ALABAMA COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION
Articulation and General Studies Committee
University Center * Auburn University at Montgomery
March 23, 1995

MINUTES OF MEETING

The Alabama Commission on Higher Education Articulation and General Studies Committee (AGSC) convened at 10:35 A.M. The meeting was called to order by Dr. Crump. Dr. Guin Nance welcomed everyone to the AUM campus. The following members were present:

Dr. Evelyn Ellis, Alternate	Alabama A&M University
Dr. Alfred Smith, Alternate	Alabama State University
Dr. Carol Daron	Auburn University
Dr. Paul Parks	Auburn University
Dr. Henry Hector	Commission on Higher Education
Dr. Paul B. Mohr	Commission on Higher Education
Dr. Harold McGee	Jacksonville State University
Dr. Roy Johnson	Southern Union State Community College
Dr. Rod Britt	Southern Union State Community College
Dr. Donald Crump	University of Alabama
Dr. Thomas Osborne	University of North Alabama
Dr. John Morrow	University of South Alabama
Dr. Julius Brown	Wallace State Community College-Selma
Dr. Larry Allen, Alternate	University of South Alabama
Dr. Joe Morris, Alternate	Jefferson State Community College
Mr. Bert Slafter, Guest	Department of Postsecondary Education
Dr. Regina Colston, Guest	Alabama A&M University
Dr. Yvonne Kozlowski, Guest	Auburn University
Dr. Martha Allen, Guest	Central Alabama Community College
Dr. John Johnson, Guest	Alabama Southern Community College

The following Chief Academic Officers (CAOs) were present:

Dr. Sam McManus	University of Alabama in Huntsville
Dr. William Sibley	University of Alabama at Birmingham
Dr. Guin Nance	Auburn University
Dr. Bill Meehan, Alternate	Jacksonville State University
Dr. Ed Roach	University of West Alabama
Dr. Livingston Alexander	Troy State University/Montgomery
Dr. Virginia Caples	Alabama A&M University
Dr. William Blow	Commission on Higher Education
Ms. Brenda T. Carter	Commission on Higher Education

Committee members, Chief Academic Officers (CAOs), and guests introduced themselves. Dr. Crump opened the meeting by stating that the primary agenda for the day would be to hear the concerns and suggestions of the Chief Academic Officers. Dr. Crump gave an overview of the charge of the Committee created by Act 94-202 by the legislature last Spring. He stated that the two major charges of the AGS Committee were to develop the freshman, sophomore general studies curriculum for the two-year and four-year public institutions by September 1998 and to develop a statewide articulation agreement for transfer of credit among two-year and four-year institutions by September 1999. The Committee is also charged with examining the need for a uniform course numbering and title system within the state and to serve as a group to resolve problems in the administration and interpretation of the articulation agreement and the general studies curriculum. Dr. Crump then gave an update on what the AGS Committee has done thus far:

1. Surveyed all states in terms of types of agreements and policies regarding articulation between the two-year and four-year institutions in their state;
2. Met with a consultant from the University System of Georgia who described the articulation arrangements between institutions of higher education in their System which has been in place since the late 60's;
3. Met with a consultant from Florida who described the articulation arrangements in their state, where the governance structure for higher education is somewhat different in that the community colleges are under one administration and the four year colleges are under a different board but they both report to an elected education commissioner. The common course numbering and title system was also presented;
4. Surveyed four-year institutions in Alabama to identify individual general studies requirements. Results were analyzed to see what was common and what was different among our institutions;
5. Contacts were made to the State Department of Education to secure teacher certification general studies requirements. Information was also secured from the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools in terms of accreditation standards;
6. In December, all information acquired was pulled together to develop the first draft of a proposal reflecting distribution requirements in the general studies curriculum within Alabama two-year and four-year institutions;
7. In January, the draft proposal was refined and then distributed to the Chief Academic Officers for comments and suggestions along with a progress report of the Committee's work; and
8. Comments on the first draft proposal were received and distributed among Committee members from at least twelve or more institutions. Feedback from the draft proposal lead the Committee to decide that a meeting should be scheduled with the Chief

Academic Officers to address concerns and misunderstandings regarding the role of the Articulation Committee.

Feedback received included:

1. Natural Sciences & Mathematics (level of Mathematics)
2. No Fine Arts Requirement
3. Physical Science and Earth Science not identified
4. Should Oral Communication be a requirement
5. Specification of two courses in Writing in Freshman/Sophomore years
6. Humanities should include two courses of Literature and two courses of History - More general - More semester hours
7. Not enough requirements in Social Sciences
8. Include Foreign Language in Humanities or Area V
9. No Wellness and Physical Education Requirement
10. No Multi-Culturalism and International Education Requirement

Dr. Crump agreed to compile feedback received in a written form to distribute to CAOs.

Other members of the Committee were then given an opportunity to share their observations regarding feedback received. Dr. McGee stated that the Committee has not yet addressed the topic of course numbers and titles and is not yet prepared to go into great length on the subject. He stated that the AGS Committee would be happy to receive the CAOs suggestions. He also reminded the CAOs that the Committee will be conducting some form of regional meetings throughout the state to address the course numbering and title system through academic committees for each major discipline. He stated that the law only asks that the Committee make comments on this issue. Although the Committee is not required to develop a course numbering and title system, it is however required to develop a general studies curriculum.

Dr. Roy Johnson advised the Chief Academic Officers that the Committee agreed on the ninety-six (96) hours in the freshman and sophomore year. Generally, the acceptable standards in articulation agreements require that about two-thirds (2/3) of

those hours be in a general studies course. This 2 to 1 ratio was adopted as a target. The draft proposal is not a model or maximum core but a minimum academic core designed to leave as much institutional flexibility as possible.

Dr. Morrow stated that in Area 5, it was assumed that the student from a junior college would work with the counselors to identify the institution in which that student would transfer and would look more closely at what the specific major requirements were so that the program could be patterned to meet the requirements of that four-year institution.

Dr. Parks stated that because of the terminology used in Mathematics at some of the institutions, the Committee faced a dilemma about what is called Pre-calculus and what is called College Algebra.

Dr. Osborne reminded the CAOs that the AGS Committee has not taken any formal vote on any issues. He stated that by consensus, the Georgia System was taken as a model, but there has been no formal acceptance. The draft proposal circulated is in a preliminary stage and is negotiable.

Dr. Crump then opened the floor for questions and comments from the CAOs. Dr. John Johnson asked how the transfer agreement would work-by course or by component. Dr. Crump responded that it would be premature to begin discussing how the Committee sees the articulation taking place. He stated that the Committee is working toward the transfer as a package curriculum and is not evaluated on a course by course basis but would transfer as an equivalent.

Dr. Crump stated that it would be counter-productive to spend too much time dealing with the transfer issue though he is aware that everyone is concerned. The focus at this point should be primarily on the nature of the general studies. Dr. Roy Johnson stated that if the focus could be on the 65 quarter hours (Areas I through IV) as being a core academic curriculum, and is accepted among all two and four-year colleges in the state, tremendous progress is made. The next phase gets into all the various disciplines and degree tracks and will be attempted after the first two-thirds is worked out (Area V). And the third issue is transferability. Dr. Johnson stated that ideally, any of the courses agreed on when the process is over, could go either as a package or individually because they will be common.

Dr. Sibley stated that UAB has a 44 hour package that every student has to take. He suggested that the core be divided into two or three levels of "packages" to support individual courses at institutions to accommodate the articulation. He stated that at a later time discussions could be held regarding computer literacy, etc. being placed in Communications or somewhere else.

Dr. Crump stated that there was a great deal of concern regarding computer literacy being a part of the general studies curriculum. He asked for discussion on whether this should be a requirement or whether it's best left for each institution to make a decision. After a lengthy discussion, Dr. Crump stated the Articulation Committee is not charged to include computer literacy in the general studies curriculum and the Committee should not get involved in the mechanism of how the individual institutions chose to address this issue. Dr. Roy Johnson stated that discipline committees will be appointed for each discipline in Area V and will recommend to the Committee a common core. An institution may retain its own core which may be separate, but by agreement everyone accepts the core in Area V. Dr. Parks added that the Committee has to be cautious about adding more hours to the general studies curriculum.

Dr. McManus suggested that based on whether the AGS Committee accepts some of the suggestions made, that he would like to have another draft of the general studies curriculum which would include a good distribution of hours. The Chief Academic Officers could meet and discuss it. Dr. McManus stated that faculty structure is a consideration if changes are to be made. Dr. Osborne suggested that two-year representatives be invited to the Chief Academic Officers meeting to voice concerns regarding transfer of students.

Dr. Crump stated that an overview of the outcome of this meeting will be shared with the Chief Academic Officers along with a revised draft of the general studies curriculum.

The AGS Committee/Chief Academic Officers adjourned at 2:05 P.M.

The AGS Committee reconvened at 2:10 P.M.

Dr. Morrow moved that the Minutes of the last meeting be accepted. It was seconded by Dr. McGee. The Minutes were unanimously approved.

Dr. Crump stated that there was progress made at this meeting. He stated that he still had concerns that if a course was not listed in the draft proposal that institutions don't have a responsibility to require it. Dr. Smith stated that it might be helpful to emphasize that we're talking about identifying a minimum group of courses that all students, regardless of major, are expected

to take. The term "core" curriculum envisions that you have left some things out. Dr. Crump stated that he will address this issue in his overview to Chief Academic Officers.

Dr. Parks stated that Dr. McManus indicated a strong desire for the Committee and the CAOs to agree upon a more general core requirement at four-year universities that would put some structure in the overall requirement so that the junior colleges will have a better understanding of what all the four-year universities are going to require as a part of the general studies program, a general studies program that would be reasonably generic to all four-year institutions in the state with some differences. Dr. McManus has agreed to have a retreat in late April and bring a recommendation back to the committee from the Chief Academic Officers. Dr. Parks recommended that the Committee gave the CAOs an opportunity to meet and recommend to the Committee. Dr. Crump suggested that the Committee give the CAOs what has been done today and ask for their reaction.

After a lengthy discussion on the first draft of the proposed general studies curriculum, changes were made in Areas I, II, III, and IV. Dr. Crump suggested that this second revised working draft will be shared with Dr. McManus and the CAOs. The Committee agreed to ask for responses and comments on or before April 25 meeting.

Dr. Crump stated that the next meeting of the AGS Committee will include a work plan on regional meetings, discipline committees, and time lines on completion. The goal is to have the work plan by the Summer of 1996.

The next meeting of the Committee is scheduled for 10:30 A.M. on April 27 in Opelika.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:00 P.M.

W. Donald Crump, Chair