

University System of Georgia
Regents' Academic Advisory Committee on English
Annual Meeting, 26-27 January 2012
Georgia Gwinnett College
Meeting Minutes

USG Representatives in Attendance: Billy Reynolds, Abraham Baldwin; Beth Howells and David Wheeler, Armstrong State; Lisa Mallory and Joan Hildenbrand, Atlanta Metropolitan; Lillie Johnson, Augusta State; Barbara Goodman, Clayton State; Carmen Skaggs, Columbus State; Rob Bleil, Coastal Georgia; Barbara Murray, Dalton State; Carmine Palumbo, East Georgia; Washella Simmons, Fort Valley; Leslie Worthington, Gainesville State; Elaine Whitaker, Georgia College & State Univ., chair-elect; Jen Wunder, Georgia Gwinnett, chair; Jesse Bishop, Georgia Highlands; Ted Wadley, Georgia Perimeter, past chair; Elizabeth Kuipers, Georgia SW; Rebecca Burnett, Robin Wharton, and Carol Senf, Georgia Tech; Jason Horn, Gordon; Debra Matthews, Macon State; Rhonda Crombie, Middle Georgia; April Gentry, Savannah State; Mark Nunes, Southern Polytechnic; Gardner Rogers, Valdosta State; Angela Coleman, USG liaison; Leslie Caldwell, USG Director of Testing; Felita Williams, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Planning.

Guests from TCSG

Day 1

The 2012 Annual Meeting was held in the Heritage Room of the GGC Library. Jen Wunder, RAAC on English Chair, called the annual meeting to order at 1 pm. Dr. John Haydock, Acting Dean of the GGC School of Liberal Arts welcomed all participants. Introductions followed.

Packets were distributed to members in attendance. Packets provided to participants contained:

1. Charges from the system and RAAC memos regarding articulation agreements with the TCSG for Humanities;
2. Multiple samples of syllabi, assignments, graded student work, and materials for Humanities supplied by member schools of the TCSG including Chattahoochee Tech and Athens Tech;
3. Links to online TCSG course management systems housing the courses (further examples) and the textbooks used by the TCSG;
4. Multiple samples of the same materials listed above but from USG schools that offer Humanities courses;
5. Core curriculum excerpts, including the A-E learning goals and overlay goals in the new core as well as Area F guidelines in the English major;
6. New Learning Support Policies.

Marketing Materials for English

The system offices would be very receptive to receiving materials from our RAAC explaining the value of an English major and the pathways open for post-graduate employment as a result of the completion of this major.

Area F

Because the system is now outcomes based, we have been asked to revisit the Area F guidelines with a view to making each assessable. There is general agreement that the outcomes need to be of appropriate scope but flexible enough to accommodate different institutions' missions and majors. It was noted that guidelines need to be measurable.

Common Courses/Surveys

Institutions are generally receptive to dividing surveys further, if desired by member institutions, so long as common course numbers already established retained their meanings. The RAAC affirmed that the prefixes, numbers and descriptions of courses need to be consistent if they are in the common course list. As long as you are following the policy elements, the rest is up to a school. The solution for courses that do not match (the three-way split for example) is to give them new numbers. For example, 2113, 2114, and 2115. Committee members are in agreement that this is the simplest solution.

The committee unanimously agrees that we will recommend to ABAC that the school can change the numbers to solve the problem.

Transferability rules and cross-area transfer credit in the new core curriculum were briefly discussed. Note that if we approve something for Area C and the CGE does as well, then that course transfers to Area C across the entire system.

Outcomes for Common Courses

The system offices would like to see committees begin to develop outcomes for the common courses. These can be with overlap in Area F. The chair asked what would happen if the outcomes for the common courses were standardized: Is it acceptable to give a small number of outcomes, very small, that all schools can agree upon, and then schools can add to the small number some additional, institutional specific outcomes that are different? The indication from the system was that, yes, this was acceptable.

Discussion ensued. How can we allow for the flexibility necessary in a World Literature survey and flexibility of the text? This is particularly important to committee members, and members are in full agreement that standardization should be avoided.

It is proposed that we arrive first at what we believe the Area F outcomes should be and then, once those are determined, we might look at them and designate one or two that are applicable to the surveys.

USG-TCSG HUMN 1101 Articulation Agreement

A preview of the tasks ahead for the next day took place. Members were asked to review the materials in the packet before the group breakfast with TCSG members the next day. The chair walked members through the materials supplied by the TCSG and encouraged everyone to visit the CMS and view the courses from the TCSG.

Day 2

Members met to discuss HUMN 1101 with our TCSG colleagues and attempt to arrive at an articulation agreement in which the USG schools could accept the course in Area C. It would go into Area C; or, in cases where English majors allow an elective in Area F, it would be allowable there. Students who take World Literature and a foreign language in Area C, for example, might be able to place this course from the TCSG into Area F. The more likely place would be Area C. There are only a few schools in the USG that offer HUMN 1101. One thing the committee may need to address is whether or not this is the same as a 2000-level HUMN in the USG.

Considerable sharing occurred, including detailed breakout sessions concerning Course Materials, Ranges/Norming, and Outcomes. Conversations were collegial and productive. Nevertheless, RAAC members expressed concerns, including the concern that TCSG colleagues had 6/6 loads and large class sizes. Following the breakout sessions, TCSG colleagues left, and RAAC members were led by our chair in summarizing our understandings. The textbook used for HUMN 1101 was considered acceptable. Discussion focused on the possibility of shared outcomes, assignments assessed with a common rubric, the need to keep the conversation open, and the need to ensure rigor across all courses in TCSG and USG.

Developments in Learning Support in the USG

New system minimums and LS policies were shared by Leslie Caldwell. These are lower than some set by the TCSG. The bottom scores resemble those of the Ability to Benefit scores set by the federal government. Brief open discussion ensued.

The remainder of the meeting consisted of subcommittee reports, installation of officers, and plans for convening on the last weekend of January 2013 in Milledgeville.

Appendix 1

Subcommittee Report of Marketing the English Major

Notes for "Marketing" English (VERY sketchy and incomplete): Billy Reynolds and Gardner Rogers

English:

- Most obviously, trains students (whether in Lit or in Comp) in *communication*;
 - Increasingly, this is multi-modal training;
 - Our classes teach students to:
 - Read carefully and in depth;
 - Write persuasively and coherently

- Speak persuasively and coherently
 - All of the above make students of value to potential employers in many fields
- Provides many courses where students both read at least 50 pages/week *and* write 20+ pages/semester: See *Academically Adrift*, where Arum and Roksa found that students who did both (not just one or the other) did significantly better in the CLA (Collegiate Learning Assessment); the payoff is in improved critical thinking skills
 - In a follow-up study of the cohort described in *Academically Adrift*, Arum and Roksa found that while Business majors had the most success finding jobs after graduation, students majoring in communication fields (including English) also had a high success rate in finding jobs.
- Teaches (through reading and discussing and writing about texts that reflect a wide variety of cultures and many historical periods) awareness, appreciation, or at least tolerance of cultural difference and nuanced sensitivity to differing perspectives issuing from differences in culture, race, class, gender, and so on.
 - These are key requirements for citizenship in an increasingly global community
- Teaches (as students encounter “difficult” texts or texts representing difficult, complex situations) problem-solving skills and recognition of complexity

WE think our immediate “audience” should be imagined as legislators (state representatives) and parents.

Potential marketing tools include:

- Internships
- Plugging into alumni networks
- Surveys and interviews of graduated majors

Appendix 2

Area F Report

The Sophomore Subcommittee proposed the following outcomes for Area F which were voted upon and unanimously approved. Students will be able to:

1. Demonstrate intermediate level mastery of a foreign language;
2. Identify key periods and genres in literary and/or cultural production;
3. Communicate effectively for appropriate audiences and purposes;
4. Analyze and interpret texts;
5. Integrate sources appropriately.