**Academic Council Minutes**

**Date:** September 18, 2008

**Attending:** Dr. George Stanton, Dr. Terry Norris, Dr. Joyce Hickson, Dr. Linda Hadley, Dr. Glenn Stokes, Ms. Beverly Davis, Dr. Patrick McHenry, Dr. Terry Irvin, Dr. David Rock, Mrs. Callie McGinnis, Dr. Sandra Stratford, and Dr. Kathy Carlisle

**Guests:** Dr. Bill Hortman, Dr. Carl Wallman, Ms. Karen Morris, Dr. Gina Sheeks, and Mr. John Stephenson

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic Considered</th>
<th>Action or Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Mr. John Stephenson presented an informative session on the updated selection process for the Educator of the Year Award</td>
<td>Meeting was convened by Dr. Stanton on September 18, 2008 at 2p.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Dr. McHenry presented a proposal to update the student registration process.</td>
<td>• During Mr. Stephenson’s presentation he informed the Council of the updated selection process for the Educator of the Year Award. He informed the group that the selection process had been updated in an effort increase transparency. He then described the new process and took questions and concerns from the Council. The first question was about the requirements to qualify for the award, namely part time and full time status. Subsequent questions were about interview length and graduate and on-line student participation. Some concern was raised that the name of the award had connotations of professorial duties other than teaching. The Council decided to ask the Scholastic Honors Committee to review the name of the award.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Dr. McHenry’s proposal outlined the current registration process and his proposed registration process. His proposal also outlined the benefits and possible difficulties associated with this updated process. After the proposal was</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Dr. McHenry presented the Council with several alternatives to Courgarview/Vista/Blackboard.

• Dr. McHenry expressed his concerns about the limitations of Courgarview and the impact these limitations could have on the new wave of on-line classes. Dr. McHenry then presented several alternatives to the Council such as Sakai and Moodle. The trade offs of these options and others known to the group were discussed. The Council was informed that some of these options were already being evaluated for possible use on campus. The Council then decided to refer this issue to the Distance Learning Committee.

• Dr. Stanton then began the Action portion of the Agenda.

• Dr. Rock recommended that supervising teachers be given priority registration.

• Dr. Rock asked the Council about the process of adding student groups to the priority registration list. Concerns were made about the length of the list currently circulating. The Council decided to find out who was determining priority registration and that limitations placed on priority registration by the Regents' Exam policies should supersede all other presented some concerns were expressed about the implementation of this new process, namely the time and cost aspects of the implementation. Also, the desire of students to alter their schedules and the possible processes through which students could alter their schedules were discussed. Ultimately, the Council decided to table any further discussion or decisions until the Freshmen Learning Communities had been finalized.
• Dr. Stanton continued the action agenda by asking the Council to make recommendations on the allocation of the 2008-2009 Foundation Budget.

• Dr. Stanton opened the meeting to any other business not on the agenda. No new business was brought forward.

• Dr. Stanton gave the Council members time to make announcements.

• Dr. Stanton informed the Council that they have $40,000 to allocate from the revised 2008-2009 Foundation Budget. Concerns were expressed about the need for faculty development. Concerns were also expressed about the potential for more budget cuts. Dr. Stanton then asked the college and library deans to convene in a separate meeting with two goals in mind. The first goal is to come to a consensus about the use of the $40,000 for this academic year. The second goal is to create a 2 to 3 year plan modifying the current allocation of Foundation funds.

• Dr. Stanton informed the Council of the possibility of half-semester and Saturday classes. He also informed the Council that colleges considering these types of classes will need to cover the cost of the class with the tuition generated from the enrollment.

• Dr. Stanton informed the Council of the need for ample evening classes starting this spring and continuing into the foreseeable future.

• Dr. Stanton informed the Council of the verbal acceptance of the University’s withdrawal from eCore.
- Dr. Stanton asked the Council for an update on the progress of implementing Digital Measures. He then informed the Council of Dr. Mescon’s views on CSU’s current policies and practices regarding Student Evaluations.

- Dr. Stanton informed the Council of the decision for two commencements in December, the speakers for each event, and the awarding of an honorary doctorate at the morning commencement.

- The Council was informed that the Chairs rejected the proposed orientation schedule the Council accepted earlier.

- Dr. Stanton informed the Council that there were 40 submissions for the Online Course Development Grant. He also informed the Council that the courses must be ready by December 15 to receive funding.

- Dr. Stanton informed the Council that the Strategic Planning Survey was nearing completion and would be sent out soon. He also informed the Council of the coming strategic planning meetings where faculty, staff, and community input would be heard.

- Dr. Sheeks recommended in response to the earlier concerns about priority registration that Darryl Hollowman and Lori Gibbons compile a list of recommendations and meet with Dr. Mescon about the final list.
• Dr. Stanton put forward a motion to adjourn.

• The meeting adjourned at 3:36 p.m.

• Mrs. McGinnis informed the Council that the Library in response to budget cuts would no longer receive the New York Times or Barron’s on microfilm. She also informed the group of the suspension of GIL by the USG in response to budget cuts.

• The motion had no objections.

• See the following pages for the hand-outs used in the meeting.

Recorder: Christopher Jake Morrow
Agenda: Academic Council
18 September 2008: 2 PM
Academic Conference Room: Richards Hall

Agenda

Presentations
- Educator of the Year Selection Process: John Stephenson, SGA VP
- Student registration proposal: Pat McHenry - submit report
- Alternatives to Vista/Blackboard: Pat McHenry

Action Agenda
- Recommendation that supervising teachers be provided with priority registration
- Foundation Budget Recommendation: 2008-2009

Other Business
- Mid-term classes: George Stanton
- Evening classes-spring and beyond: George Stanton
- eCore affiliation: George Stanton
- Student evaluation and digital measures: George Stanton

Announcements

COLUMBUS STATE UNIVERSITY FOUNDATION, INC
PARTNERSHIP FUND - Program Uses
Revised proposed Budget for FY 2008-2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAUW</td>
<td>$ 500</td>
<td>$ 250</td>
<td>$ 500</td>
<td>$ 500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Reentry</td>
<td>$ 1,000</td>
<td>$ 975</td>
<td>$ 1,000</td>
<td>$ 1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Education</td>
<td>$ 10,000</td>
<td>$ 11,295</td>
<td>$ 10,000</td>
<td>$ 10,000</td>
<td>$ 20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Awards</td>
<td>$ 5,700</td>
<td>$ 6,254</td>
<td>$ 5,700</td>
<td>$ 5,700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honors Program</td>
<td>$ 9,000</td>
<td>$ 8,610</td>
<td>$ 9,000</td>
<td>$ 9,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Education Marketing</td>
<td>$ 10,000</td>
<td>$ 7,812</td>
<td>$ 10,000</td>
<td>$ (10,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment Marketing</td>
<td>$ 25,000</td>
<td>$ 25,746</td>
<td>$ 35,000</td>
<td>$ (35,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics Collaborative</td>
<td>$ 25,000</td>
<td>$ 20,317</td>
<td>$ 25,000</td>
<td>$ 25,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>$ 130,000</td>
<td>$ 130,000</td>
<td>$ 130,000</td>
<td>$ 130,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Scholarships</td>
<td>$ 4,200</td>
<td>$ 9,900</td>
<td>$ 4,200</td>
<td>$ 4,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Recruitment</td>
<td>$ 10,000</td>
<td>$ 10,863</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VPAA Fund</td>
<td>$ 6,000</td>
<td>$ 5,626</td>
<td>$ 6,000</td>
<td>$ 6,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Academic Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 50,083</td>
<td>$ (50,083)</td>
<td>$ 40,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>$ 236,400</td>
<td>$ 237,678</td>
<td>$ 286,483</td>
<td>$ (45,083)</td>
<td>$ 241,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Announcements:
- AAUW
- Adult Reentry
- International Education
- Faculty Awards
- Honors Program
- International Education Marketing
- Enrollment Marketing
- Mathematics Collaborative
- Music
- Other Scholarships
- Student Recruitment
- VPAA Fund
- Other Academic Support

TOTAL

Columbus State University Foundation, Inc.
Partnership Fund - Program Uses
Revised Proposed Budget for FY 2008-2009

Student Affairs
**Educator of the Year**

2008 – 2009

---

**Selection Committee**

- During the first SGA Forum, the V.P. of Scholastic Affairs will appoint a Selection Committee.
- The V.P. of Scholastic Affairs will serve as chair of this committee.

---

**First Meeting of Selection Committee**

- The Selection Committee will meet at the start of the spring semester so that all members are aware of their duties and responsibilities, and are aware of the procedures that must be followed.

---

**Nominations Begin**

- During spring semester, the *Saber* will run a call for nominations to include a form that students may drop off in a box outside the student government office.
- Nomination forms will also be handed out in SGA Forums for representatives to distribute to their various organizations.
Selection Committee Reviews
Nominations

• Once the nomination process has closed, the Selection Committee will send a letter to each candidate nominated, congratulating them and asking them to submit a letter of acceptance to the Vice President of Scholastic Affairs.

Acceptance Letters

The professor’s acceptance letter should include:
• A philosophy of teaching statement
• Courses taught, years in education, and positions held
• Research projects, activities outside of the university, and any additional information the professor deems relevant

Review of Applicants

• Once the deadline for letters of acceptance has passed, the Selection Committee will review the letters and narrow the field of candidates to 10-15
• These 10-15 candidates will receive a letter congratulating them on this achievement
• The candidates not selected will receive a letter informing them of this, to include a certificate congratulating them on their nomination

Interview Process

• Interviews will be set up by the Selection Committee for the remaining candidates
• To ensure fairness, any member of the Selection Committee that is majoring in a subject taught by a candidate will not be eligible to interview that candidate
• If a student has taken a class with one of the professors nominated, they will not be eligible to interview the professor.
• Roughly two weeks will be allotted for the first round of interviews.
Post-Interview

- Once the Selection Committee has interviewed the 10-15 remaining candidates, the Selection Committee will meet to narrow the field down to 5
- As before, a letter of congratulations will be sent to the remaining 5, and a letter and certificate will be sent to the candidates not selected.

Second Interview

- To ensure equality, a second interview will be conducted by a different member of the Selection Committee
- As before, if a student is majoring in the area in which a professor teaches, they will not be eligible to interview the professor.
- Also, if a member of the committee has taken a class with a nominee, they will not be eligible to conduct the interview

Class Visits

- Lastly, a member of the committee will schedule a class visit with the professor to observe the professor and take notes.
- As stated before, if a student is majoring in the area in which a professor teaches, they will not be eligible to conduct the class visit.

Winner Selected

- The Selection Committee will meet and select the winner once the class visits have been completed
- A letter and small memento will be sent to the four professors not chosen after the Scholastic Honors Convocation. These professors' names will appear in the program at Scholastic Honors Convocation
Scholastic Honors Convocation

- During Scholastic Honors Convocation, the winner will be presented with an official CSU blazer, a $1,500 prize, and a plaque
Proposal
This document proposes a plan to register incoming freshmen by generating schedules for them based on preferences collected from them in advance.

Current Problem
The current practice for registering incoming freshmen is to place them in a computer lab at the end of the orientation day. Departmental advisors give brief, general instructions, and then stand by to help as students attempt to build their schedules. There are several difficulties with this process:
- Students get relatively little individual attention from advisors.
- Students are unable to absorb in one sitting the amount of information it takes to understand the curriculum.
- Because students don’t understand the curriculum, they make mistakes. For example, they might register for a 4000-level class, two classes that satisfy the same area, etc.
- Often, there are not enough computer stations to accommodate all students in an advising session. When this happens, students line the walls waiting for their peers at the computer terminals to finish and free up stations.
- Faculty advisors are available on a limited basis in the summer.
- Students resist signing up for Freshman Learning Communities because they don’t understand how FLC fits in the curriculum.
- Students get thwarted and disproportionately frustrated by small obstacles to registration, such as full classes at a certain time, the need for a prerequisite override, etc.
- The registration session creates the illusion of choice for students, but they quickly encounter limited availability of courses, especially towards the end of the summer.

Proposed Process
Rather than “advising” students and compelling them to register themselves as above, we would collect information and preferences from students and use an internal process to generate their schedules.

1. At an appropriate point during or after the admissions process, students will be given a chance to express a set of preferences about the general time and content of their schedules. This information could be collected on-line. (See attached preference sheet.)
2. Students will be encouraged to take the math placement test at their earliest convenience.
3. After students enter their preferences and have time to take the math placement test, the Registrar’s Office enrolls each student in an appropriate schedule of classes. The schedule is based on the student’s major, preferences, placement scores, etc.
4. Certain departments may wish to schedule their own students.
5. Schedules are generated for students on a first-come, first-served basis.
6. Students may log into ISIS to check their schedule? Schedule is mailed to them?
7. During orientation, students will continue to have an academic session, separate from the registration process, that explains the curriculum.
8. Students who wish to make schedule changes can do so by following instructions available in their packets. Schedule change might be accomplished by visiting the office of an advisor or department chair during certain open hours scheduled for this purpose.

9. Students, with schedules in hand, would attend their classes and happiness would reign throughout the kingdom.

Benefits

- Students would get appropriate schedules.
- Students, being placed in appropriate courses from the beginning, may be less likely to seek out same at regional institutions. Students on the right track may be easier to retain.
- Because the preference sheet limits curricular choices only to what is relevant to freshmen, it makes it less baffling to students.
- Students would have more time to decide on their preferences than they do in the current advising/registration session, where they are asked to make decisions on the spot.
- Students and faculty advisors (and deans) would be spared the current purgatorial registration experience.
- Students would have an incentive to complete the admissions process as soon as possible so that they might get their first scheduling preferences.
- Students could be placed in FLC sections.
- Earlier registration of students would help departments anticipate demand for courses.
- Raising and lowering section caps for orientation would not be necessary.
- Students who are admitted and registered might be more likely to show up.
- Department chairs could manage the time needed to help students change schedules rather than having to cover several orientation sessions throughout the summer.

Possible Difficulties

- It is impossible to know how many students would want to change their schedules once they have them.
- Only BA programs (and a few others) require foreign language. This could be confusing to students as they submit their preferences.
- Transfer students could not be handled in this process and would need a separate advising session of some kind.
- Some students qualify to enroll in ENGL 1101x. We would need some way to communicate this to students and give them a choice whether to take 1101 or attempt to test out of it.
- AP credit may not show up in time.
- There may be some difficulty applying the results of the math placement test.
- How to handle Area F?
Freshman Advising Preference Sheet

Notes:
1. We will make every effort to honor choices you make on this preference sheet, but due to the large numbers of incoming students, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to accommodate all of your preferences.
2. You will be asked to make a series of choices by ranking which options are most desirable for you. In each of these cases, the number 1 will indicate your first choice, the number 2 your second choice, and so forth. Please rank every option presented so that we can make an informed decision on your behalf.
3. Before your form can be processed, you must take the Math Placement Test, and you must sign up electronically for the Regents' Exam.

Name: ____________________________

ID Number: ________________________

Major: ____________________________

I. Freshman Learning Communities

Freshman Learning Communities (FRLC) are a hallmark of Columbus State's core education. Enrolling in an FRLC means that you will be attending a cluster of classes with the same group of students and with a group of professors who are working together. FRLCs are very popular and represent outstanding educational opportunities.

Please rank your preference: __ FRLC 1116 01: Topic A
__ FRLC 1116 02: Topic B
__ FRLC 1116 03: Topic C
__ FRLC 1116 04: Topic D
__ I am not interested in an FRLC

II. Preferences among courses that satisfy the Area A math requirement.

- Please rank your preference. Note that your math placement score will determine the highest level of math you should take:
  - [menu of Math courses w/placement score information]

III. Preferences among seminars in Area B

- Please rank your preference:
  - [menu of seminars]

IV. Preferences among courses that satisfy Area C

- Please rank your preference:
  - [menu of Art/Music/Thea 1100]

V. Preferences among courses that satisfy Area D

- Please rank your preference:
VI. Preferences among courses that satisfy Area E and Wellness

• Please rank your preference between American History before or after 1865:
  o [menu of HIST 2111/2112]

• Please rank your preference among courses that satisfy the Area E behavioral science requirement:
  o [menu of courses]

• Please rank your preference among courses that satisfy the Area E World Cultures requirement:
  o [menu of courses]

• Please rank your preference among activity courses that satisfy the wellness requirement:
  o [menu of courses]

• Did you study a Foreign Language in high school? __ Yes __ No
  Which language? ________________________________
  For how many years? ___________________________

• In which Foreign Language are you most interested?
  __ French
  __ German
  __ Japanese
  __ Latin
  __ Spanish

VII. Scheduling preferences:

• How many courses do you wish to take? (5 courses recommended to stay on track to graduate in four years.)
  o [drop-down menu]

• Do you wish to take any courses on-line?
  o [menu of on-line courses available to freshmen]

• At what times during the week do you prefer to schedule your courses?
  o [drop down schedule of time preferences: _MWF 8 am to 1 pm; _MW 1 pm to 6 pm; _MW after 6 pm; _Tue/Thu 8 am to 12 pm; _Tue/Thu 12 pm to 6 pm; _Tue/Thu after 6 pm; _Saturday]
To: Academic Council

From: Patrick McHenry

Re: CougarView

Date: September 18, 2008

Few would disagree that our current course management platform, CougarView, based on Vista/Blackboard, is a sorry product: slow, clumsy, unreliable, difficult. CSU currently pays $43,684 annually for its use.

I don't know whether we can escape Vista/Blackboard, but I recommend that we give it serious consideration by commissioning an appropriate committee to look into it.

At least two alternatives exist (from Dr. Bob Cummings):

1. **Sakai** ([http://sakaiproject.org](http://sakaiproject.org))
   Sakai defines itself as a CLE, or Collaboration and Learning environment. It is situated as the open source alternative to WebCT/Blackboard, but Sakai's users report much greater satisfaction. Sakai began in 2004 when several large universities, seeking an alternative to CT/BB, contributed their own course management systems to a consortium which then yielded Sakai. It is now used at over 150 institutions, including Georgia Tech and the University of Georgia. Sakai's course features include teaching tools (classroom webspace, assignment hosting, gradebooks, etc.), portfolio tools, and generic collaboration tools (rss feeds, announcements, drop boxes, email, polls, forums, presentations, calendars, etc.). As Sakai is open source, the software itself is free, but adopting institutions do face costs in training staff and users. To meet these needs there are several professional consulting groups available on a fee basis, including rSmart. Many campuses who adopt Sakai also join the Sakai Foundation, which directs the project and supports it with financial and intellectual contributions, **but it is not necessary to join the foundation to use the software**. Sakai can be customized on site, with the help of consultants, or run right out of the box.

   Moodle is another successful and widely-adopted open source course management system. Whereas Sakai is often called "community source," since it is developed by a pool of institutional commitments, Moodle followed more of a traditional open source development path and has been developed largely by more than 500,000 individuals. Moodle is available for both individuals and institutions. Moodle offers many of the same types of teaching tools and collaboration tools found in Sakai and WebCT/Blackboard. Until recently it was more likely to be adopted on a course-by-course basis, rather than by entire institutions. Now, however, Moodle supports institutional adoption.