RECOMMENDATIONS PRESENTED AT PRIOR CIC MEETINGS NEEDING FURTHER DISCUSSION OR NOT SUPPORTED BY ONE FIRST LEVEL REVIEWER

OWG 4: Business:
(reviewed & concerns from Funke Fontenot and Kimberly Holmes):

2. **Recommends that prerequisites for BISE 2010 Fundamentals of Computer Applications be changed to read "READ 0099, ENGL 0099, ENGL 0989 or satisfactory English scores to place into co-requisite remediation or higher; MATH 0099, MATH 0987, MATH 0989 or satisfactory math scores to place into co-requisite remediation or higher":**

>   Currently ASU's BISE 2010 does not have prerequisites listed since few, if any, ASU students were in foundation-level learning support classes. The addition of the prerequisites above require that new ASU students must complete or exempt foundation-level remediation classes prior to taking BISE 2010. This is necessary to assure students have the skills to be successful in this class.

>   ➢ **Need clarification regarding research that supports the position that completion of these prereqs will sufficiently ensure that "students have the skills to be successful in this class". We want to be cognizant of avoiding unnecessary hurdles to timely progression and completion. FF and KH**

8. **Recommends continuing to offer the following current ASU and DSC programs at the new ASU:**

>   **UNDERGRADUATE**
>   • **Certificate in Legal Assistant/Paralegal**
>   • **Associate of Applied Science in Legal Assistant/Paralegal**
>   • **Bachelor of Applied Science in Technology Management**
>
>   • **Bachelor of Science Degree in Accounting**
>   • **Bachelor of Science Degree in Business Information Systems**
>   • **Bachelor of Science Degree in Management (Major – Business Management)**
>   • **Bachelor of Science Degree in Management (Major – Healthcare Management)**
>   • **Bachelor of Science Degree in Marketing**
>   • **Bachelor of Science Degree in Supply Chain and Logistics Management**

- **Minor in Business Administration (Non-Business Majors)**
- **Minor in Supply Chain and Logistics Management (Business majors only)**

GRADUATE
- **Master of Business Administration (Major – General MBA)**
- **Master of Business Administration (Major – Accounting)**
- **Master of Business Administration (Major – Healthcare)**
- **Master of Business Administration (Major – Supply Chain and Logistics Management)**
- **Master of Business Administration (Major – Public Administration):**

The listing includes certificates, degrees, and minors currently offered at DSC and ASU which are anticipated to have sufficient demand to continue at the new ASU.

➤ **As previously discussed with the Dean of Business, the legal assistant/paralegal areas of study are typically housed in Political Science/Public Administration rather than Colleges of Business, except where there is a separate Legal Studies unit. Therefore, we approve the recommendation except for inclusion of the Legal Assistant/Paralegal certificate and Associate degree. FF and KH**

10. **Recommends discontinuing the following programs:**

- **Bachelor of Applied Science with a Major in Fire Services Administration**
- **Bachelor of Applied Science with a Major in Supply Chain and Logistics Management:**

The first program has had no demand. The second has been replaced by a Bachelor of Science program.

➤ **Based on our inventory of credentials, the BAS in Fire Services Administration has already been deactivated. Deactivation of the BAS in SCLM is approved with the caveat that the program applies appropriate consideration to any enrolled students. FF and KH**

OWG 7: Math:
(reviewed & concerns from Funke Fontenot and Kimberly Holmes):

Recommends that the MATHCS department in the New ASU should be called the:

Department of Mathematics and Computing:

The committee examined three possible names to choose from.   They are:

(i)   Department of Mathematics and Computer Science,

(ii)   Department of Mathematics and Computing,

(iii)   Department of Mathematics and Computing Disciplines.

The committee discussed these options before taking a vote. The main problem identified with using the name of "Department of Mathematics and Computer Science" is that there are computing pathways/degree programs other than Computer Science.

By using the name "Department of Mathematics and Computing" we are representing all current and future programs which are housed in or supported by the department. Examples: Computer Information Systems and BIT.

> **Did the OWG consider other alternatives beyond the named three? Also, removing the "Science" from the title may have an unintended impact of discouraging persons who are more familiar with *Computer Science* and *STEM*. FF and KH**

OWG 8: Nursing & Health Sciences:
(reviewed & supported by Abiodun Ojemakinde & Tom Ormond):

ORIGINAL RECOMMENDATION:

1. **Recommends discontinuing the nursing satellite program in Sandersville:**

   This recommendation is to close the Sandersville satellite December 2017. The Sandersville Health Care Professional to RN (Bridge) program is located three hours away from the Darton main campus which has created issues with the ability to provide adequate oversight of this campus. The track's 2014 licensure exam pass rate was 63%, which led to an overall nursing program pass rate of 78%. This low rate triggered a Georgia Board of Nursing required program corrective action. Currently, there is no contract in place for this satellite program. Transitioning this Bridge program to our Cordele site will allow better access for students traveling I-75, increase oversight, and enable us to maximize use of the Cordele Center.

Returned to OWG for rewrite with new knowledge of program being transferred to a technical school.

REVISED RECOMMENDATION:
(reviewed & supported by Funke Fontenot and Kimberly Holmes):

Recommends discontinuing the nursing satellite bridge program in Sandersville and working with the Technical College System of Georgia to ensure continued service in that area of the State:

   This recommendation is to close the Sandersville satellite within the next 2 years. The Sandersville (Bridge) program is located three hours from the Darton main campus which has created issues with the ability to provide adequate oversight. We are currently working with Oconee Fall Line Technical College, Southeastern Technical College, and

East Georgia State College to ensure that area of the State continues to be served with a strong nursing program. This closure would allow us to possibly move the bridge to the Cordele Center to increase traffic and better serve our community.

OWG 14: Online Education:
(reviewed & supported by Kimberly Holmes NOT supported by Funke Fontenot):

12. Recommends that all programs that will continue to be offered in the new University, and that are currently offered online at ASU and DSC, continue to be offered in the online format after consolidation:

All programs that will be continued in the new University, and that are currently offered online should continue to be offered in the online format to ensure greatest access for all students.

Recommend a reconsideration of this recommendation subject to the developing of a strategic plan/academic master plan for the new U. This will be consistent with the OWG's recommendation # 17 below. FF

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

ORIGINAL RECOMMENDATION:
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

All above recommendations returned by request of OWG for more research.

REVISED RECOMMENDATION:
(reviewed & supported (with note) by Kimberly Holmes NOT supported by Funke Fontenot):

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 as the starting point:

Faculty Senate has a vested interest in evaluations. DSC recently researched this topic and developed a best practices evaluation instrument. This instrument can be adapted/changed as deemed necessary for the New University.

➢ **Approved with the understanding that Deans and Chairs, as faculty, are eligible to participate. KH**
➢ **Recommend reconsideration. The revised recommendation does not address the issue of process and the comment on the original recommendation by Dr. Ijimakinde. Best practices show that evaluation instruments start at the disciplinary/department level and work their way up for college-wide community and faculty senate review and approval. FF**

OWG 23: Faculty Honors and Awards:
(reviewed & supported by Funke Fontenot, Elizabeth Perkins and Kimberly Holmes):

ORIGINAL RECOMMENDATION:

1. **Recommends that the following faculty awards be awarded at the new ASU:**

    A) **Teacher of the Year;**
    B) **Researcher of the Year;**
    C) **Public Service Award;**
    D) **Mentor of the Year:**

After studying the faculty awards given by ASU and DSC pre-consolidation as well as taking into consideration the mission of the new ASU, the OWG determined that these awards represent the functions faculty will serve at the new ASU while keeping the number of awards limited so they remain an exceptional achievement.

Return for consideration of including "On-line Teacher of the Year".

REVISED RECOMMENDATION:

Recommends that the following faculty awards be awarded at the new ASU:

    A) **Teacher of the Year;**
    B) **Researcher of the Year;**
    C) **Public Service Award;**
    D) **Mentor of the Year;**

E) Online Teacher of the Year:

After studying the faculty awards given by ASU and DSC pre-consolidation as well as taking into consideration the mission of the new ASU, the OWG determined that these awards represent the functions faculty will serve at the new ASU while keeping the number of awards limited so they remain an exceptional achievement. In August, the committee voted to include 'Online Teacher of the Year' as a new category in the Faculty Honors and Awards

Approved KH (Question: Is there an OWG considering Honors/Awards for Staff?)

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

ORIGINAL RECOMMENDATION:

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?

RETURNED FOR CLARITY.

REVISED RECOMMENDATION:
(reviewed & NOT supported by Funke Fontenot discussion from
Kimberly Holmes):

Recommends that promotion & tenure policy and evaluation instruments created at the college level should be reviewed by the respective college tenure and promotion committee. Any changes to promotion and tenure policy or evaluation made at the college level must be approved by a university-wide committee to ensure compliance with BOR and university policy:

The tenure and promotion policy and tools should be reviewed by college level committees and updated as appropriate to remain current with trends in the field. Any changes should be formally approved by university wide committee.

➢ **Approved with understanding that the Deans and Chairs are faculty and, therefore, are eligible to participate. KH**

➢ **The revised recommendation does not address the concerns about the frequency of review, although it mentions it in its rationale for the recommendation. I suggest we move include the wording in the rationale, "should be reviewed by college level committees and updated as appropriate to remain current" in the recommendation itself. FF**

OWG 28: Ceremonies:
(reviewed & supported by Danette Saylor and Elizabeth Perkins):

ORIGINAL RECOMMENDATION:

1. Recommends faculty participation by college for each ceremony. Faculty must seek approval of the Provost to be excused from participating in the ceremony:

To ensure there is a significant number of faculty representation for each ceremony.

DISCUSSION – Faculty often only miss the ceremony in the case of an emergency. Often, it is difficult to get in touch with the Provost on the day of. I would recommend excusing faculty on approval from the chair and dean.

Additionally, is it necessary for all faculty from the institution to attend? This is not the model used at many institutions. Though significant representation is certainly important, it does not seem necessary to require all faculty to attend all ceremonies, particularly if space is an issue. Most faculty want to be present to support their students and will attend. Could the recommendation be revised to require faculty to attend at least one ceremony per year as scheduled by their chair or dean?

Returned for clarity. Possibly two recommendations?

REVISED RECOMMENDATIONS:
(reviewed & supported by Kimberly Holmes NOT supported by Funke Fontenot):

Recommends faculty participation by college for the designated ceremony in which graduates within their college will receive their diploma.

To ensure there is a significant number of faculty representation for each ceremony.

➢ **Recommendation has a limited scope. There are other university-wide ceremonies recognizing student achievements than the award of diplomas. So what is the recommendation for faculty participation in instances where "graduates within their college" is not receiving a diploma? FF**

OWG 28: Ceremonies:
(reviewed & supported by Funke Fontenot and Kimberly Holmes):

ORIGINAL RECOMMENDATION:

2. Recommends keeping Albany State University's tradition of requiring graduates to submit a written request to the Office of Academic Affairs for review and approval for the student to graduate in absentia:

To ensure there is a significant number of graduates for each ceremony.

DISCUSSION – Requiring students to provide notice to the Office of Academic Affairs does not ensure significant numbers of graduates; it may provide a significant number of participants, but the two are not one in the same. Currently at DSC, students are able to note whether or not they intend to participate in graduation ceremonies on their graduation application. The decision should be their own. A separate appeal request that must be approved seems unnecessary and significantly disadvantages students who live at a distance or are fully online. Also, what would be considered a good "excuse"? What happens if it is not approved? Finally, is there an issue with the number of students attending graduation?

Particular concern with on-line students.

REVISED RECOMMENDATION:

Recommends graduates notify the Office of the Registrar if the graduate is unable to attend the ceremony. *Notification will be part of the graduation application.*

To ensure the Registrar's Office and the Chief Marshal have adequate information regarding the number of graduates participating in the ceremony in an effort to ensure ample seating is allocated for each graduate.

ORIGINAL RECOMMENDATION:

5. Recommends continuing ASU's tradition of hosting the Honors Day Convocation in March:

It is recommended to host the Honors Day Convocation in March, preferably before Spring break; thereby, ensuring this major event does not interfere with faculty and staff preparing for Spring Commencement. It is also recommended that only one ceremony is

held and all scholarships awarded by the University and the Foundation are presented at the ceremony.

DISCUSSION: DSC has two separate ceremonies – one for honors and one for scholarships. We removed scholarships from the ceremony to allow for more focus on student awards. The major faculty/staff awards are also given at this event. Will the new convocation focus on scholarships, honors, or both, and will the event be able to accommodate all of the awards presented? I don't necessarily deny the recommendation, but I would like further clarification.

Possibly two ceremonies: honors and scholarship?

REVISED RECOMMENDATION:

Recommends hosting two separate Honors Day ceremonies; one ceremony for honor awards and the second ceremony for scholarship awards.

INFORMATIONAL UPDATES:

5. Recommends continuing Albany State University's tradition to include the ASU National Alumni Association Induction as a part of the commencement ceremony:

To engage graduates to become active supporters of the alumni association; thereby, ultimately becoming active supporters of the University with its goals and objectives.

Best Practice? **After polling other colleges and universities, it appears this is an accepted practice at most commencement ceremonies.**

3. Recommends that the Deans of the various colleges disburse honor cords to graduates. The Office of the Registrar will provide the Deans with the lists:

Honor cords are very important to the students and is a way to recognize the students during graduation. Each college should be responsible for disbursing such cords to their students.

DISCUSSION – Are these the honors cords that are received for receiving cum laude, magna cum laude, or summa cum laude honors?
Are these cords purchased by the colleges?
Is this not a part of an honors ceremony?

Possibly two recommendations?

Since this matter involves funding issues, the committee agreed to withdraw this recommendation.

7. Recommends the Honors Day program is scheduled during the day in addition to the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs suspending classes during the time the program is held:

To ensure faculty and students are given the opportunity to attend the program.

DO NOT APPROVE: While this certainly gives opportunities to a traditional population of students, it does not provide opportunities for students who are non-traditional and may work during the day or potentially our online student population. Of course, no date will work for all students and faculty, but a day-time ceremony certainly advantages one group of students over another. Additionally, suspending classes will require a review of engaged minutes to ensure that courses are meeting according to federal guidelines. While this time can certainly be built in to the calendar, it can also be avoided.

Concern with daytime ceremony and recommendation to suspend classes.

The committee agreed to withdraw this recommendation for consideration.