ACADEMIC PROGRAMS AND CONTINUING EDUCATION
Minutes of November 2, 2004

Present: Paul Alberto, Al Baumstark, Michelle Brattain, Dean Dabney, Crawford Elliott, Michael Eriksen, Sally Fowler, Shelby Frost, Cecelia Grindel, John Hicks, Philo Hutcheson, Fred Jacobs, John Kesner, Susan Laury, Basil Mattingly, Tim Renick, Mary Shoffner, Sara Weigle, Mary Zeigler.

**Call to Order**
The Chair, Tim Renick, called the meeting to order at 3:06 p.m. in Room 718, General Classroom Building.

**Approval of Minutes**
The minutes of the October 19, 2004 meeting were approved.

**AGENDA ITEM(S)**

1. Review, revise and vote on the proposal set forth by the three-person subcommittee (Michelle Brattian, Dean Dabney and Tim Renick) appointed by APACE at the October 19 meeting to develop an APACE/Senate procedure to review programs for deactivation and termination.

Tim Renick outlined the proposal and reported that he Council of Chairs already has endorsed the document and the Provost has indicated his general support. There will be a FACP meeting tomorrow at 1:30 p.m. to discuss this proposal set forth from this meeting. The process parallels the program review process. The program(s) for consideration will be assigned to one of APACE’s subcommittee’s, either the Graduate or Undergraduate Council. After analysis of the program by a three-member review team, the Graduate or Undergraduate Council will make a recommendation to APACE. Then APACE will make a recommendation to the Senate Executive Committee.

Paul Alberto explained the proposal of the Provost and Dean’s Group to evaluate programs in the context of possible termination or deactivation. This proposal contains a significant role for APACE and would allow for the present APACE proposal to be integrated with it. By the proposal of the Dean’s Group and Provost, the joint APACE/Budget subcommittee on costs and organization would develop a procedure for applying a list of “indicators” and APACE would consider the individual programs proposed for deactivation or termination based on the guidelines of the APACE/Budget subcommittee.

A serious and extended discussion ensued of the APACE proposal. This included issues such as whether an APACE role in the process is “redundant” given the role of the colleges to determine the fate of their programs (raised by Basil Mattingly); whether the APACE subcommittee APRC would be a more logical body to consider academic program termination than the Undergraduate Council and Graduate Council (raised by Michael Eriksen); and whether the three-person review team needed to restrict its analysis to Georgia State resources (raised by Crawford Elliott). After discussion, none of
these points led to specific changes in the proposed
document.

Sara Weigle suggested an editorial modification, clarifying the description of the subcommittees in
sections 3 and 4 of the proposed APACE document. This was accepted by consensus.

Al Baumstark moved for the approval of the Draft of the Senate Review of Proposals for the
Deactivation & Termination of Academic Programs. Several members seconded the motion. The
motion carried with one dissent.

Announcements/Adjournment

There being no additional business or announcements, the meeting was adjourned at 3:55 PM.