



UNIVERSITY OF
GEORGIA



Task Force on Student Learning and Success

Report of Progress and Recommendations

December 1, 2017

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	3
Broad Objectives.....	5
I. Evolving the Curriculum.....	5
II. Enhancing Teaching and Learning	6
III. Expanding Student Support and Mentoring.....	7
Specific Recommendations	
Recommendation 1: Emphasize writing skills in the curriculum.....	8
Recommendation 2: Make data literacy a core part of undergraduate education.....	10
Recommendation 3: Develop a program to explore the grand challenges of our time.....	12
Recommendation 4: Update organization of UGA’s general education curriculum and develop area-specific curricular maps for general education	15
Recommendation 5: Develop a program that allows students to work in teams to solve real-world problems.....	18
Recommendation 6: Transform courses and classrooms to actively engage students	19
Recommendation 7: Strengthen systems to document and promote effective teaching	21
Recommendation 8: Increase the proportion of smaller classes	23
Recommendation 9: Enhance the Freshman College Summer Experience.....	24
Recommendation 10: Develop cohort-based support programs for underserved students.....	25
Recommendation 11: Establish a campus-wide Council on the First-Year Experience	28
Recommendation 12: Expand resources and programs to acclimate and support transfer students	30
References.....	32
Appendix 1: Other selected Grand Challenges or Big Idea Programs.....	34
Appendix 2: Freshman College Summer Experience (FCSE) Retention Rates.....	36
Appendix 3: Rural/Urban demographics and student outcomes	37

INTRODUCTION

President Morehead charged the Task Force on Student Learning and Success on February 2, 2017 with taking a fresh look at the University’s undergraduate learning environment to identify opportunities to further enhance the educational experience for our students—inside and outside the classroom. The table below provides a complete list of Task Force members.

Table 1. Members of the President’s Task Force on Student Learning and Success

Name	Title
Dr. Eric Atkinson	Associate Vice President for Student Affairs
Dr. Peggy Brickman	Meigs Distinguished Teaching Professor of Plant Biology
Dr. Charles Bullock	Richard B. Russell Chair in Political Science; University Professor and Meigs Distinguished Teaching Professor of Political Science
Mr. Jacob Fucetola	Student Government Association Vice President
Dr. Silvia Giraud	Associate Professor of Foods and Nutrition
Dr. Michele Howard	Associate Vice President for Student Affairs
Ms. Judy Iakovou	Director of Academic Advising Services
Dr. Donald J. Leo	Dean and UGA Foundation Professor in Engineering
Dr. Jean Martin-Williams	Associate Dean for the Fine and Performing Arts; Meigs Distinguished Teaching Professor of Music
Dr. Libby Morris	Director of the Institute of Higher Education; Zell B. Miller Distinguished Professor of Higher Education and Teaching Academy Executive Committee Member
Dr. Annette Poulsen	Augustus H. “Billy” Sterne Chair of Banking and Finance
Dr. Tom Reichert*	Department Head for Advertising and Public Relations and Georgia Athletic Association Professor of Advertising
Dr. Greg Robinson	UGA Foundation Distinguished Professor in Chemistry
Dr. Rahul Shrivastav (Co-Chair)	Vice President for Instruction and Professor of Communication Sciences and Special Education
Dr. Denise Spangler	Senior Associate Dean for Faculty and Staff Services; Bebe Aderhold Professor in Early Childhood Education and Teaching Academy Executive Committee Member
Dr. Kyle Tschepikow	Assistant to the President
Dr. Franklin West	Associate Professor of Animal and Dairy Science
Dr. Shannon Wilder	Director of the Office of Service-Learning
Dr. David Williams	Associate Provost and Director of the Honors Program; Jere W. Morehead Distinguished Professor and Meigs Distinguished Teaching Professor of Religion
Mr. Victor Wilson (Co-Chair)	Vice President for Student Affairs

**On August 1, 2017, Tom Reichert joined the University of South Carolina as Dean of Information and Communications.*

The Task Force was asked to examine and make recommendations related to four areas in particular: 1) pedagogy and rigor; 2) general education; 3) interdisciplinary education; and 4) integrating academic and student life. Subcommittees were organized around these areas, and the subcommittee structure is presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Subcommittee Structure

Pedagogy and Rigor	General Education	Interdisciplinary Education	Integrating Academic and Student Life
David Williams (chair)	Annette Poulsen (chair)	Donald J. Leo (chair)	Michele Howard (chair)
Denise Spangler	Greg Robinson	Libby Morris	Silvia Giraudo
Charles Bullock	Jacob Fucetola	Tom Reichert	Shannon Wilder
Peggy Brickman	Jean Martin-Williams	Judy Iakovou	Eric Atkinson
Kyle Tschepikow	Rahul Shrivastav	Franklin West	Victor Wilson

The Task Force also was instructed to develop recommendations that could be implemented within a short timeframe and that would have an immediate impact on student learning and success. In addition, the Task Force was directed to avoid making any recommendations that would increase credit hour requirements, extend time-to-degree, or raise costs to students.

On December 1, 2017, the Task Force delivered 12 recommendations to President Morehead. The recommendations were organized into three broad objectives to further enhance undergraduate education at the University of Georgia: 1) evolving the curriculum; 2) enhancing teaching and learning; and 3) expanding student support and mentoring. Each of these areas is described in greater detail with specific recommendations embedded.

BROAD OBJECTIVES

I. Evolving the Curriculum

The academic curriculum is the most critical component of the educational experience for students. While the curriculum is primarily the responsibility of individual departments and faculty, the Task Force reviewed UGA's general education and overall lower-division course requirements to identify the extent to which these requirements help to prepare students to be successful citizens and professionals in a rapidly evolving global economy. The Task Force pursued its work with an awareness of the high regard that UGA's existing general education coursework has received from organizations such as the American Council of Trustees and Alumni, which has awarded UGA with an A rating for the strength of its Core Curriculum. The Task Force also adhered to regulations and policies of the University System of Georgia with respect to curriculum changes. As a result, the Task Force's efforts were largely directed towards improving general education opportunities for UGA students within the existing framework.

Three broad themes emerged as the Task Force discussed evolving the curriculum. First, the Task Force found broad consensus that, for our students to be even more successful, two areas need to be further emphasized in our curriculum: writing skills and data literacy.

A high level of competency in writing, and communication in general, is often cited as one of the most important skills required by employers (e.g., Association of American Colleges & Universities, 2015). In response to this issue, many universities have updated and strengthened their writing requirements. The Task Force agreed that it was important to review and update the writing requirements for UGA students so they can remain competitive in the workforce.

Similarly, the contemporary workplace increasingly demands that employees be able to collect, visualize, analyze, and interpret data. The use of data is no longer limited to technical and business processes; it is rapidly expanding to all sectors of human endeavor. Consider, for example, the high value placed on data analytics in industries as varied as agriculture and forestry (e.g., GIS and climate data), media and mass communication (e.g., social media analytics), public health and policy

(e.g., demographic data) or sales and marketing (e.g. data for consumer profiles). The Task Force unanimously agreed that teaching students strong data literacy skills is crucial to their future success as citizens and professionals.

Second, the Task Force rallied around the idea of making undergraduate education more interdisciplinary in nature. Even the most cursory review of the forces that have shaped the world in recent decades highlight the value of—and the need for—interdisciplinary education. The most significant breakthroughs in science, medicine, business, agriculture, and the arts and humanities have emerged through the integration of processes and techniques that were traditionally held within specific and somewhat rigidly defined academic areas. Contemporary practice and workforce expectations increasingly require knowledge and skills that transcend traditional academic boundaries and academic majors. The Task Force viewed promoting interdisciplinary education while still allowing a student to achieve deep disciplinary knowledge as being critical for students' future success.

Third, and related to the first two, the Task Force agreed that relevance and intentionality were foundational to a robust general education curriculum. Discussions in this area attempted to find a middle ground between two seemingly opposing ideas. On the one hand, the Task Force supported the idea that general education needed to remain broad-based and independent of specific discipline-based ideas. On the other hand, the group realized that many students fail to see the value of completing a wide-range of coursework that often can appear disconnected to majors and future career goals. The Task Force believed that steps to highlight the relevancy of general education coursework would be beneficial to the students' long-term success.

In many of the discussions in this area, the Task Force converged on the concept of "meta-majors," which are broad thematic areas of study encompassing many fields of study that are not tied to the more traditional boundaries of individual colleges or other administrative units. For example, a healthcare meta-major may encompass programs across several different colleges (e.g., Biology and Psychology in the Franklin College of Arts and Sciences; Kinesiology in the College

of Education; Biological Engineering in the College of Engineering; various programs in the Colleges of Pharmacy and Public Health, etc.). Similarly, a business-related meta-major may include various programs in the Terry College of Business as well as programs in the College of Family and Consumer Sciences (e.g., financial planning) and the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences (e.g., agribusiness). The Task Force concluded that the specific recommendations described below could be better conceived around meta-majors themes rather than a more conventional college-by-college approach. UGA has already adopted the use of meta-major categories for certain purposes such as for academic advising in the exploratory center and when organizing the majors fair. The same organization could be extended to several other activities and programs, including several recommendations in this report.

A second broad concept that shaped the discussions in the Task Force was the idea of developing “T-shaped” skills to help students achieve greater levels of success. This approach, which seems to have emerged from discussions within IBM on the future of the workforce (see *Beyond IT*, 2009 and Miller, 2015), is gradually being adopted in higher education. It provides a framework to integrate academic work with other opportunities across campus to extend the learning environment beyond the traditional classroom. Developing “T-shaped” skills requires that students have two broad sets of knowledge and competencies: (i) deep disciplinary knowledge, which forms the stem of the “T,” and (ii) a broad set of skills that allow cross-disciplinary collaboration and which form the horizontal top of the “T.” These broader competencies include abilities such as general communication skills, global and broad cultural understanding, teamwork, etc. While the former are often best learned through coursework and related activities, the latter could be infused through the many activities that UGA offers beyond the classroom. Indeed, UGA’s experiential learning requirement and the many programs that allow students to meet this requirement (e.g., the Archway partnership, Leadership UGA, Arch Society, IMPACT Service trip leaders, and others) already support the development of such competencies. However, efforts to further integrate such activities with disciplinary curriculum could enhance the learning experiences of our students.

The following specific recommendations were designed to evolve the curriculum at UGA:

Recommendation 1: Emphasize writing skills in the curriculum

Recommendation 2: Make data literacy a core part of undergraduate education

Recommendation 3: Develop a program to explore the grand challenges of our time

Recommendation 4: Update organization of UGA’s general education curriculum and develop area-specific curricular maps for general education

Recommendation 5: Develop a program that allows students to work in teams to solve real-world problems

II. Enhancing Teaching and Learning

Even the best ideas to strengthen the curriculum will not bear fruit unless the curriculum is delivered in a manner that is engaging and grounded in empirical support. Furthermore, the ever improving academic profile of the UGA student body provides new opportunities for our faculty to increase the rigor of their courses. Faculty at UGA take great pride in teaching and working directly with students, and recent efforts to enhance teaching and learning, such as the small class initiative, the expansion of the Center for Undergraduate Research Opportunities (CURO), and the experiential learning requirement, are making a positive impact on the intellectual climate. Nevertheless, as in most top-tier research universities, faculty at UGA are faced with competing demands on their time, and additional investments in faculty support and teaching infrastructure can go a long way in further enhancing the learning environment for our students.

The discussions on enhancing teaching and learning at UGA focused on two broad themes. The first major point of discussion considered how to promote active learning pedagogy at UGA. Recent research has shown a significant positive impact on student learning and success from adopting active learning techniques in the classroom.

Even relatively small changes in classroom layout can impact student-faculty engagement, student-student interaction, and learning. Promoting critical-thinking, problem-solving skills, and teamwork are just three of the many outcomes associated with active learning pedagogy. Some UGA faculty and departments have already adopted this in a variety of classes (e.g., SCALE-UP classrooms in Physics; Reacting to the Past pedagogy in Classics, etc.). The Task Force agreed that wider adoption of active learning pedagogy at UGA would result in improved student learning and academic performance.

The second major theme looked at barriers to pedagogical innovation, especially the evaluation of teaching effectiveness. The Task Force believed that while most faculty value pedagogical innovation, the nature, format, and weight placed on student evaluations as the only measure of teaching effectiveness deters some faculty from adopting innovative pedagogical approaches in the classroom. At the same time, it is recognized that student evaluations provided an important window into instructional quality. This discussion has led to a few specific recommendations to support innovation in pedagogy by expanding faculty support for best practices in teaching and learning and strengthening our existing approach to collecting feedback on teaching effectiveness.

The following recommendations emerged from these two themes:

Recommendation 6: Transform courses and classrooms to actively engage students

Recommendation 7: Strengthen systems to document and promote effective teaching

Recommendation 8: Increase the proportion of smaller classes

III. Expanding Student Support and Mentoring

Lastly, the Task Force looked at ways to enhance a range of support services for students and to strengthen the learning environment beyond the classroom. While the rapidly improving academic profile of our students often formed the basis for many discussions, the Task Force also paid great attention to the diversity of the student body and the varying nature of challenges faced by different students. For example, 23% of our undergraduate students are Pell-grant eligible, about 6% are first-generation college students, about 15% come from rural areas, and a large number of students enter UGA as transfers, having never participated in the foundational programs offered to students who start college at UGA. The Task Force concluded that it was critical to elevate support for these student groups. The Task Force also agreed that addressing this challenge would require an integrated effort between the various units that support students, including those housed in Student Affairs, Instruction, and other areas. Existing student support programs could benefit from a more integrated planning, branding, and recruitment model. In addition, some programs may need to be refined, while new programs likely need to be developed.

The Task Force developed four specific recommendations to expand student support and mentoring:

Recommendation 9: Enhance the Freshman College Summer Experience program

Recommendation 10: Develop cohort-based support programs for underserved students

Recommendation 11: Establish a campus-wide council on the first-year experience

Recommendation 12: Expand resources and programs to acclimate and support transfer students

RECOMMENDATION 1: EMPHASIZE WRITING SKILLS IN THE CURRICULUM

RATIONALE

Most of our undergraduate students are not receiving sufficient training to write effectively on a college and professional level, despite the fact that writing is often cited as one of the most critical competencies desired in the workforce (for example, AAC&U, 2015). Because many students enter UGA from a dual enrollment program or with AP credits in English, an ever-increasing proportion of our students never take a college-level writing class and receive much less instruction in writing than students at aspirant institutions. Currently, 60% of our entering students test out of English 1101. In addition, many of our undergraduates gain little or no experience with discipline-specific writing because writing education at UGA often is linked to humanities fields, such as literature. Moreover, with an increased focus on STEM education at UGA and in the society at large, it is no longer feasible to ignore the growing demand for help with science or technical writing.

According to the National Census of Writing, most four-year institutions across the nation already have a writing requirement beyond the first-year experience (62%). Among these schools, the writing requirement typically involves one to three writing-intensive courses (86%). In the last several years, many universities have modified their writing requirements to promote writing within-the-discipline. Seven of the University of Georgia's peer institutions have a writing requirement that involves discipline-specific, writing-intensive courses, as do ten of the University's aspirational institutions.

Based on these observations, the Task Force recommends that UGA should re-evaluate its writing requirements with an emphasis on three goals: (i) UGA students should have more college-level writing experience, (ii) at least a part of the college writing experience should be discipline-based, and (iii) writing instruction should be broadened to include competencies in multimodal, especially, digital communication.

IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

The writing requirements at UGA will need to be reviewed and revised in greater detail than was feasible within the scope of this Task Force. Furthermore, any changes in these requirements will require approval through the faculty governance process and must also meet the guidelines of the University System of Georgia. For these reasons, the Task Force recommends that the General Education subcommittee (of the University Curriculum Committee), along with faculty from the Department of English and other key office bearers (e.g., representative from the Franklin College of Arts and Sciences; Office of the VP for Instruction) be charged with revising UGA's English writing requirements to achieve the outcomes highlighted above (increase college-level writing, ensure discipline-based writing instruction, and emphasize multimodal communication instruction).

The information and models provided below can serve as an initial template for these discussions. These are not intended as definitive solutions; rather, these are suggested as potential opportunities for further exploration. These opportunities emerged through discussions within the Task Force, a review of writing instruction at other universities, and conversations with experts at UGA.

- Many universities require each entering freshmen student to take a college writing course in the first year. Review whether such a requirement should be implemented at UGA. For example, the University of Michigan has a first-year writing requirement that is not considered equivalent to an AP class. (<https://lsa.umich.edu/sweetland/undergraduates/first-year-writing-requirement.html>). Similarly, Stanford requires a first- and second-year writing course, followed by a writing course within the major (<https://undergrad.stanford.edu/academic-planning/degree-requirements/writing-and-rhetoric-requirement>). At the University of California-Berkeley, all undergraduates take a two semester sequence of reading and composition (<http://writing.berkeley.edu/students/requirements>).

-
- Consider revising a second writing course and/or instituting upper-level writing requirements so that writing classes are more discipline-based and connected to students' major or meta-major categories.
 - UGA systems can tag classes as having an “intensive” writing component. Consider whether students should be required to have a certain minimum number of writing-intensive classes before graduation. These courses may be taken within specific majors (or meta-major) areas, thereby allowing discipline-based intensive writing training.
 - Another approach to improve the writing instruction at UGA is to expand the Writing Intensive Program (WIP; see <http://wip.uga.edu>). This program provides support to faculty teaching writing intensive courses by training graduate students from within that departments as writing coaches. This model can allow implementation of discipline-based writing-intensive courses for a large number of classes at relatively low costs. Currently only the Franklin College of Arts and Sciences and the Warnell School of Forestry and Natural Resources participate in this program.
 - Consider opportunities for modifying the writing courses so as to emphasize a broader set of writing and communication competencies. An example of these guidelines may be seen at the Writing and Communication program at Georgia Tech (<https://wcprogram.lmc.gatech.edu/guiding-principles/>), which emphasizes that communication is multi-modal and includes competencies in written, oral, visual, electronic, and non-verbal communication.

RECOMMENDATION 2: MAKE DATA LITERACY A CORE PART OF UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION AT UGA

RATIONALE

Courses are needed that emphasize the compilation of information, the analysis of data, and the use of empirical methodologies to inform and guide decision-making in all fields. Helping our students learn how to make decisions based on quantitative reasoning is especially important in light of the increasing global emphasis on computational, technical, and reasoning skills.

Standards for general education at most colleges and universities have long incorporated coursework focused on quantitative skills. However, these requirements have generally emphasized mathematics or basic statistics courses. Similarly, the University of Georgia currently requires six hours of mathematics or quantitative reasoning courses in the Core Curriculum. (For courses satisfying this requirement, go to <http://bulletin.uga.edu/GenEdCoreBulletin.aspx>.) An emphasis on quantitative reasoning moves beyond basic math or statistics and helps students understand how quantitative analysis is used to solve problems and develop successful strategies. One source notes, “Quantitative literacy involves sophisticated reasoning with elementary mathematics more than elementary reasoning with sophisticated mathematics” (Lynn Arther Steen in *Achieving Quantitative Literacy*, quoted on https://serc.carleton.edu/sp/library/qr/teaching_principles.html).

Multiple sources point to the importance of having the ability to analyze data in today’s world of “big data.” *Forbes Magazine*, for example, argues that data analytics will “drive business operations” in the future, and *Harvard Business Review* suggests that most industries are nowhere close to achieving the potential value from data analysis. Not only must organizations acquire and process information relevant to their goals, they must be able to analyze that data in a manner that helps them maximize the potential of the organization. Coursework dedicated to the specific needs of a diversity of disciplines will help our students be leaders in their fields.

IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

As with Recommendation 1, this is essentially a curricular change that requires formal approval through UGA’s faculty governance process. Therefore, the Task Force recommends that a committee be appointed to consider how data literacy and quantitative reasoning skills could be incorporated into the current curriculum. It would be up to departments or colleges to determine whether such a course could fit into the two-quantitative-course requirement in the current Core Curriculum or whether they would prefer to add or modify existing requirements for their major. Courses in data literacy could reflect the use of data analytics and quantitative reasoning in differing careers. Thus, individual majors, meta-majors or colleges could develop courses specific to their disciplines that would benefit students in a dynamic world that increasingly depends on technical skills and comprehension.

Individual departments or colleges could implement this recommendation through several alternative strategies. An individual major could develop a course that would be specifically suited to their discipline. Alternatively, a college could develop a course that prepares students for technical expertise in the broader spectrum. For example, the Terry College of Business currently offers a course, BUSN 4000: Predictive Modeling and Optimization, which was created through interdisciplinary discussions within the college. The course covers the essentials of calculus and analytical concepts that are vital in today’s business environment. The creation of the Georgia Informatics Institutes in Fall 2016 resulted in the approval of an INFO course prefix for courses in the broad field of Informatics, and interdisciplinary courses in the College of Engineering have been introduced in topics such as fundamentals of informatics (INFO 2000) and machine learning (INFO 4150). With the discussion of the introduction of meta-majors, groups of majors may find it appropriate to develop a course that satisfies the expectations of the related careers as they identify common characteristics across the majors.

The Task Force recognizes that each college, meta-major, or major is best able to design coursework that addresses data literacy in their respective disciplines. Possible strategies could include:

- Encouraging units to actively incorporate quantitative reasoning into the current curriculum, whether through specific assignments or modules in current courses, or through design of new courses for their major.
- Redesigning current courses or creating new courses to satisfy the Core Curriculum requirements that provide instruction in data literacy and quantitative reasoning.
- Creating a set of courses, whether by college, cross-college, or cross-unit, that students could choose from to satisfy the data literacy requirement and that focus on specific discipline or meta-major characteristics. These courses would be more general than those developed within a specific major.
- An issue to be addressed is whether units would recommend major- or area-specific courses taken at the lower-level (as in the current Core Curriculum) or upper-level (as in the Terry College of Business) and whether the courses would be an additional requirement for the major. These decisions are best addressed at the unit level.

RECOMMENDATION 3: DEVELOP A PROGRAM TO EXPLORE THE GRAND CHALLENGES OF OUR TIME

RATIONALE

This recommendation attempts to address two ideas that emerged in the discussions of the Task Force – the need to promote interdisciplinary education, and the need to highlight the relevancy of general education coursework for students. By highlighting the grand challenges of our time and the inherently interdisciplinary solutions necessary to address these challenges, the Task Force hopes to instill a culture of thinking broadly and using interdisciplinary methods to solve problems.

For more than 20 years, federal agencies, scientific associations, industry, funding agencies, and professional associations have pointed to the importance of interdisciplinary research and collaboration to address the major problems facing the nation and world. Consequently, in recent years, leading universities including Princeton, Stanford, and UCLA have launched university-level grand challenge research initiatives. While some graduate (and undergraduate) students may be privileged to work on complex, well-resourced research agendas, many students do not have access to large scale initiatives that emphasize teamwork, interdisciplinary training, and cross-disciplinary problems; yet, these skills are highly valued competencies for graduates.

To meet this need, the proposed Grand Challenges initiative for undergraduates can use extant resources to launch campus-based curricular and co-curricular programs around “big ideas” or grand challenges, as defined by the institution. Grand Challenges curricular programs can motivate students to think big—beyond the content of a single course or the requirements of a single major—in order to build interdisciplinary perspectives while enabling the role of education to address challenging national and global issues. If research and instruction are indeed symbiotic, then student and faculty participation in a Grand Challenges instructional program may also yield significant strides in Grand Challenges (Big Ideas) research.

Grand Challenges programs at the curricular level have been led by the National Academy of Engineering; more than 40 engineering schools participate in the Grand Challenges Scholars Program. These programs include the following curricular elements: themed projects and a research experience; interdisciplinary courses or programs; entrepreneurship activities; global perspectives/experience; and service-learning; <http://www.engineeringchallenges.org/>.

Consequently, it is not surprising that five of our peer and aspirational institutions offer grand challenge programs based in their colleges of engineering: University of Iowa, NC State, The Ohio State University, UT Austin, and UVA. Aspirational institutions such as UT Austin and UVA open the courses to all students. The University of Minnesota, UCLA, and UC-Berkeley also offer Grand Challenge or Big Ideas approaches in instructional programs. Details about these programs are included in the appendices.

IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

The launch and implementation of such a program will require a concerted effort across the entire institution and will require strong leadership for successful execution. In all likelihood, the charge to develop and implement such a program will need to be given to a single office, with support from a committee representing a wide range of campus units. The primary steps include:

- (i) Determine grand challenge topics to be explored during a specified period of time (e.g., one year or five years).
- (ii) Design and implement a series of events (for e.g., speaker series, lunch and learn events, competitions, marketing campaigns, community/service-learning events) around the grand challenge topic. Activities should emphasize the interdisciplinary nature of the problem/solutions and highlight how these have an impact across a large number of disciplines.

(iii) Sponsor seed grant funding for teams of students and faculty to work together on research projects aligned with the grand challenge topics. The grant program, for example, could be administered by the Center for Undergraduate Research Opportunities.

(iv) Ensure and track student participation in these events.

Each of these steps can be achieved in a variety of ways:

- A UGA Grand Challenges program could follow the research themes set forth by the Office of the Vice-President for Research: “Inquiring and Innovating to Improve Human Health; Safeguarding and Sustaining our World; and Changing Lives through the Land-Grant Mission.” Alternatively, a study committee could review the undergraduate curriculum including current experiential learning opportunities to identify leading themes to serve as foundational pieces for a Big Ideas or Grand Challenges undergraduate initiative.
- Grand Challenges courses, developed by faculty, would tap their expertise and their interest in co-teaching and working across disciplinary lines with a potential for building new research collaborations, while motivating students to think about the great challenges we face and the role they can plan to address them.
- Several UGA units, including the Division of Student Affairs and Public Service and Outreach, could develop a series of programs focused on the Grand Challenges topics. Student participation could be required for a certain number of activities, even though these activities will not award credit and will be offered free of cost.
- UGA has a strong foundation of interdisciplinary programs upon which to build a Grand Challenges initiative. Currently, UGA offers more than 40 interdisciplinary undergraduate certificates, hosts more than 30 centers and institutes organized around interdisciplinary themes, supports a highly successful Office of Service-Learning, Center for Undergraduate Research Opportunities, and an Office of International Education, to name a few of the resources for a Grand Challenges curricular and co-curricular undertaking.

Other support includes:

- Offer faculty development workshops to support the development of interdisciplinary, team-taught “Big Idea” courses that could meet general education requirements and/or serve as introductory courses to meta-majors. Policies and practices will be needed to support team-teaching, the basis for most interdisciplinary efforts.
- Offer three credit-hour Big Idea courses to second-year students, as a modified continuation of the FYO program (see UC-Berkeley Big Idea courses). These courses could be college or school sponsored, as opposed to centrally funded, and would reflect the degree of interest by an academic unit.
- Experiment with large-scale (200-300 students) Grand Challenges courses taught by leading professors with breakout sessions led by graduate students and/or input from appropriate centers and institutes. A large-scale course could introduce a Grand Challenges theme for the academic year.
- Charge the Office of Instruction with assessing the readiness and interest by colleges and schools in collaboration with public service and student affairs units to develop a Grand Challenge Scholars program.
- Support the development of a pilot Grand Challenges program, perhaps led by the College of Engineering.
- Other pilot projects:
 - o The Office of Service-Learning is well-positioned to use the PSO Scholars program as a model to develop an independent or collaborative Grand Challenges Scholars program under the theme “Changing our Lives through the Land-Grant Mission.”
 - o Units in PSO, like the Carl Vinson Institute of Government and the Fanning Leadership Institute, are well positioned to partner with SPIA and the School of Law to establish a Grand Challenges program under the broad theme of “Safeguarding and Sustaining our World.”
- Consider the development of a Grand Challenges interdisciplinary certificate built from existing and newly developed courses.

-
- Reward Grand Challenges Scholars with a notation on the transcript or other high visibility awards.
 - Consider the development of a Grand Challenges Living Learning Community, as developed at Georgia Tech.

As a large land-grant university, UGA seems well-equipped to start small (with Big Idea courses) and scale to multiple GC programs with specific problem targets.

The Task Force would like to acknowledge the role of the 2017 Teaching Academy Symposium in developing this recommendation as some of these ideas were initially discussed at that meeting.

RECOMMENDATION 4: UPDATE ORGANIZATION OF UGA'S GENERAL EDUCATION CURRICULUM AND DEVELOP AREA-SPECIFIC CURRICULAR MAPS FOR GENERAL EDUCATION

RATIONALE

The University currently has a distributive model of general education comprised of five core areas that include the following: foundation courses; life sciences and physical sciences; quantitative reasoning; world languages and global culture, humanities and the arts; and social sciences. These categories meet the requirements for general education as described by the University System of Georgia (USG). Individual departments and faculty can propose courses within these broad areas. These course proposals are reviewed and approved by the General Education sub-committee as meeting the criteria for each of these categories.

There are several concerns about the existing general education curriculum at UGA and at large research universities in general. The distributive model makes the core seem as though it is “just a check box” with no relevance to the major or to the student’s choice of major or career choice in general. Given the constraints of the USG Core Curriculum, it would be difficult to completely eliminate the distributive model. However, there are ways to shape it and make it more relevant to student’s overall education and lives. The aim of this proposed re-organization is to guide students to a path that allows for some in-depth inquiry within selected areas of the general education curriculum while allowing them to select the standard courses that will be required for progress within their selected major.

To be well educated is to know something about a range of important domains of inquiry. This principle leads easily to the idea that a distribution requirement should be a central component of general education. At the same time, students need to take responsibility for their own education and select general education coursework with greater intentionality. Students would see greater benefit if the choice of classes taken to meet the general education requirements is made in a more purposeful manner.

IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

To nudge students to be more intentional in their choice of general education coursework, the Task Force recommends two broad changes to UGA’s general education curriculum. Since this is a curricular matter, this will need review and approval from the faculty governance process including the General Education sub-committee of the University Curriculum Committee (UCC) and the University Council.

First, it is recommended that UGA’s general education coursework be re-organized using an alternate framework that highlights the relevancy of the general education coursework to various learning outcomes. Any such description must meet the requirements of the USG guidelines on general education. The Task Force recommends that the UCC review and consider adopting the framework proposed by a team of faculty and administrators in the summer of 2017 to meet these objectives. This framework is described later within this recommendation.

Second, it is recommended that the University take steps to create curriculum maps within a given area so that courses can be viewed on a continuum instead of in silos. For example, within the sciences, faculty have recently started conversations to better coordinate courses in chemistry, biology, and mathematics so that the concepts needed for life scientists are covered in chemistry and mathematics. This process can be applied to other areas of the general education curriculum to provide a more unified program to students. These efforts will likely need to be promoted by the Office of the Vice President for Instruction, with partnership from faculty governance, especially the General Education subcommittee of the UCC. To be successful, such efforts will also need external expertise (e.g., external facilitators) and some faculty support. These may be facilitated through a central office, such as the Center for Teaching and Learning.

An alternate framework to describe UGA's General Education requirements

A team of administrators and faculty members (Rodney Mauricio, General Education Subcommittee Chair; William Vencill, Associate Vice President for Instruction and past chair of UCC and General Education Subcommittee; Brian Glaser, member of General Education Subcommittee; Madeline Smith, Center for Teaching and Learning – Assessment; and Colleen Kuusinen – Center for Teaching and Learning) represented UGA at the Association of American Colleges & Universities (AAC&U) Institute on General Education and Assessment where they sought to create a plan to make general education at UGA more relevant to students while ensuring that these meet all USG requirements (June 2017). The group also developed a draft plan of general education assessment at UGA that will provide a better model for feedback to general education instructors and allow for a better path of continuous improvement in general education. Both the general education and assessment plans were developed in consultation with AAC&U Institute personnel. As a member of the AAC&U Institute, this group is expected to provide a report on progress at one year. Following its review, the Task Force has adopted this plan in its entirety as a specific recommendation. If adopted, this will also impact some other recommendations from the Task Force (e.g., emphasizing writing skills in the curriculum).

General Education at UGA may be re-organized as follows:

1. Communicating Your Ideas (2 courses in Core Area I, and through the curriculum)

- a. Students will be able to express ideas in writing with clarity and fluency.
- b. Students will be able to express ideas effectively in formal and informal oral (and possibly other formats, e.g., visual/digital) presentations.

2. Reasoning from Quantitative Data (2 courses in Core Areas I, III, and through the curriculum)

- a. Express and manipulate quantitative information, concepts, and thoughts in verbal, numeric, graphical, computational, and symbolic form to frame and devise a solution to a problem.
- b. Evaluate conclusions drawn from or decisions based on quantitative data.

3. Understanding your Place in the World (Human Diversity and the Environment) (5-6 courses in Core Area IV and other courses)

- a. Cultural diversity: Understand contemporary cultures and people(s) in the U.S.
- b. Global culture: Understand contemporary cultures and people(s) outside of the U.S.
- c. Environmental awareness: Explain the interactions between human activity and the environment at local, regional, or global scales.
- d. Environmental awareness: Assess the ethical, cultural, economic, or political forces that affect environmental problems and policies.

4. Critical Inquiry: Constructing Knowledge in Liberal Education

Living a Purposeful Life (1 core class: Humanities and the Arts)

- a. Describe, interpret, and appreciate literary, artistic and other works within the humanities and their contexts.
- b. Analyze the impact and role of artistic and literary production and achievement on our understanding of the human condition.

Science as a Way of Knowing (2 core classes, including 1 with laboratory: 1 course each in Life and Physical Sciences)

- a. Demonstrate an understanding of basic knowledge, principles, and laws in the natural sciences.
- b. Explain how knowledge is constructed in the sciences using the scientific method.
- c. Locate and evaluate reliable sources of scientific evidence to construct arguments, to apply scientific knowledge and to critically assess real-world issues.
- d. Within a laboratory course, demonstrate proficiency in experimental science by making observations, understanding the fundamental elements of experiment design, generating and analyzing data using appropriate quantitative tools, using abstract reasoning to interpret data and relevant formulae, and testing hypotheses with scientific rigor.

Living in Society (3 core classes: Social Sciences and Ethical Reasoning)

- a. Identify and explain the fundamental concepts of social policy at either the local, national, or global scale.
- b. Interpret interconnections among and differences between social institutions, groups, or individuals.
- c. Develop an understanding of the basis of ethical principles, codes, and standards of conduct.

Experiential Learning (includes research, study abroad, internships, service-learning, creative, and leadership)

RECOMMENDATION 5: DEVELOP A PROGRAM THAT ALLOWS STUDENTS TO WORK IN TEAMS TO SOLVE REAL-WORLD PROBLEMS

RATIONALE

The accelerating pace of scientific discovery and the rapid changes in the workforce, such as those resulting from wider adoption of automation and artificial intelligence, make it imperative for UGA to prepare its students for lifelong learning and to emphasize competencies such as teamwork, problem-solving and critical thinking. The recent addition of the experiential learning requirement can help students develop these important competencies. However, a program designed specifically to nurture such competencies would be a great addition to existing programs for student success. Such a program could add another venue for experiential learning, while supporting the development of “T-shaped” skills in our students. The program outlined below can also help engage UGA’s strong alumni base as well as foster greater engagement with various corporate, civic, or non-profit groups.

IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

A team of faculty and staff should be charged with the development and implementation of a team-based, problem-solving program. Key elements of the program will include the following:

- The program identifies a set of real-world problems (e.g., through alumni networks, corporate connections, faculty and researchers at UGA, PSO or government affairs units). Additionally, a group of faculty could create a set of imaginary but realistic problems. Each problem must have clear objectives, goals/milestones, and an explicitly stated outcome or end-result.
- The program would advertise the problems (such as, through a website) and invite students to join the team that will solve/address each problem.
 - o Teams may be 5-15 students (small class)
 - o Each team would be led by a faculty
 - o Teams must be interdisciplinary in nature (e.g., each team must represent students from at least two or more majors).

- o Students may need to apply and interview to join the team
- o Each team has to work together to address the assigned problem and report their findings to the source (e.g., alumni, company, etc.) in the form of a report and an oral presentation.
- Program can be done for-credit (variable credit, based on nature and extent of the problem being addressed). Program should be no longer than one semester in duration.

For logistical reasons, the program may initially be incubated and developed as a part of the Honors Program. As the interest in the program increases, it could be opened up for all students at UGA.

Two other programs can serve as models for this recommendation:

Pennsylvania State University has recently developed a related program although it is focused on faculty expertise, technology development, and commercialization with industry partners (<http://innovation.psu.edu/>).

UGA’s Archway Partnership follows a similar model focused on economic development needs for Georgia communities (<http://www.archwaypartnership.uga.edu/>).

RECOMMENDATION 6: TRANSFORM COURSES AND CLASSROOMS TO ACTIVELY ENGAGE STUDENTS

RATIONALE

This recommendation seeks to assist faculty in transforming undergraduate courses to actively engage students in their learning by using innovative, evidence-based instructional practices. In concert with faculty support, the Task Force recommends enhancing various instructional spaces across campus to further support active engagement of students.

Evidence-based instructional strategies, such as active learning, have been demonstrated to lead to deeper learning. This allows students to transfer their knowledge to novel settings, leading in turn to greater persistence and degree completion (American Council on Education, 2017). Creating more active learning spaces on campus is critical to advancing evidence-based instructional strategies. Thus, the Task Force recommends that the University provide targeted support to assist faculty in transforming undergraduate courses to actively engage students and to modify traditional classrooms in order to facilitate adoption and implementation of evidence-based instruction.

A growing body of literature demonstrates that active learning techniques foster higher levels of student engagement, discussion, and collaboration than traditional instructional practices (e.g., Park & Choi, 2014). Furthermore, numerous studies across academic disciplines show that these techniques can deepen student learning and increase academic performance (e.g., Freeman, Eddy, McDonough, Smith, Okoroafor, Jodrt, & Wenderoth, 2014). Finally, research clearly shows that evidence-based instructional strategies help to close achievement gaps for underserved students.

Active learning pedagogy, with its focus on interaction and teamwork, makes use of certain furniture and technology not often found in a standard classroom, such as swivel chairs, movable tables, and distributed display monitors (Lippens, 2016). The University currently maintains a limited number of classrooms with these elements and they largely are located in newer facilities such as the Business Learning

Community, Science Learning Center, and Baldwin Hall Expansion, which support only a handful of the institution's academic programs.

IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

The Task Force recommends that the University develop targeted support and training to assist faculty in transforming undergraduate courses to actively engage students, with the goal of increasing and sustaining the number of courses that use active learning pedagogy. Work from the National Center for Academic Transformation (NCAT) suggests that it is important to transform entire courses rather than individual class periods or portions of courses. Further, faculty members need to be involved in course redesign from the ground up: identifying learning outcomes, matching curricular content to those outcomes, and learning about evidence-based instructional strategies that can help students achieve the desired learning outcomes. The University can provide professional learning opportunities to help rethink student learning outcomes, refresh content, learn how to enact engaging instructional strategies, and consider how to assess new forms of student learning. The NCAT offers multiple models for supporting faculty members in transforming instruction, but common to all is an initial intensive period of time for faculty members to interact with peers and experts to redesign objectives, curriculum, instructional strategies, and assessments, followed by support from peers and experts during the first implementation of a newly redesigned course.

In tandem with providing training and support, the Task Force also recommends the development of a centrally-led initiative to transform select traditional classrooms into active learning classrooms. The overarching goal of the initiative would be to ensure every school and college offering undergraduate instruction has access to active learning space that complements its unique academic programs. A request-for-proposal (RFP) would help to achieve this goal. The RFP should include a document outlining the guiding principles for active learning classroom design. The University of Michigan offers an excellent model for consideration.

This document would assist deans, department heads, and faculty members as they contemplate location, layout, furniture, technology, and other elements to be included in the proposals. The RFP should also provide a cost structure for various active learning designs to help units develop project budgets. As a final consideration, it is recommended that a pool of central funds be set aside for this initiative to be matched by unit-level funds or private support. A shared cost model will allow the institution to transform a greater number of classrooms, promote buy-in among schools and colleges, and create avenues for alumni and friends to support this important initiative through private giving.

RECOMMENDATION 7: STRENGTHEN SYSTEMS TO DOCUMENT AND PROMOTE EFFECTIVE TEACHING

RATIONALE

Several meta-analyses demonstrate that what teachers do matters for student learning, retention, and satisfaction. Accordingly, identifying and strengthening mechanisms to document and promote effective teaching is of great importance in furthering student engagement and success. To be maximally effective, evidence-based instructional strategies must be accompanied by changes in student learning outcomes and associated assessment practices, which brings to bear related issues such as peer review of teaching and common course evaluations.

Peer review can help provide evidence of performance on aspects of teaching, such as depth of subject knowledge and appropriateness of course material that are better assessed by peers than students (Berstein 2008; Peel 2005). Studies examining peer review have documented several positive outcomes for faculty involved in the process including improved self-assurance (Bell and Mladenovic 2008), collegiality and respect (Quinlan and Akerlind 2000), and improved classroom performance (Freiberg 1987). Unfortunately, peer reviews are often conducted as one-shot events and therefore fail to capture growth and change over time. They also do not provide opportunities for reflection (Peel 2005) or for collaboration in constructing solutions with peers (Quinlan and Akerlind 2000) that are needed to achieve changes in teaching quality (Brockbank and McGill 1998). Peer reviews of teaching are not a required step for promotion and tenure at UGA, but they are being phased in at many other universities, including some comparator and aspirational institutions. Our hope is that a nuanced framework with multiple methods to document teaching effectiveness will improve UGA's ability to reliably assess teaching quality, support faculty growth as teachers, and measure rigor in the classroom. The Task Force advises a more extensive process of mentoring than found in typical peer feedback, while recognizing this process could not take place every semester but perhaps every few years.

The University of Georgia values quality and rigor in the courses it offers its students. End-of-course

evaluations provide valuable student feedback and are one of the ways that UGA strives toward improving the quality of courses and student learning experiences. The end-of-course evaluation can also be used as an indicator of individual teaching effectiveness and to help instructors enhance the future delivery of courses. UGA already has an Academic Affairs Policy (4.07-16) that governs end-of-course evaluations, which requires the use of a common set of questions and a common scale. The questions specified by this policy address how many hours per week a student devoted to the course outside of class, whether the assignments were useful for helping the student learn, and how much the course challenged the student to think. While these common questions are required, the policy permits instructors to include additional questions designed to measure teaching effectiveness in their disciplines. It is clear, however, that this policy has not been adopted universally across campus. Even where it has been applied, there are issues regarding how readily available the evaluation results are, how easily the evaluations can be administered, and how they can be recorded and archived for broad analysis. Further, localized systems can lead to inconsistencies across colleges/schools and departments. UGA lags behind many other institutions in regard to having an effective central course evaluation system.

IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

In order to enact peer evaluation, departments should be encouraged to engage in a collaborative process to provide input into criteria by which their teaching will be assessed (e.g., the choice of peer evaluation format and instruments). It is recommended to bring together key faculty leaders/departments and provide them with a structure to help them co-create, test, and evaluate existing frameworks in a relatively low-stakes context (e.g., annual evaluation rather than tenure and promotion.) Beginning with an opt-in model, pilot departments can volunteer to engage and become leaders in this process. Administrators as well as faculty affairs and pedagogy experts should be drawn upon to support the process of peer evaluation by encouraging opportunities for formative assessment practices;

developing clear, well-articulated expectations for teaching effectiveness; sponsoring a process to support teaching skill development; and structuring opportunities for confidential peer feedback.

In addition to using peer mentoring to strengthen instruction, UGA should enact a centralized, standardized, automated, and recorded end-of-course evaluation system. The degree to which the results should be made available or public, where the results should be retained and for how long, and who should have access to data storage are obvious topics for faculty governance. But the ease of implementation should be of importance to all involved. Therefore, the Task Force recommends that a new central, online course evaluation system be integrated with Banner to facilitate its use across campus and implement strategies to ensure a high rate of student participation.

RECOMMENDATION 8: INCREASE THE PROPORTION OF SMALLER CLASSES

RATIONALE

In recent years, the UGA President's Office has invested heavily in major faculty hiring initiatives, including one in 2015 representing an investment in excess of \$4M that focused on reducing class sizes. This Small Class Size Initiative created more than 300 new course sections to ensure that students receive more personalized attention to promote student learning and success.

The motivation to make such a major investment is clear as research shows that large classes “prompt faculty to alter their courses in ways deleterious to students” (Monks and Schmidt 2010). Correspondingly, with regard to the attainment of higher-order academic skills such as problem solving, written expression, and critical thinking, “students in smaller classes...acquire more of these skills than do students in larger classes” (MNSU, n.d.). Further, “students in smaller classes reported learning more” (Inside Higher Ed 2013).

Currently, UGA fares well with regard to its percentage of courses having fewer than 20 students, with an overall percentage of 45.5%, but our student-faculty ratio of 18:1 falls behind such institutions as Penn State at 16:1, Michigan and UVA at 15:1, and UNC at 13:1.

The Task Force recommends hiring more faculty and increasing the number of smaller courses relative to the total. It is important to lower our student-faculty ratio, particularly in critical instruction areas. This would promote higher levels of student success and align the university with key aspirational institutions.

IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

The 2015 Small Class Size Initiative has proven effective. The UGA Department of Mathematics provides a good example of its success. An internal study comparing student performance in smaller sections of MATH 1113 (Precalculus) and MATH 2250 (Calculus I for Science and Engineering) offered in Fall 2016 against larger sections offered in prior years, showed that the smaller classes resulted in substantially lower drop/withdraw/fail (DWF) rates. Prior to the small class initiative (between 2013 and 2015), the DFW rates in these classes had been at or above the national average. In contrast, with smaller classes in Fall 2016, these fell to just below the national average in the case of MATH 2250 and to approximately half of the national average with regard to MATH 1113.

The Task Force recommends that UGA should continue its focus on increasing the number of smaller classes in targeted areas in order to promote higher levels of student learning and success.

RECOMMENDATION 9: ENHANCE THE FRESHMAN COLLEGE SUMMER EXPERIENCE

RATIONALE

The Freshman College Summer Experience was an outgrowth of the 1997 President's Task Force on the Quality of the Undergraduate Experience and was developed by the then VP for Instruction, Tom Dyer. The summer program was originally designed to introduce new freshmen to college life. Currently, the Freshman College Summer Experience (FCSE) is a month-long (July) residential program open to all regularly admitted first-year students (275 students participated this past summer with a goal of 300 students for next summer). Participants have an opportunity to earn course credit toward graduation, and to fulfill a general education requirement in a variety of areas. This past summer, FCSE students earned degree credit in a three- or four-hour disciplinary course and a two-hour service-learning course.

FCSE is the ideal summer bridge program to a successful first year, enriching student learning and growth. Freshman College participants emerge from the program confident in their ability to successfully navigate the campus and meet academic challenges in their first year at UGA. Participants gain a head start on course work and receive high levels of support interacting with faculty and staff; participate in mandatory small-group programs, learning about the many academic support units and campus resources (including tutoring for certain core classes); and are exposed to co-curricular activities/events on campus and in the Athens community. In addition, the cohort model and graduate student peer mentors assist in connecting students' living environments and academic environments beyond FCSE and throughout the challenging first year. By living and learning on campus for three weeks in July, students are more prepared academically and socially for the first year. A number of positive outcomes are associated with participation in the FCSE, including high rates of first-year retention (see Appendix 2).

With this context in mind, the Task Force posited that this program would be very beneficial to certain groups of students: first-generation, Pell grant eligible, and rural students. These groups of students have participated in the FCSE at much lower levels primarily because of its cost; yet, it stands to reason

that they would benefit greatly from the highly targeted resources, mentoring, and support provided through the program to promote student learning and success. The Task Force recommends that necessary steps be taken to encourage and facilitate greater participation of these groups of students in FCSE.

IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

Cost can make it difficult for some students to participate in this program. The 2017 Freshman College Summer Experience program fee was \$1,500, which included the costs of summer housing, meal plan, and special programs and events. In addition to the program fee, participants also were responsible for the cost of their tuition (in-state or out-of-state), University and orientation fees, and course materials/textbooks. HOPE and Zell Miller Scholarship awards can be applied to the cost of tuition but not fees. As a possible solution to alleviate any potential financial barriers and to maximize overall student participation, the University could conduct a feasibility study to explore the creation of a set number of scholarships to cover the FCSE program fee cost for traditionally underserved student populations who have high financial need.

In addition, FCSE could expand the number of seats in the cohort to accommodate an increase in participation from traditionally underserved student populations. This step would further promote diversity and inclusion within the FCSE and positively support the recruitment, retention, and academic success of traditionally underserved student populations.

In addition, the University should examine additional resources to provide on-campus employment opportunities to all FCSE participants who are interested in applying for a student job. Offering employment opportunities around campus is another way to connect students to the institution and offset financial barriers for traditionally underserved student populations.

RECOMMENDATION 10: DEVELOP COHORT-BASED SUPPORT PROGRAMS FOR UNDERSERVED STUDENTS

RATIONALE

The UGA student body reflects a diverse group of individuals in terms of their domicile (rural, suburban, or urban), exposure and familiarity with college (first-generation college students), and in terms of their financial means. While many UGA students come from metropolitan Atlanta, Savannah, and other urban areas throughout the Southeast, approximately 15% of the student population at UGA hails from more rural parts of the state (see Appendix 3). Similarly, approximately 5% of UGA's incoming freshman class in the fall 2017 semester were the first in their families to go to college, while 23% were eligible to receive Pell grants, a reflection of having limited financial means. The Task Force also noted that programs dedicated to support such groups of students, such as the Coca-Cola First-Generation Scholarship Program, have a significant positive impact on student success. To build upon the success of such cohort-based programs, the Task Force recommends expanding this model to support more underserved students at UGA.

Efforts are currently underway to build a program similar to the Coca-Cola Program for students with high financial needs and who are awarded one of the “Georgia Commitment Scholarships.” In developing this recommendation, the Task Force looked at the possibility of developing a similar program for students who come from rural areas. It is recognized that many of these students also come from families with limited financial means and may be first in their families to go to college.

The recent national discourse on higher education has brought to light the very real challenges facing students from rural America. For example, “Colleges Discover the Rural Student” and “Voices from Rural America on Why (or Why Not) Go to College” in *The New York Times*, have given voice to the educational experiences of students outside of sub/urban geographic areas. The Task Force recommends that UGA offer these students a comprehensive program that brings together financial, academic, and other kinds of resources to support this population of students at UGA, and thereby expand

our land- and sea-grant mission by extending the transformative reach of higher education throughout Georgia.

IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

A team of administrators from the Office of Instruction, Student Affairs and other units (Naomi Norman, Associate VP for Instruction; T. Chase Hagood, Director of the Division of Academic Enhancement; Judy Iakovou, Director of Academic Advising; Kara Fresk, Director of Learning and Strategic Initiatives in Student Affairs; Shannon Wilder, Director of the Office of Service-Learning; and Meihua Zhai, Senior Institutional Researcher and Principal Data Scientist, Office of Institutional Research) represented UGA at the Association of American Colleges & Universities (AAC&U) Institute on High Impact Practices and Student Success where they worked together to craft a proposal to support rural students at the University (June 2017). Following its review, the Task Force has adopted this plan as a specific recommendation.

The AAC&U proposal, tentatively called the “ALL Georgia” was prompted by data from the Office of Institutional Research showing that students from rural areas of Georgia have approximately 10 percent lower four-year graduation rates and higher one- and two-year withdrawal rates than their sub/urban peers. Moreover, minority UGA students from rural areas were found to have a lower four-year graduation rate and higher one-year withdrawal rate than rural students who do not self-identify as a minority. The ALL Georgia Program would be dedicated to supporting students from rural areas and ensure that these students achieve the same levels of success at UGA as their peers from urban and suburban regions.

The ALL Georgia Program would offer rural students two pathways to academic success at UGA. One pathway will comprise an intentional network of support and resources that will be available to all rural students. The second pathway will be a comprehensive, four-year scholarship program for a cohort of high-achieving and high-need ALL Georgia Scholars.

Both pathways represent a partnership among the Office of Instruction (primarily Division of Academic Enhancement, Admissions, Office of Student Financial Aid, and Academic Advising), Student Affairs, Public Service and Outreach, and Cooperative Extension. The exact details of the program remain to be finalized, but will include a series of experiences, dedicated support network, and optional opportunities as described below.

First-Year Common Experience to Start Strong:

- ALL Georgia students may choose to begin their UGA experience by participating in a Dawg Camp transition program hosted by UGA Student Affairs. Over a three-day period, they will learn about campus and community resources, involvement, leadership, and UGA traditions.
- Following Dawg Camp, ALL Georgia students may choose to participate in two days of an early start academic preparation program, coordinated by the Division of Academic Enhancement (DAE). This program would include classroom simulations; workshops on topics such as study strategies, note-taking skills, stress management, academic writing, studying in groups; brief introduction to academic resources on campus; tips on how to prepare for a productive academic advising appointment; learning to navigate eLC; and more.
- During the first semester, ALL Georgia students may opt to bolster their summer experiences via a common course: UNIV 1xxx (to be submitted to CAPA). This specially designed course, relying on an evidence-based approach to structuring students' positive and sustained transition to higher education, will help students grapple with some of the common challenges for underserved students: learning/study strategies, time management, planning for success, navigating educational systems, etc.
- For the first year, ALL Georgia students may choose to live in intentionally-planned housing communities. Students will have direct access to the new Russell Academic Center (opening Fall 2018). The new RAC will serve both as a key referral point to resources across campus and as a

hub of service interactions, including appointment and drop-in Academic Advising and Academic Coaching, as well as Student Success Workshops and the UNIV course, all offered in close proximity to their residences. The opportunity for ALL Georgia students to live in proximity to one another and engage in targeted programming will create and extend learning opportunities outside of the classroom. In subsequent years, students will have the opportunity to serve as a Resident Assistant for this community of learners.

- PSO and Extension will develop and host a networking event for ALL Georgia students to welcome them to UGA, introduce them to the work PSO does on rural issues, connect them with experiential and employment opportunities, and engage with PSO faculty who could serve as resources and mentors.

Staying Strong Beyond the First Year:

- ALL Georgia students may choose to participate in an immersive service-learning project, such as IMPACT Service Breaks, that encourages a significant understanding and engagement with pressing social issues.
- Students in this program may hone leadership skills in a second-year common experience. Select students could develop as leaders by participating in a year-long, cohort-based experience hosted by UGA Student Affairs. Beginning in September and concluding in April, students will learn about various models of leadership, develop a personal leadership philosophy, interact with leaders across the state of Georgia, and engage in a project or internship that helps them apply their learning to create positive change in their communities.
- ALL Georgia students may apply to participate in a mentor program hosted by UGA Student Affairs. Participating students would be matched with a faculty or staff member who would help the student to clarify career and personal interests, to become more connected and engaged at UGA, to develop skills for addressing current and future challenges, and to develop a course of action for achieving his or her goals.

-
- Public Service and Outreach (PSO) units will direct awareness of its existing opportunities for ALL Georgia students to participate in internships and other experiential learning opportunities, such as the PSO Student Scholars program.
 - PSO will support opportunities for rural student employment that engage these students with the work of PSO units.
 - PSO faculty will offer a workshop for advisors and faculty on rural issues and communities so that they might better understand the experiences of rural students.

All Georgia Scholars Financial Scholarship Pathways:

A key element of this ALL Georgia proposal is the comprehensive, four-year scholarship program for a cohort of high-achieving and high-need ALL Georgia Scholars. These scholars will receive a scholarship to make a UGA education affordable. In addition to the resources available to all ALL Georgia students, the Scholars will receive networking and internship opportunities to prepare them for their post-UGA careers; opportunities for global learning; and service-learning or research courses to connect them back to their hometowns or similar communities in Georgia or elsewhere. The Scholars program will help them grow as scholars, individuals, and members of the University community.

The ALL Georgia Scholars Program will provide a robust four-year collegiate experience for 24 rural students (four cohorts of six students) at UGA who demonstrate significant financial need. The program will welcome six new students into the cohort every year. Each ALL Georgia Scholar will receive an annual academic scholarship of \$7,000 (renewable up to four years if they have a 2.8 GPA in their first semester and a 3.0 GPA thereafter) to help make it possible to attend the University.

Each student in the cohort will receive academic and life-skills support from the Division of Academic Enhancement and Student Affairs, co-curricular involvement, peer and faculty mentors, and service-learning or other experiential learning support to enhance their UGA education. In addition, ALL Georgia Scholars will have the opportunity to participate in the Freshman College Summer Experience before enrolling at the University to help transition them into our unique learning environment. They will also be eligible for grants to participate in global and/or service-learning and to reconnect with their home community.

Success of the ALL Georgia program will depend on coordinating processes and sharing student data across these units so that the ALL Georgia Scholars may be identified, recruited, and tracked from entry through graduation permitting timely and direct assessment of the program's impact(s).

RECOMMENDATION 11: ESTABLISH A CAMPUS-WIDE COUNCIL ON THE FIRST-YEAR EXPERIENCE

RATIONALE

The University of Georgia offers a multitude of programs, services, and opportunities to acclimate new first-year students to campus. These programs provide the support and resources new students need to successfully transition to being a college student at UGA. Key initiatives range from Orientation, Dawg Camp, Freshman College Summer Experience, Welcome Week activities, First-year Housing Live-On requirement, to the First-Year Odyssey seminar.

There are many units and academic departments throughout the campus that provide programs and services to meet the needs of first year students. However, there is no mechanism to facilitate collaboration among stakeholders managing these programs, resulting in poor communication across units and with students, lower efficiency on operations, and reduced effectiveness of various programs.

In addition, while there are many effective programs to acclimate first year students to the University, it is difficult for students and their families to locate these programs because no central portal exists. In addition, consistent marketing across programs would help to expand awareness and participation by entering students.

To address these challenges, the Task Force recommends the establishment of a campus-wide Council on the First-Year Experience. The purpose of the Council on the First-Year Experience is to increase communication and collaboration between stakeholders offering first-year programs and to provide a unified approach for marketing these opportunities to new students and their families.

IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

Council membership will be determined by the Vice President for Instruction and the Vice President for Student Affairs and co-chaired by one Associate Vice President in each of these divisions. Potential programs and/or departments to be considered for inclusion in the Council on the First-Year Experience include but are not limited to:

- Undergraduate Admissions/Orientation
- First-Year Odyssey Seminar
- Dawg Camp
- University Housing
- International Orientation/International Student Life
- Freshman College/Academic Enhancement
- Welcome Week/Center for Student Activities and Involvement
- Exploratory Center
- Academic Advisor Representatives
- Honors Program
- CURO
- Health Promotions/University Health Center
- Dean of Students Office/Student Care and Outreach
- Greek Life Office
- Georgia Daze/GAAME/Institutional Diversity
- Multicultural Services and Programs
- Financial Aid
- Registrar's Office
- Faculty across campus who administer first year student programs

The Council on the First-Year Experience will meet on a monthly basis during the academic year and once each summer.

Objectives to Be Addressed by the Council on the First-Year Experience:

1. Identify all specific programs and services offered at the University for first-year students.
2. Review current marketing for these programs to determine more effective and efficient strategies for the future.
3. Create a UGA First-Year Experience website to serve as a landing site for all first year programs with links to existing efforts.
4. Determine approaches to improve communication and collaboration with Council members to better meet the needs of new first year students.
5. Consistently share information on program updates and changes.
6. Consistently assess the impact of these initiatives.
7. Provide regular reports to the Vice President for Instruction and the Vice President for Student Affairs.

RECOMMENDATION 12: EXPAND RESOURCES AND PROGRAMS TO ACCLIMATE AND SUPPORT TRANSFER STUDENTS

RATIONALE

Over the past several years, UGA has experienced increased growth in the number of transfer students enrolling at the University. These students have different transitional needs than our first-year students and are much more diverse in terms of demographics and academic pursuits. Transfers are more likely to be from minority backgrounds, non-traditional, and/or first-generation students who primarily live off-campus and work at least part-time while enrolled. They view themselves as experienced students but are often unprepared for the academic rigor at UGA, and this may impact their overall success and time to degree. In addition, they are not knowledgeable about academic and support resources provided at the University and often flounder within the first eight weeks of enrollment.

In April 2014, the Transfer Advisory Committee led by Judy Iakovou, Director of Academic Advising, conducted an in-depth study of the transfer student experience at UGA. In addition to the above academic challenges faced by transfers, the committee also learned that many students feel isolated, lonely, and disappointed. New transfer students are often overwhelmed by the size of campus, bus systems, large class sizes, and living away from home. In turn, they feel alienated from their peers. The combination of academic rigor, change of social network, and financial challenges leads many students to experience transfer shock, which is the tendency for transfer students' grade point average to drop during their first semester of enrollment on a new campus.

In a recent study of transfer students, the UGA Office of Undergraduate Admissions sought to learn more about the transitional needs of new transfers. Approximately 38% of transfer students indicated they experienced a difficult transition to the University. In qualitative conversations with current transfer students, members of the Task Force heard similar statements from students who had great difficulty connecting to UGA, identifying social engagement opportunities, and locating campus resources and services. It became evident that transfer students have different transitional

needs than other students, but the University currently does not offer a comprehensive approach to support this population.

IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGIES

The 2014 Transfer Advisory Committee suggested several strategies to address the challenges faced by transfer students at UGA. This Task Force has adopted most of the recommendations made in that report.

Initiatives for Working in the Pre-Transfer Environment:

- Develop a better working relationship with other institutions in the system that serve as the starting point for our incoming transfer students. Evaluate the transfer pathways for our students and liaise with advisors at these schools to identify ways to create efficient transfer pathways.
- Identify clear pathways to degree by merging feeder institution programs with UGA degree programs and posting mixed degree programs on a transfer website for pre-transfer students to use in planning.
- Create a listserv for advisors from partner institutions to share changes in programming, new academic requirements, and policy changes.
- Develop staff to manage communications (e.g., a website), and at least one staff advisor in each college to work with incoming transfers students on how credits will likely be managed, as well as liaise with Admissions.
- Provide information to incoming students prior to orientation on topics such as, what to expect at UGA, what to bring, or, how to interpret transfer credit, perhaps through the development of transfer handbooks for each college.
- Work with the Office of Institutional Research to identify potential at-risk students using a predictive model based upon markers in MATH, SAT scores, previous GPA and number of withdrawals.

Initiatives for working with current transfers:

- Determine ways to make the transfer equivalence and departmental credit evaluation process more understandable, efficient, and student friendly.
- Develop a live companion transfer equivalency site to help students knowledgeably plan their courses at feeder schools.
- Offer frequent workshops for students at-risk or a voluntary transfer seminar in study skills and critical thinking, with an emphasis on learning in a research environment. Partner with STEM faculty members and others to teach demonstration lessons encompassing the application, analysis, and evaluation skills necessary for deep learning.
- Offer walk-in hours specifically for transfer students in the Exploratory Center to answer questions about the campus, majors, or resources, especially early in the semester.
- Provide a transfer student center space where new transfer students can meet, get information, and learn about available campus resources.
- Establish an internal transfer-student website for campus-wide collaboration on programming.
- Oversee a peer mentor program for incoming transfer students.
- Maintain open communication with students via newsletter, Twitter, and other media.
- Help connect students to relevant campus organizations for their major, interest, or background through assessment efforts and data analytics.
- Develop partnerships between various academic units and Student Affairs to provide programs to meet the needs of new transfer students. Examples may include programs on navigating cultural and familial differences, teaching your family about college, how to get engaged in campus life, or financial literacy.
- Partner with academic units to develop relevant communities which address the diverse needs and interests of transfer students.
- Work with the Office of Student Financial Aid to identify funding sources to provide scholarships and additional aid to transfer students.

REFERENCES

- American Council on Education report on Unpacking Relationships: Instruction and Student Outcomes (<http://www.acenet.edu/news-room/Documents/Unpacking-Relationships-Instruction-and-Student-Outcomes.pdf>). Last retrieved on November 18, 2017.
- Association of American Colleges & Universities (2015). Employer Priorities for Most Important College Learning Outcomes. <https://www.aacu.org/leap/public-opinion-research/2015-employer-priorities>. Last retrieved on November 18, 2017.
- Association of American Colleges and Universities, “Essential Learning Outcomes,” <http://www.aacu.org/leap/essential-learning-outcomes>. Last retrieved on November 18, 2017.
- Association of American Colleges and Universities, “Quantitative Literacy VALUE Rubric,” <http://www.aacu.org/value/rubrics/quantitative-literacy>. Last retrieved on November 18, 2017.
- Bell, Amani, and Rosina Mladenovic. 2008. “The Benefits of Peer Observation of Teaching for Tutor Development.” Review of. *Higher Education: The International Journal of Higher Education and Educational Planning* 55 (6):735-52.
- Berstein, Daniel J. 2008. “Peer Review and Evaluation of the Intellectual Work of Teaching.” Review of. *Change* 40 (2): 48-51.
- Beyond IT. IBM’s role in creating the workforce of the future (2009). https://www-05.ibm.com/de/ibm/engagement/university_relations/pdf/Beyond_IT_report_IBM_Workforce_of_the_Future.pdf. Last retrieved on November 18, 2017.
- Brockbank, Anne, and Ian McGill. 1998. “Facilitating Reflective Learning in Higher Education.” In, 297. Society for Research into Higher Education Ltd. London (England),: Taylor & Francis, 1900 Frost Rd., Suite 101, Bristol, PA 19007-1598; Tel: 800-821-8312 (Toll Free) (paperback: ISBN-0-335-19685-3.
- “Class Size” (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://www.mnsu.edu/cetl/teachingresources/articles/classsize.html>. Last retrieved on November 18, 2017.
- “Class Size Matters,” Inside Higher Ed. Retrieved from <https://www.insidehighered.com/views/2013/01/29/essay-importance-class-size-higher-education>. Last retrieved on November 18, 2017.
- Environmental Computing, “Quantitative Tutorials for the Environmental Sciences,” <http://environmentalcomputing.net/>. Last retrieved on November 18, 2017.
- Forbes, “Realizing the Potential of Big Data and Analytics,” by Daniel Newman, January 31, 2017 <https://www.forbes.com/sites/danielnewman/2017/01/31/realizing-the-potential-of-big-data-and-analytics/#7498c908709a>. Last retrieved on November 18, 2017.
- Freeman, S., Eddy, L. E., McDonough, M., Smith, M. K., Okoroafor, N., Jordt, H., & Wenderworth, M. P. (2014). Active learning increases student performance in science, engineering, and mathematics. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 111(23), 8410-8415.
- Freiberg, H. Jerome. 1987. “Enriching Feedback to Student-Teachers Through Small Group Discussion.” Review of. *Teacher Education Quarterly* 14 (3): 71-82.

Harvard Business Review, “Most Industries Are Nowhere Close to Realizing the Potential of Analytics,” by Nicolaus Henke, Jacques Bughin, and Michael Chui, December 16, 2016. <https://hbr.org/2016/12/most-industries-are-nowhere-close-to-realizing-the-potential-of-analytics>. Last retrieved on November 18, 2017.

Lippens, A. F (2016). How active learning spaces support an evolving pedagogy. Retrieved from the Educational Advisory Board website: <https://www.eab.com/research-and-insights/facilities-forum/expert-insights/2016/reconfigure-classrooms-to-support-evolving-pedagogy>. Last retrieved on November 18, 2017.

Miller, R. K. (2015). Why the hard science of Engineering is no longer enough to meet the 21st century challenges. http://www.olin.edu/sites/default/files/rebalancing_engineering_education_may_15.pdf. Last retrieved on November 18, 2017.

Monks, James and Robert Schmidt. (2010). The impact of class size and number of students on outcomes in higher education [Electronic version]. Retrieved from <http://digitalcommons.ilr.cornell.edu/workingpapers/114/>. Last retrieved on November 29, 2017.”

National Association of Colleges and Employers (2016). Job Outlook 2016: The attributes employers want to see on new college graduates’ resumes. <http://www.nacweb.org/career-development/trends-and-predictions/job-outlook-2016-attributes-employers-want-to-see-on-new-college-graduates-resumes/>. Last retrieved on November 18, 2017.

National Center for Academic Transformation (<http://www.thencat.org>). Last retrieved on November 18, 2017.

Park, E. L., & Choi, B. K. (2014). Transformation of classroom spaces: traditional versus active learning classroom in colleges. *Higher Education: The International Journal of Higher Education and Educational Planning*, 68(5), 749-771.

Peel, Deborah. 2005. “Peer Observation as a Transformatory Tool?” *Review of. Teaching in Higher Education* 10 (4): 489-504.

PLOS Computational Biology, “The Quantitative Methods Boot Camp: Teaching Quantitative Thinking and Computing Skills to Graduate Students in the Life Sciences,” by Melanie Stefan, Johanna Gutlerner, Richard Born and Michael Springer, April 16, 2015, <http://journals.plos.org/ploscompbiol/article?id=10.1371/journal.pcbi.1004208>. Last retrieved on November 18, 2017.

Quinlan, Kathleen M., and Gerlese S. Akerlind. 2000. “Factors Affecting Departmental Peer Collaboration for Faculty Development: Two Cases in Context.” *Review of. Higher Education* 40 (1): 23-52.

SERC @ Carleton College, “Developing Quantitative Reasoning,” compiled by Nathan Grawe, <https://serc.carleton.edu/sp/library/qr/index.html>. Last retrieved on November 18, 2017.

University of Michigan (n.d.). Considerations for planning new general purpose classrooms. Retrieved from <https://www.provost.umich.edu/space/instruct/ClassroomPlanningConsiderations.pdf>.

APPENDIX 1: OTHER SELECTED GRAND CHALLENGES OR BIG IDEA PROGRAMS

Addendum for Recommendation 3 (Grand Challenges Program)

National Science Foundation

https://www.nsf.gov/od/oia/additional_resources/interdisciplinary_research/definition.jsp.

A working definition of interdisciplinary research is provided by the National Academies' report*: "Interdisciplinary research is a mode of research by teams or individuals that integrates information, data, techniques, tools, perspectives, concepts, and/or theories from two or more disciplines or bodies of specialized knowledge to advance fundamental understanding or to solve problems whose solutions are beyond the scope of a single discipline or area of research practice."

**Committee on Facilitating Interdisciplinary Research, Committee on Science, Engineering, and Public Policy (2004). Facilitating interdisciplinary research. National Academies. Washington: National Academy Press, p. 2.*

The following research universities offer a Grand Challenge (GC) or Big Issues program:

The **University of Minnesota** offers a Grand Challenge curriculum built on three-credit-hour courses, open to all students, which meets liberal education theme requirements. GC courses are taught by cross-disciplinary instructors who bring unique perspectives to each Grand Challenge being explored. Seven to eight courses are offered each term, and the GC program is overseen by the Office of Undergraduate Education. <http://gcc.umn.edu/>

The **UCLA** Grand Challenges program focuses on two broad research agendas which include student immersion activities. The GC Undergraduate research scholars program offers a course open to second and third year students, which includes placement in a research setting (research mentor); a weekly concurrent course; and an interdisciplinary research experience with peers (course mentor). Graduate students may work with both the research agenda and the associated course. <https://grandchallenges.ucla.edu/>

UC-Berkeley launched Big Idea courses in 2012 to bring together two or more faculty members from different disciplines to co-teach innovative interdisciplinary courses. Big Ideas Courses explore key intellectual and societal challenges that cannot be adequately addressed by the perspective or methodology of one discipline alone. <http://bigideascourses.berkeley.edu/>

UT-Austin offers a competitive GC scholars program, and selected students must complete five curricular and extracurricular components: service learning, global dimension, entrepreneurship, a project or independent research related to one of the GC, and completing of the interdisciplinary curriculum. More may be seen at <http://catalog.utexas.edu/undergraduate/engineering/minor-and-certificate-programs/> showing the NAE Grand Challenges Scholars program (certificate).

The **University of Virginia** GC program is aimed at graduating at least 20 scholars per year who have worked together from all majors around a grand challenge. Students complete a variety of activities (often a non-major course related to their grand challenge) that are assembled from the wide range of courses and activities at UVA. <https://opengrounds.virginia.edu/content/grand-challenge-scholars-program>.

Programs at other peer and aspirational institutions share the curricular focus on study abroad/global perspectives, entrepreneurship, service-learning, independent research, and a limited interdisciplinary coursework. Financial support may or may not be available from the institution to support the program participants in required elements. Costs are controlled in some cases by coursework in lieu of an element such as study abroad. Iowa offers a GC Scholars and a GC Fellows program.

University of Iowa: <https://www.engineering.uiowa.edu/current-students/grand-challenges-scholars-program>

North Carolina State University: <http://www.engineeringchallenges.org/File.aspx?id=15973&v=52988610>

Ohio State: <https://advising.engineering.osu.edu/current-osu-students/gcsp-requirements>

The Georgia Institute of Technology offers through the Division of Student Life a Grand Challenges Living-Learning community of just over 100 students. Students are required to live in Howell residence hall for the academic year, enroll in two three-hour courses (with a fee), complete a required service project, and attend mandatory retreats. The program has a director and staff, facilitators from various schools, faculty fellows, and an advisory board made up of schools and program partners. <http://grandchallenges.gatech.edu/>

Duke University through a large endowment offers the Bass connection (named after the benefactors). BASS includes 5 themes—Brain and Society; Information, Society and Culture; Global Health; Education and Human Development; and Energy and the Environment. <https://bassconnections.duke.edu/theme>

University of Denver: Grand Challenges is a family of programs built on the DU history of public outreach and a long-standing commitment to community service. It is led by the Center for Community Engagement and Service Learning (CCESL); the collaboration for the public good working group is comprised of eight DU faculty and staff from distinct disciplines and departments across campus. A description of their listening sessions and current and future activities can be found at the website. <https://www.du.edu/ccesl/grand-challenges/>

Other resources:

British Academy. (2016). Crossing paths: Interdisciplinary institutions, careers, education, and applications. Retrieved from <https://www.britac.ac.uk/>

Dubrow, G., Tranby, R., & Voight, C. (Eds.). (2008). *Fostering interdisciplinary inquiry: Proceedings from a conference*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota.

National Academy of Sciences. (2005). *Facilitating interdisciplinary research*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.

Grand Challenges.org is a family of initiatives fostering innovation to solve key global health and development problems. <https://grandchallenges.org/#/map>

The **American Academy of Social Work and Social Welfare**, an honorific society, has enunciated the Challenges for Social Work. <http://aaswsw.org/>. One of the aspirations of the Grand Challenges program is to build a more cohesive society that fights exclusion and marginalization, creates a sense of belonging, promotes trust, and offers pathways for social and economic mobility for everyone. UGA is a sustaining sponsor of the Grand Challenges for Social Work. <http://aaswsw.org/>

APPENDIX 2: FRESHMAN COLLEGE SUMMER EXPERIENCE (FCSE) RETENTION RATES

Data provided by the Division of Academic Enhancement.

2008	
Freshman College At-Risk	96.9%
Freshman College Non-At-Risk	97.5%
UGA Overall	94.5%
2009	
Freshman College At-Risk	100%
Freshman College Non-At-Risk	97.3%
UGA Overall	94.5%
2010	
Freshman College At-Risk	93.5%
Freshman College Non-At-Risk	98.7%
UGA Overall	94.5%
2011	
Freshman College At Risk	95.7%
Freshman College Non-At-Risk	98.7%
UGA Overall	94.1%
2012	
Freshman College At-Risk	100.0%
Freshman College Non-At-Risk	98.9%
UGA Overall	94.2%
2013	
Freshman College At-Risk	100.0%
Freshman College Non-At-Risk	97.6%
UGA Overall	94.1%
2014	
Freshman College At-Risk	93.3%
Freshman College Non-At-Risk	96.1%
UGA Overall	95.2%
2015	
Freshman College At-Risk	88.4%
Freshman College Non-At-Risk	94.5%
UGA Overall	95.2%

APPENDIX 3: RURAL/URBAN DEMOGRAPHICS AND STUDENT OUTCOMES

Based on recent data collection from UGA's Office of Institutional Research, rural students comprise just under 15% of the UGA undergraduate population. "Rural," for this preliminary research, encompasses all population, housing, and territory not included within a Census defined urban area, 2010 boundaries. According to a September 2016 report, rural Georgia accounts for 17% of the population of the state. (See <https://saportareport.com/rural-georgia-home-17-percent-states-residents-faces-grueling-hardships/>).

In much of the national conversation, students with rural origins are considered "the new minority student" in that they are "difficult to find, harder to enroll, but offering a perspective that moved to the forefront in the last presidential campaign." The 17 percent of Georgians who live in rural areas face severe economic and educational challenges and UGA should continue and further emphasize its efforts to recruit such students and extend them the necessary support to ensure their success.

Some useful references on the challenges faced by students from rural areas are available here:

- "The Disadvantage of Rural Students in College Enrollment and Choice" at <http://bit.ly/2iku9g3>
- "The Effects of Rurality on College Access and Choice" at <http://bit.ly/2fZmfrp>
- "USDA Rural/Sub-Urban Stats" at <http://bit.ly/2uYEpR5>.

The following tables show the most recently available data for UGA students.

Table A: Graduation Rates by Urban / Rural Status

Cohort	Totals			Four-Year Grad Rates			Five-Year Grad Rates		
	No Match	Rural	Urban	No Match	Rural	Urban	No Match	Rural	Urban
2008	389	687	3,702	47.30	51.67	63.72	65.04	78.31	84.55
2009	349	675	3,651	55.01	55.41	64.50	80.23	78.07	84.00
2010	297	721	3,649	55.22	57.14	64.89	75.42	77.53	83.94

First permanent address was taken from ADC

"Rural" encompasses all population, housing, and territory not included within a Census defined urban area (2010 boundaries)

Year ending in summer term; rate expressed as a percentage

Table B: Withdraw Rates by Urban / Rural Status

Cohort	Totals			Four-Year Grad Rates			Five-Year Grad Rates		
	No Match	Rural	Urban	No Match	Rural	Urban	No Match	Rural	Urban
2011	339	832	4,299	6.78	6.25	4.16	10.62	10.94	7.40
2012	325	713	3,884	4.92	6.73	4.07	8.31	10.94	7.08
2013	372	748	4,098	6.45	5.35	3.98	10.22	9.36	6.98

Permanent address was taken from Admissions 60A table

"Rural" encompasses all population, housing, and territory not included within a Census defined urban area (2013 boundaries)

Table C – Graduation Rates by Minority and Urban / Rural Status

Cohort	Minority	Totals			Four-Year Grad Rates			Five-Year Grad Rates			Six-Year Grad Rates		
		No Match	Rural	Urban	No Match	Rural	Urban	No Match	Rural	Urban	No Match	Rural	Urban
2008	No	330	646	3,281	48.49	51.86	64.55	64.24	78.48	85.34	66.67	82.51	88.69
2008	Yes	59	41	421	40.68	48.78	57.25	69.49	75.61	78.39	71.19	85.37	84.32
2009	No	279	629	3,243	55.56	56.28	64.91	81.36	78.06	84.03	82.44	81.72	87.17
2009	Yes	70	46	408	52.86	43.48	61.28	75.71	78.26	83.82	87.14	80.44	87.01
2010	No	248	672	3,201	57.66	57.89	65.64	78.63	77.98	84.54	79.84	80.21	86.60
2010	Yes	49	49	448	42.86	46.94	59.60	59.18	71.43	79.69	63.27	85.71	83.93

Minority includes African-American, Hispanic and American Indian First permanent address was taken from ADC

“Rural” encompasses all population, housing, and territory not included within a Census defined urban area (2010 boundaries) Year ending in summer term; rate expressed as a percentage

Table D – Graduation Rates by Gender and Urban / Rural Status

Cohort	Gender	Totals			Four-Year Grad Rates			Five-Year Grad Rates			Six-Year Grad Rates		
		No Match	Rural	Urban	No Match	Rural	Urban	No Match	Rural	Urban	No Match	Rural	Urban
2008	Female	258	443	2,310	54.26	55.31	68.36	69.77	79.68	86.75	71.32	82.84	89.13
2008	Male	131	243	1,391	33.59	44.86	56.00	55.73	75.72	80.88	59.54	82.31	86.63
2009	Female	215	374	2,271	60.47	62.57	70.15	81.40	81.28	85.91	83.26	83.16	88.38
2009	Male	134	301	1,378	46.27	46.51	55.23	78.36	74.09	80.91	83.58	79.73	85.20
2010	Female	189	449	2,248	61.38	61.92	69.97	79.37	77.73	85.01	80.95	80.18	86.83
2010	Male	108	272	1,401	44.44	49.27	56.75	68.52	77.21	82.23	70.37	81.25	85.37

First permanent address was taken from ADC

“Rural” encompasses all population, housing, and territory not included within a Census defined urban area (2010 boundaries)

Year ending in summer term; rate expressed as a percentage

Table E – Withdraw Rates by Gender and Urban / Rural Status

Cohort	Gender	Totals			One-Year Withdraw Rate			Two-Year Withdraw Rate		
		No Match	Rural	Urban	No Match	Rural	Urban	No Match	Rural	Urban
2011	Female	210	502	2,607	6.19	5.58	4.53	9.52	9.96	7.86
2011	Male	129	330	1,692	7.75	7.27	3.61	12.40	12.42	6.68
2012	Female	202	425	2,324	4.95	7.29	4.17	8.91	10.82	7.10
2012	Male	123	288	1,560	4.88	5.90	3.91	7.32	11.11	7.05
2013	Female	240	464	2,488	7.50	5.60	3.38	10.83	9.70	6.23
2013	Male	132	284	1,610	4.55	4.93	4.91	9.09	8.80	8.14

Permanent address was taken from Admissions 60A table

"Rural" encompasses all population, housing, and territory not included within a Census defined urban area (2013 boundaries) Year ending in summer term

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Task Force greatly appreciates the help extended by Megan L. Mittelstadt, Ph.D., Assistant Director for Faculty Development and Recognition at the Center for Teaching and Learning, for some background research in developing this report.

The Task Force also appreciates the efforts of Tracy Coley, Public Relations Coordinator in the Office of the Vice President for Instruction, and Lindsay Robinson, in the Division of Marketing and Communications, for their assistance with copy editing, proof reading, and formatting the report.