”

CHEM 1211K, General Chemistry I, “First course in a two-semester sequence covering the fundamental principles and applications of chemistry designed for science plans of study. Topics to be covered include composition of matter,

nomenclature, stoichiometry, solution chemistry, gas laws, thermochemistry, quantum theory and electronic structure, periodic relations, and bonding. Laboratory exercises supplement the lecture material.

Prerequisites: Completion or exemption of all learning support requirements.

Corequisites: MATH 1111 or satisfactory math scores to place into MATH 1112 or higher.”

CHEM 1212K, General Chemistry II, “Second course in a two-semester sequence covering the fundamental principles and applications of chemistry designed for science plans of study. Topics include molecular structure, intermolecular forces, properties of solutions, reaction kinetics and equilibria, thermodynamics, and electro-and nuclear chemistry. Laboratory exercises supplement the lecture material.

Prerequisite: CHEM 1211K.”

CHEM 2301K, Organic Chemistry I, “This course will cover the stereochemistry, properties, as well as methods of preparation and mechanisms of the principle classes of carbon compounds. Laboratory instruction will include basic techniques for preparation, purification and identification of organic compounds. Laboratory exercises supplement the lecture material.

Prerequisite: CHEM 1212K.”

CHEM 2302K, Organic Chemistry II, “This is a continuation of CHEM 2301K, a systematic study of the reactivity of organic compounds as well as their identification by spectroscopy. Laboratory exercises supplement the lecture material.

Prerequisite: CHEM 2301K.”

NOTE: All courses will remain 4 credit hours:

Course numbers, names and catalog descriptions must be normalized. These recommendations have been reviewed and agreed upon by Chemistry faculty at ASU and DSC.

Reason for Return: CHEM 1211K and CHEM 1212K concern with eCore and BoR policy 2.4.10

REVISED RECOMMENDATION:

[\(reviewed & supported by Funke Fontenot and Elizabeth Perkins \(with comments\)\):](#)

Recommends that Chemistry courses common to both institutions have the following course numbers, names, and descriptions:

CHEM 1151K, Principles of Chemistry I, “This course is the first in a two-semester sequence covering elementary principles of general and organic chemistry and biochemistry designed for allied health profession majors. Topics to be covered include elements and compounds, chemical equations, nomenclature, and molecular geometry. Laboratory exercises will supplement the lecture material.

Prerequisite(s): Completion or exemption of all learning support and English requirements; MATH 0099, MATH 0987, MATH 0989, or satisfactory math scores to place into co-requisite remediation or higher.”

DISCUSSION: If trying to fix according to eCore, Principles of Chemistry I is CHEM 1211K, not 1151K.

CHEM 1211K, Principles of Chemistry II, “First course in a two-semester sequence covering the fundamental principles and applications of chemistry designed for science plans of study. Topics to be covered include composition of matter, nomenclature, stoichiometry, solution chemistry, gas laws, thermochemistry, quantum theory and electronic structure, periodic relations, and bonding. Laboratory exercises supplement the lecture material.

Prerequisites: Completion or exemption of all learning support requirements.

Corequisites: MATH 1111 or satisfactory math scores to place into MATH 1112 or higher.”

DISCUSSION: If trying to fix according to eCore, Principles of Chemistry II is CHEM 1212K, not 1211K. Also, this pre-req does not exist any longer according to the MATH recommendations above. It would need to say 1113.

CHEM 1212K, General Chemistry II, “Second course in a two-semester sequence covering the fundamental principles and applications of chemistry designed for science plans of study. Topics include molecular structure, intermolecular forces, properties of solutions, reaction kinetics and equilibria, thermodynamics, and electro-and nuclear chemistry. Laboratory exercises supplement the lecture material.

Prerequisite: CHEM 1211K.”

DISCUSSION: If trying to fix according to eCore, CHEM 1212K is Principles of Chemistry II, not General Chemistry II.

CHEM 2301K, Organic Chemistry I, “This course will cover the stereochemistry, properties, as well as methods of preparation and mechanisms of the principle classes of carbon compounds. Laboratory instruction will include basic techniques for preparation, purification and identification of organic compounds. Laboratory exercises supplement the lecture material.

Prerequisite: CHEM 1212K.”

EMGP: APPROVED –However, for full catalog information, please provide lecture-lab-credit hours.

CHEM 2302K, Organic Chemistry II, “This is a continuation of CHEM 2301K, a systematic study of the reactivity of organic compounds as well as their identification by spectroscopy. Laboratory exercises supplement the lecture material.

Prerequisite: CHEM 2301K.”

APPROVED – EMGP. However, for full catalog information, please provide lecture-lab-credit hours.

NOTE: All courses will remain 4 credit hours:

Course numbers, names and catalog descriptions must be normalized. These recommendations have been reviewed and agreed upon by Chemistry faculty at ASU and DSC

OWG 9: Science:

(reviewed & supported by Tom Ormond NOT supported by Abiodun Ojemakinde):

Recommends that all laboratory science courses have the lecture and laboratory portions consolidated into a single course:

Laboratory science courses should be limited in enrollment numbers based on laboratory capacity, with the same students participating in lectures and labs for any particular section scheduled. This will allow the instructor the flexibility to coordinate the lab content with the lecture content at any given point in the semester. NOTE: This is how courses are currently scheduled at DSC, and how the faculty at ASU would prefer to have it.

Decision – OJ: Recommendation is not supported, because it is not cost effective; lab capacity (usually no more than 25) will limit the lecture class size, thus more course sections and instructors will be needed. Also, many transfer articulations require separate lecture and laboratory credits. This proposal would make transfer articulation more difficult and create unnecessary burden for students to repeat coursework they had previously completed or students not having adequate coverage or exposure to required course contents.

OWG 11: Graduate Admissions:

(reviewed & supported by Elizabeth Perkins NOT supported by Funke Fontenot):

Recommends that the Provost (permanent) engage the campus and communities in the region in academic strategic planning to identify new degree programs that promote the quality of life and fill unmet needs and guide the university in terms of the timelines and priorities for implementing these programs:

Through informal discussion, the OWG identified several educational degree programs which are consistent with these needs and provide opportunities for graduates. However, the OWG believes that a more systematic approach will ensure quality programs, facilitate accreditation, and promote fiscal responsibility.

FF: NOT Supported. While there is a need to strategically determine areas of need and growth in our graduate programs, I am not sure the recommendation is the most efficient way to do that. There are many data sources that can help inform this decision, including the Carl Vinson Institute study prepared for the consolidation.

OWG 14: Online Education:

(reviewed & NOT supported by Abiodun Ojemakinde and Tom Ormond):

ORIGINAL RECOMMENDATION:

Recommends the new University maintain an online website that is connected to, but distinct from, the overall University website to highlight online programs, courses, policies, and distance learner support services:

This is best practice for recruitment of distance learners and will provide a centralized location for information and resources required by federal law and SACSCOC standards for all campus stakeholders.

A. Ojemakinde Disagree. Online should have a webpage within the University's website, with the same feel, look, and navigation as other units on the University's website.

Ormond Agree: Does this mean that the online website looks different than other programs across the university website? Shouldn't all programs have the same look, while still being unique according to the specific area?

REVISED RECOMMENDATION:

(reviewed & supported by Funke Fontenot and Elizabeth Perkins):

Recommends that the new University maintain an online website that is consistent with the overall University website, but that is tailored to online learning to highlight online programs and courses from all colleges, distance education policies, and distance learner support services:

This is best practice for recruitment of distance learners and will provide a centralized location for information and resources required by federal law and SACSCOC standards for all campus stakeholders.

OWG 16: Advising, Tutoring, & Mentoring:
(reviewed & supported by G. “Pat” Ridgeway, NOT supported by Paul Bryant):

ORIGINAL RECOMMENDATION:

1. Recommends mandatory and on-going online and on-campus professional development training for all professional and faculty academic advisors:

In effort to minimize advising errors and to ensure that students are advised strategically, consistently, and accurately, professional and faculty advisors must be apprised about modifications in policies, practices, programs, and curricula.

I do not concur with this recommendation due to the “mandatory and on-going” requirement.

REVISED RECOMMENDATION:

(reviewed & supported by Danette Saylor and Elizabeth Perkins):

1. Recommends online and on-campus professional development training for all professional and faculty academic advisors:

The committee recommends annual professional development training for all professional and faculty academic advisors so that students may be advised strategically, consistently, and accurately to persist towards graduation.

ORIGINAL RECOMMENDATION:

2. Recommends that the University’s students be afforded opportunities for the following mentoring relationships: student to student (student clubs and organizations, program peers), professional staff to student (academic advisors, servant leadership, and career services staff), faculty to student (research projects and learning communities), administrator to student mentoring (shadowing opportunities), alumni to students, and community/business leaders to students:

Mentoring relationships can enhance a student’s transition from high school to college, improve program of study recruitment and retention efforts, and complement preparation for graduate studies and/or an intended career by contributing to his or her knowledge about and experience in the field.

I do not concur with this recommendation. As written, it is too specific. A more board recommendation would allow for more autonomous professional oversight and creativity.

REVISED RECOMMENDATION:

(reviewed & supported by Danette Saylor and Elizabeth Perkins):

2. Recommends that the University's students be afforded opportunities for student to student, professional staff to student, faculty to student, administrator to student, alumni to student, and/or community/business leaders to student mentoring relationships:

Mentoring relationships can enhance transition from high school to college; improve program of study recruitment and retention efforts; and complement preparation for graduate studies and/or an intended career by contributing to one's knowledge and experience about the field.

OWG 19: General Education and Core Curriculum:

(reviewed & supported by Funke Fontenot concern from Elizabeth Perkins):

Recommends that the Student Learning Outcome (SLO) for Area D-Natural Science, Mathematics/Technology for the new ASU read as follows:

Science: Students will demonstrate an understanding of the physical or biological perspectives of the universe using the scientific method, mathematical concepts, or logical reasoning.

Math/Technology: Students will apply technological or mathematical concepts using verbal, numerical, graphical or symbolic forms:

The new SLO is a combination of the current SLOs from each institution and better meets the needs of our students.

EMGP: DISCUSSION: At the last Gen Ed OWG meeting I attended, a conversation was had to potentially increase the number of hours in Area B to 5, which would put the number of hours in Area D at 10. If this is the case, it would likely be needed to have one overall SLO for Area D, rather than two distinct offerings. The way that Area D is crafted is often different from other areas, particularly as there are often options for STEM versus non-STEM majors. I would recommend that the OWG review the structure of the proposed Area D before finalizing the SLO. Of course, if it decides that the Area D will definitely have a science requirement separate from a math/technology requirement, this will work well.

OWG 22: Faculty Credentials, Rosters, Workloads, Pay:

(reviewed & NOT supported by Tom Ormond Abiodun Ojemakinde.):

1. Recommends that the current DSC Grievance Policy and Procedure be the basis for the Grievance Policy and Procedure at the new ASU:

DSC has an existing policy that can easily be modified to fit the new ASU.

A. Ojemakinde What considerations were given to other policies in the USG's institutions?

T. Ormond Agree But why? Need more explanation.

2. Recommends that the new faculty senate form a committee to develop a new faculty evaluation instrument(s) based on the existing DSC faculty evaluation:

DSC recently developed a new faculty evaluation instrument after much research across the United States. This instrument can be adapted to the different needs of all of the colleges.

A. Ojemakinde Disagree. While Faculty Senate may provide general guidelines on faculty evaluation, faculty evaluation should be initiated, developed, and driven at the college level in order to accommodate peculiarities of disciplines, accreditation requirements, cultures/practices of each college, etc. Faculty evaluations developed by the colleges should be reviewed and approved by the Provost.

T. Ormond Agree But college's/schools should be included in the development of the system

[OWG 22: Faculty Credentials, Rosters, Workloads, Pay: \(reviewed & supported by Tom Ormond NOT supported by Abiodun Ojemakinde,\):](#)

Recommends that an ad hoc Faculty Senate committee and other appropriate legal and governance officials, including EEO, be assembled to modify the current policy and procedure especially to ensure currency. It should then be submitted for approval by appropriate shared governance bodies:

DSC has an existing policy that can easily be modified to fit the new ASU.

A.Ojemakinde The rationale does not fit the recommendation.

[OWG 22: Faculty Credentials, Rosters, Workloads, Pay: \(reviewed & supported by Abiodun Ojemakinde, NOT supported by Tom Ormond\):](#)

1. Recommends that workload models at new ASU need to be flexible:

Different departments will have different needs.

T. Ormond Not sure what this recommendation means. Need more clarification.

2. Recommends that specific workloads will be determined at the department level:

Different departments will have different needs.

T. Ormond Not sure what this recommendation means. Need more clarification.

OWG 22: Faculty Credentials, Rosters, Workloads, Pay:
(reviewed & supported by Elizabeth Perkins NOT supported by
Funke Fontenot):

1. Recommends that the new faculty senate form a committee to develop a new faculty evaluation instrument with equal representation from each college within the New ASU based on the existing DSC faculty evaluation:

DSC recently developed a new faculty evaluation instrument after much research across the United States. This instrument can be adapted to the different needs of all of the colleges.

FF: The part of the recommendation suggesting that the new faculty evaluation instrument be “based on the existing DSC faculty evaluation” is NOT Supported. Given the different expectations for scholarship, teaching and research between the two institutions, more will need to be done to reconcile the respective evaluation instruments.

OWG 24: Promotion/Tenure Policy & Faculty Development:
(reviewed & NOT supported by Funke Fontenot discussion from
Elizabeth Perkins):

3. Recommends that the new promotion & tenure policy and evaluation instruments should be reviewed annually by the respective college tenure and promotion committee as well as a University wide committee:

The tenure and promotion policy and tools should be reviewed annually and updated as appropriate by college and university wide committees in order to keep up to date with best practices and emerging trends in the respective fields.

FF: While review of policy helps ensure that it is up to date and in line with best practices, doing so every year is unduly burdensome and unrealistic. I suggest “periodic review.”

EMGP: DISCUSSION: annual review seems a bit much and may cause too much turmoil if not only reviewed but also changed every year. Also, would the faculty have the option to be evaluated based on the instrument under which they started?

OWG 26: Testing Center:
(reviewed & supported by Elizabeth Perkins NOT supported by
Funke Fontenot):

1. Recommends that the new University investigate offering the appropriate admission exams at off-site locations such as High Schools for MOWR and other populations:

The working group believes that offering admission examinations at off-site locations will increase the University's community presence and ultimately student enrollment.

FF: NOT Supported. OWG should address the logistics of this recommendation/

NOTE FROM RANDY: I believe Funke's suggestion goes to the "Recommendation-to Reality" /implementation phase of consolidation.

2. Recommends that the new University investigates the prudence of requiring pre-scheduling for all exams by students and community members alike. Further, it is recommend that if scheduling is deemed necessary, that exam scheduling software be vetted to ensure that it is not only user friendly, but that appropriate reporting data may also be extracted:

Data should be gathered on student location and need and compared to existing testing infrastructures on each campus to determine if prescheduling should be required for all campuses. Appropriate scheduling software should be utilized (at no cost to ASU students for ASU exams) that will not only provide a user-friendly interface, but which will also provide a means to extract statistical data.

FF: NOT Supported. Is the suggestion that walk-ins become the norm? Prescheduling makes for good planning on both the part of the student and the university.

NOTE FROM RANDY: I believe Funke's suggestion goes to the "Recommendation-to Reality" /implementation phase of consolidation.

4. Recommends that the primary testing center location for *specialized and community* testing be at the current Albany State University campus:

ASU currently offers numerous specialized tests, which require specialized software and dedicated computers. Processes and procedures are in place to accommodate this type of testing and the community is already familiar with testing at this campus location for these exams. The working group does believe that it would be beneficial to the new University to explore offering the SAT/ACT at both campus locations to accommodate as many potential students as possible.

FF: NOT Supported—rationale inconsistent with recommendation that “it would be beneficial to the new University to explore offering the SAT/ACT at both campus locations to accommodate as many potential students as possible.”

OWG 26: Testing Center:
(reviewed & supported by Funke Fontenot discussion from Elizabeth Perkins):

3. Recommends that current and future satellite locations (such as Cordele) offer proctored testing for ASU students and for non-ASU students as time and space allow:

This is a customer service/student support issue. Proctored testing offered at satellite locations allow students to save money and time while participating in online or hybrid courses that require proctored exams.

DISCUSSION: In addition to time and space, it will also be important that the financial implications be examined, as personnel costs are associated with proctored testing. Many satellite locations are staffed by a single person who must serve as a proctor among several other duties simultaneously. It will be important that should this option be available that appropriate personnel are designated for this function to ensure that integrity of the examination.

OWG 75: Career Services:
(reviewed & NOT supported by Danette Saylor and Rocco Cappello):

ORIGINAL RECOMMENDATION:

1. Recommends that the Office of Career Services provide alumni career services at both campuses:

Both campuses recognize the importance of our alumni in student and employer development. Alumni can serve to assist both **campuses** in recruitment efforts. Alumni can also serve as points of contact or excellent resources for career exploration, internships, and employment.

Danette Saylor RESPONSE: NOT SUPPORT: There should be one centralized career services office that serves the needs of alumni, regardless of campus affiliation at the time of graduation. All of the aforementioned statements are true regarding the value of alumni in recruitment and career attainment efforts. However, this can be accomplished with one centralized office.

Rocco Cappello: Does not support- I agree with the recommendation; however, I think there are a number of logistical items that will need to be reviewed before moving forward with this.

- Where will funding come from? Will alumni affairs contribute to the budget of this office? Is that also a recommendation?
- Will there be a specific counselor in career services who works specifically for alumni or will these responsibilities be added to all counselors? I know we “cannot” discuss positions or create positions but this will impact where funding can come from.
- Will there be any cut off of alumni services? Or will we provide assistance no matter when they graduated?
- We are also talking about two separate things, finding jobs for alumni and using alumni to find positions.

REVISED RECOMMENDATION:

(reviewed & NOW supported by Danette Saylor and Rocco Cappello):

1. Recommends that the Office of Career Services provide alumni career services:

The University recognizes the importance of our alumni in student and employer development. Alumni can serve to assist in recruitment efforts and serve as points of contact or excellent resources for career exploration, internships, and employment.

ORIGINAL RECOMMENDATION:

2. Recommends that Career Services needs to be centrally located in a high traffic area on both campuses:

When Career Services are located in high traffic areas, students are more visually aware of the Office and more likely to visit and take advantage of the services.

Danette Saylor RESPONSE: NOT SUPPORT: There should be one centralized career services office that serves the needs of all ASU students. I agree that the location of career services should be located in a highly visible and high traffic area. However, there should be one location where professional career counselors can provide advising and support to students and alumni regardless of degree program. There is flexibility to offer programs, events, and activities on both campuses.

Rocco Cappello: Does Not Support – Would support with the amendment: “Career Services will have one central office in a location to be determined. In addition to this central office, there will be centrally located “satellite” offices in high traffic visible areas on all campuses in the New ASU. This would include smaller satellite campuses (i.e. Cordele, Sandersville etc...).

REVISED RECOMMENDATION:

(reviewed & NOW supported by Danette Saylor and Rocco Cappello):

2. Recommends that the Office of Career Services be located in a high traffic area:

When Career Services are located in high traffic areas, students are more visually aware of the Office and more likely to visit and take advantage of the services.