

Meeting Minutes: RAC Political Science

Monday, January 27th 2:00 PM

Conference Call: Meeting Attendees: Dlynn Williams, Kimberly Gill, Tom Rotnem, Chapman Rackaway, Julie Lester, Kris Beck, Lance Hunter, Randy Green, Peter Brecke, Michael Lewkowicz

The meeting was called to order by Dlynn Williams at 2:02. All participants on the call were asked to introduce themselves. Following the introductions, Dlynn thanked all participants for their time. She then proceeded to outline the agenda and meeting direction. The four areas: update on the votes, core curriculum, bylaws, and dual enrollment, as well as the state of the state address and what came up from that link to dual enrollment. She also stated once the agenda items were discussed, the call would be open to all to discuss and concerns or issues.

Update from Dlynn: She emailed Felita Williams the results of the vote regarding the policies that we passed, regarding area F. She stipulated she was not sure the process going forward because we are an advisory committee. She stated if she does not hear back from her by Wednesday of this week, she will try to call or try to find someone else at the board of regions that can tell her what makes it official and how do we move forward under that. The vote results were:

1. Changes to Area F Guidelines Political Science Foundation Political Science Courses

Current Area F Guidelines

The current Area F Guidelines specify that institutions can offer the following “foundation courses in political science:” Introduction to Political Science, Introduction to State and Local Government, Introduction to Public Administration, Introduction to Comparative Politics, Introduction to Global Issues, and Introduction to Domestic Issues (Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia Area F Guidelines Political Science, 1.)

Proposed Change to Area F Guidelines

The Area F Guidelines shall be changed to add Introduction to Political Philosophy to the list of foundation courses in political science.

The final committee vote on this proposition was: 14 Yes/2 No The resolution passes.

2. Changes to Area F Guidelines Political Science Credit Hours

Current Area F Guidelines

The current Area F Guidelines specify that institutions can offer 0-9 credit hours of “foundation courses in political science” (Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia Area F Guidelines Political Science, 1.)

Proposed Change to Area F Guidelines

The Area F Guidelines shall be changed to specify that institutions can offer 0-15 credit hours of foundation courses in political science. The final committee vote on this proposition was: 14 Yes/3 No. The resolution passes.

The second issue was regarding the core curriculum. She sent something out that morning and wanted to make sure we all received that and if we had any questions, what she sent out to us what came from a public meeting at her institution. And she was trying to find out if similar meetings are happening across institutions and if the feedback, looks somewhat similar or what we have been asked to provide. She explained what was sent out. The document that she scanned and sent as part of a document that was given to her at a meeting last Thursday when, the administration was looking for feedback regarding the new core curriculum and it was a very quick experience where we had about four minutes.

It appears that domain number 22, politics and government is focused on American government issues. Domain number 14 looks like the closest that could be found to global issues or some type of intro to IR. The process for Dlynn was as follows: They were brought into a group, and we were asked to prioritize the domains as to what we thought was course-based and what we thought was cross cutting across the curriculum. After those five minutes or so, they were given seven minutes to fill out the bubbled form that you see kind of labeled as round two. They were given this bubbled form and told to put courses across the top, but it wasn't that specific and things that we thought cut across the curriculum down the Y axis. So the X axis would be the numbers 14, that we mentioned, 22, whatever those numbers are across the top. And then domain numbers down the side, and they were given five to seven minutes. Then you had to pick a partner, then take five to seven minutes. And then you were supposed to synthesize those ideas and talk about what were agreements between you and your partner across the top X axis and down the Y axis. And that became around two. Dlynn asked if anyone could speak to if we had these kinds of meetings on your campus and if they were similar?

Most participants on the call had not had such an experience. She wanted to give us a heads up and ask feedback and to encourage faculty to participate. On her campus there were three sessions. The first one, the second what's happened the day of our RAC meeting at noon. The question was posed regarding who was driving the discussions and it was being led by representatives to the BOR core curriculum.

Columbus State had a meeting where faculty were all invited on December 3rd, which was our study day. CSU did not use the domain guide.

Bylaws: Kimberly discussed some of the issues with the current bylaws particularly under the executive committee section. The draft bylaws that that went out, when we were looking at just the officers in general, we had some issues with the way they were set up. The chair shall serve for a two year renewable term, then it's got the chair elect and a secretary. If the chair is reelected for a second year term, is it automatically assumed that the chair elect will serve another two years because that is not clarified. It interchanges the duties of the chair elect and a secretary. It didn't separate, even though it says that there shall be, there could be a secretary, it basically says the secretary or chair elect throughout. The way the term of office is set up for the executive committee is confusing and the committee was asked for some suggestions or some thoughts or some recommendations. I took a stab at redoing it, that part.

The draft proposal was emailed it to everyone on the conference call. The discussion was as follows: but the term of office for each member of the executive committee shall be the chair shall serve for a two year renewable term. This term will begin at the conclusion of the annual advisory committee meeting, which they are like that. And we'll conclude the end of the meeting in the second year. If the chairs renewed, the chair elect will have the option to continue to serve a two year renewable term. I mean it's basically if the chairs really liked it then the chair lit can continue to serve in the chair like position if they desire and I did have the secretary will be elected every year, the annual meeting and serve a one year renewable term. Do we want it all uniform and say two year terms so everybody does the two year. What do you all think? Chapman at West Georgia. Unanimity or consistency makes sense. You might think that that's the question is do we tie everybody down to two years or do we tie everybody down to a one year? But then you have a lot of elections.”

Dlynn asked if everyone could look at the draft and provide the group feedback. Based on your feedback, then Kimberly will bring this up as a voting item.

Tom read the existing bylaws before we met today and found this section very confusing. He would argue that in this part that says the term of office for each member of the executive committee is as follows, just forget about these as follows, just say is two years. And then underneath each bulleted position, just say if they want to serve another term for like, because I don't see why secretaries have a one year renewable term as opposed to the other two. Okay, that sounds good. So it makes it more simple. Dlynn asked if Tom could send his recommendation to Kimberly.

Any other feedback about the bylaws?

Julie had a question on article five. With the consolidations, aren't we down to 26 institution? Do we need to change that number?

Discussion was as follows: “I guess 13 now that depends on whether we, whether our one poll exactly have or if it's pure majority, which would be 50% plus one rep. I assume that the board operates by Robert's rules. Rather than delineating the number, it was suggested is why don't we just set it up as a pure majority. Roberts does call for a pure majority. So rather than including the numbers, why don't we just strike it and say a majority of the Inns of the member institutions. That way we don't have to change it. Anytime there's any consolidation, anything of that nature

except for uh, whenever motions are made next year we have to know how many we actually have.

The committee members were asked if they have any further feedback for Kimberly about the bylaws, please share with her. Members of the committee were also asked if anyone was interested, if you know someone else that might be interested in helping to serve as the secretary, one of the questions that we have as a group honestly, is to try to figure out if we do want to be a little bit more active and do some more things.

But before you leave the bylaws discussion the focus of the discussion shifted to regarding article two the general function, and that's the fifth bulleted item. The extent that our enrollments at each of our individual universities American government POLS 1101 is impacted by Ecore.

Discussion: Questions about what should be the textbook in the E core 1101 course? Do we have a chance to weigh in? Do we get to see what all the textbooks are? It's about equal or we haven't seen it. There is an opportunity for us to have an impact not only with the text but also with the quality and potentially the content. Who is responsible? Moving forward, finding out the point of contact for E core and continuing this discussion is needed. We could ask them questions like, well, what are the criteria you utilize in determining which text is chosen and do we as the advisory committee have any input about that text? Is there a way that we could see copies of those texts that you're considering? How often does the bid process go up for a textbook? So when does the bid go up again? How can you receive input regarding that bid? Then maybe we could have a preliminary conversation and then by the time we would have all the information.

Tom Rotnem agreed to reach out to e-core to try to find a contact to determine the e-core contact and to try to encourage them to participate in an upcoming meeting or conference call.

Dual enrollment: The state of the state address with Brian Kemp in the governor's new budget, he is proposing that dual enrollment is only junior and senior students. He was making the overture that it would max out at 30 hours. There was also an Article in the AJC. Julie sent the link to all committee members. Part of the discussion that we had in Savannah was that the dual enrollment with pulling instructors off of teaching at the actual campus itself and moving them to a variety of off-site locations which impacts efficiencies. Dual enrolled students are also often encouraged to do E-Core to avoid transportation and scheduling issues. The faculty in these cases aren't being moved to an offsite location, however we then come back to the E core issues that Tom outlined.

If you reduce the number of hours they can take that then going to impact everyone's formula funding because then if students are taking less hours and at the same time we have some issues with upcoming shrinking enrollments. *Helpful data: data on a number of American government sections that you offer prior to the enactment of this and what happens on particular campuses or areas where you tend to have a high dual enrollment involvement, what happens after this bill?*

Dlynn asked for other core issues.

Lance asked what other people's reactions or in response to the latest changes to the core or the information went out regarding, the additional class being added to the core curriculum and students could take the political philosophy or the philosophy course.

What do they mean when I say are foundational course? Are these are courses that we are expected to be offering courses that we can offer. Discussion ensued regarding institutions that had a variety of POLS courses within area F. The issue was discussed regarding how institutions vary. It was suggested we hold off just until we figure out what's going on with the core curriculum. Foundational are normally broad classes. And this is so institutional specific because I think it depends on how much how large your political science faculty is to teach an array of 1xxx and 2xxx level courses. Of course, at some institutions, if only have two political scientists, you are relying on courses provided by other departments to cover area F.

Next Steps: Kimberly will collect all of the bylaw suggestions and compile a draft to send out to the group for a vote. *If anyone is interested in serving a secretary, please let Kimberly or Dlynn know.* Tom will work to find out who the contact person is for E core.

We will have a bylaws vote and a conference call for E core.

Dlynn will provide updates about the Core Curriculum-if there's anything going on in your campus about the core curriculum, please feel free to email her.

Tom thanked Dlynn and Kimberly for the call and Dlynn thanked the committee members for their time.

Meeting adjourned at 2:51PM.