

January 29 and 30, 2004
BOR Advisory Committee English
Fort Valley State University

Minutes – adopted by Committee

Representatives from USG institutions attending:

Bobbie Robinson, ABAC; Robert Parham, Albany State U.; Beverly Head, Atlanta Metropolitan C.; Lillie Johnson, Augusta State U.; William Pasch, Clayton College & State U.; Michael Hannaford, Coastal Georgia Community C.; Barbara Hunt, Columbus State U.; Barbara Murray, Dalton State C.; Elizabeth Ragsdale, Darton C.; Dana Nevil, East Georgia C.; LaNelle Daniel, Floyd C.; **Joyce Jenkins (Chair), Fort Valley State U.**; Patricia Worrall, Gainesville C.; David Evans, Georgia College & State U.; Peter McQuire, Georgia Tech; Ted Wadley, Georgia Perimeter C.; Curtis Ricker, Georgia Southern U.; Gwen Jones, Georgia Southwestern State U.; Beth Burmester, Georgia State U.; Richard Baskin, Gordon C.; Debra Matthews, Macon State C.; Carmine Palumbo, Middle Georgia C.; Thomas Austenfeld, North Georgia College & State U.; Gloria Shearin, Savannah State U.; Oscar Patton, South Georgia College; Kim Haines-Korn, Southern Polytechnic State U.; Jane Hill, State U. of West Georgia; Sharon Gravett, Valdosta State U..

Other attendees:

Kathleen Burk, Board of Regents; Gerald Boyd, GA Dept. of Education (invited speaker).

Guests:

FVSU Faculty: Victoria Dubriel, Anna Holloway, Jorgette Mauzerall, Jeraldine Walker.
 Area school teachers: Lynn Baldschun, Karen Kirkpatrick, Laura Cooper, Dena Carlson, Jeanette Wolfork, Crystal Kirksey, Willene Burney, Cora Solomon.
 FVSU Students: Joycelyn Penson, Onie Pressley.

Absent

Stan Webb, Bainbridge C.; Laura Dabundo, Kennesaw State U. (Cancellation); Nelson Hilton, U. of Georgia (Illness); Sharron Lawn, Waycross C.

January 29

Dr. Jenkins, ACE chair, opened the meeting at **1:35** and welcomed area school teachers.
 Dr. Julius Scipio, Dean of Arts, Sciences, and Education at FVSU welcomed us to a University that is "on the move." He invited guests to tour the campus.

1:40 opening remarks from Dr. Kathleen Burk, for the USG Board of Regents. Burk explained that several rounds of comments on the DOE proposed school curriculum (The "Georgia Performance Standards," GPS) will occur:

Dr. Papp has invited all system faculty member to report to their respective committee chairs at their institutions and also to comment personally on the website. The advisory committees' comments will be sent to the BOR as a complete document.

The committee's second charge is to complete last year's work: examine institutional Area Fs for compliance with BOR rules on Area F and make recommendations; compare institutional outcomes for core courses with shared numbers and establish a set of common learning outcomes.

1:45 Burk introduced the featured speaker:

Dr. Gerald Boyd, State Dept of Education, State Coordinator of Language Arts

Boyd discussed the performance standards which have been on the web since Jan 12.

The GPS curriculum is not a revising of the QCC but a rebuilding. Phi Delta Kappa "audited" the curriculum two years ago and found that QCC was too broad and not deep enough. Content standards in QCC are "behavioral standards" without describing performance standards. GPS performance standards, on the other hand, define a concept / piece of knowledge, and student has to produce evidence.

Boyd invited us and the public at large to comment on the proposed curriculum. Anyone may respond on the website where the new standards are posted. Giving a name is optional, but if a whole group should respond (e.g., "30 English instructors at State College"), responses will be weighted according to by how many people's opinions are represented.

Boyd next elucidated the terminology of the curriculum.

Several parts comprise a standard:

- Content standard (describes a concept to be understood by the end of a given year of instruction).
- The **elements** of that standard give details for a grade, even if standards can be the same over several years.
- Work samples by students over the course of a year need not reflect the elements of a standard in their entirety yet—that's the goal of the end of the year.
- Standards are written to depth of understanding, not breadth of coverage.
- Teachers should now be able to creatively fill the space with assignments that will help their students gain the depth to meet the standards.
- There are "Strands" (listening, viewing, conventions, etc....) that run through several grades.

Boyd's philosophy about preparation: writing is the most important thing we teach.

Hence writing is covered in all the curricular areas, not just in Language Arts but also in science, social studies, and mathematics (fosters writing the language of the discipline)

The reading lists as published are suggested, not required, in the spirit of appropriateness. Students should be exposed not just to fiction but to other genres as well. Boyd argues that the curriculum is coherent from beginning to end. Still, is the progression coherent? That's what the "practitioners" are supposed to say now.

Currently existing GPS documents for high school: 9th grade, 10th grade, American, British, World literature. An end of course test exists for 9th grade English and for American literature, the only classes required statewide. The required four years of high school English, however, may be taken from 42 approved courses, and standard curricula exist for only a handful of these. While new performance standards for World and British literature exist, high schools do not have to offer these courses, choosing instead to offer AP or other classes. Shared learning experiences will still be minimal.

Questions arose about the assignment of 25 books per year. Expectation: 1 million words per year =25 books per year in any subject. Presumption: students read in all subject areas they are taking and in all subject that interests them.

The sample tasks are meant to illustrate the kind of assignments that will exact the grade-appropriate depth of understanding. No specific task is required or mandated.

In creating the writing standards, writing by genre has been the guiding idea (to practice the variety of the modes of discourse).

First: content and organization. Intent: avoid the formulaic nature of, say, the 5-paragraph essay.

Second: modes of discourse/ genre standard (i.e., informational, narrative). A particular mode of discourse is emphasized at every grade level (e.g. technical writing).

Third: research and technology. Even systems that are not yet up to electronic standards have to meet this. Students must compose and revise on the computer.

Fourth: both timed and process writing.

GA's high school graduation test is not rigorous enough to meet federal standards.

CRCTs will be aligned with the curriculum standards. High school test will be aligned later.

In the later years, lit and reading instruction is not ALL that different from before, but in earlier grades, a grant requires that federal reading standards be followed.

In contrast to QCC, the new standards have a "viewing skills" component. Students should now learn more particularly to distinguish between fact and opinion. Advanced media literacy.

3:00 questions from audience

-Q: Will there be more articulation between HS lit and college comp classes? A: Yes, through the increased emphasis on writing.

-Q: Are there on-going collaborations between high-school and college instructors? A: The Georgia Language Arts Supervisors group has tried to work with college teachers. DOE and BOR are increasing collaborations.

-Q: Standards are fine, but: will these really be implemented? A: At this point, end of course tests don't have a writing assessment. High school writing test will need to be revised.

-Q: Is this too much for a ninth grader to do? A: it is possible, for example, to take a math paper and use it as evidence for an English writing skill achieved.

-Q: Who will teach the teachers? Where will the time and money come from? A:

It will be with awareness sessions, a training-the-trainers model. Goal: achieve change over three years in getting teachers accustomed to performance standards.

-Q: A challenging thing to ask--English Education students often ask: 'why can't they do away with "crap" education courses and let me take more English classes?'" A: We're at a better point with ed. depts than we used to be.

-Q: How do these standards impact the different tracks for the HS graduation? A: the standards are for all students.

-Q: Will there still be non - CPC track courses? A: The next graduation policy will tend towards one diploma.

-Q: There is a conflict between diploma graduation requirements and the real needs and wishes of non-college bound high school students. A: one diploma does not mean we're going to a college-bound diploma. It means: we're going to a standards-based diploma.

-Q: Won't high-school teachers' workload preclude their grading so many essays? A: Maximum class size is now set at 28. It was scheduled to decrease further, but political change (Barnes to Purdue) has stopped that. The federal government has told us that the writing standard on our high-school graduation test is too low; a higher standard is coming in two years. The end-of-course tests involve a higher cognitive level than the graduation test, but they involve no writing because open-response is too complicated and there is not enough time for scoring.

3:40 end of discussion and break. Dr. Jenkins presented the speaker with a basket of goodies.

3:55 Committee broke into subgroups and deliberated for 90 minutes on the charge posed by Dr. Papp with respect to the GPS. (report appended as separate document).

Dinner was served at 6:00. Dr. Jenkins presented Dr. Burk with a plaque honoring Dr. Burk's long and effective service to the Committee on English. Several speakers spontaneously arose to offer their thanks to Dr. Burk as well. The chef was thanked for the preparation of a tasty meal.

January 30, 2004 meeting reconvened at 9:00

This morning's charge to the subcommittees:

Revisit outcomes of core courses ENGL 1101, 1102, 2000-level literature courses, examine Area F rules for compliance by all institutions.

Dr. Burk offered these clarifications: The central purpose of this exercise is the transferability of core courses. Some schools accept course-by-course transfer, some will only take completed areas. At some schools, the Registrar makes routine decisions.

Dave Evans: can we redefine what is appropriate in Area F? Can we re-clarify what constitutes "appropriate to the major"? Some schools have a four-semester FL requirement as a graduation prerequisite, hence they need not place these classes in Area F.

Joyce Jenkins and Elizabeth Ragsdale: There are alternative methods for FL acquisition: GSAMS at the intermediate level, or "Self-guided" FL study with certified testers.

9:25 subcommittees began work.

10:50 subcommittees reported back to plenum.

Freshmen subcommittee:

Finds that the divergence in outcomes across schools is a product of differences in institutions but that all embrace the spirit of the range of outcomes recommended by this committee last year.

Motion: "We move adoption of the general learning outcomes as reflected in last year's minutes.¹ These outcomes should be communicated to each institution."

Seconded and approved unanimously by full committee.

Sophomore subcommittee and Major Programs subcommittee:

Joint Motion: to adopt as binding an edited version of last year's proposed redefinition of Area F guidelines for English, with amendments respecting the practices of the diverse institutions in the USG:

¹ 2003 outcomes approved for 1101 and 1102:

Students who complete ENGL 1101 and 1102 should:

- *understand rhetorical contexts for their writing by establishing the writer's role, the audience, and the purpose of the project.
- *use recursive processes that include collecting information, focusing, ordering, drafting, revising, and editing.
- *approach writing as a way to think and communicate ideas to others.
- *adjust writing to a variety of contexts, including electronic environments.
- *demonstrate the techniques and skills of research, integration of source material, and documentation.
- *read and respond to various texts for purposes of interpretation, analysis, synthesis, evaluation, and judgment.
- *use conventions of writing mechanics, usage, and style to communicate effectively for the given audience, purpose, and format.

Proposed redefinition of Area F:

Area F consists of 18 hours in 1000-2000 courses related to English studies and other courses which may be prerequisite to high level major courses, distributed as follows:

- (1) foreign language courses at the level equivalent to the fourth semester, if not otherwise satisfied.
- (2) at least one world literature or world literature-based humanities course, if not taken in another area.
- (3) additional courses relevant to English studies including foreign language at the 1002-level and above, and other transferable courses in literature, the humanities, history and/or social sciences as specified by each institution.

Motion seconded and unanimously approved by full committee.

Additional motion introduced by sophomore subcommittee and refined by full committee:

Learning Outcomes in sophomore level literature courses

"The contextual and cultural setting of literature necessitates close attention to the translation involved in the reception of texts, whether it is a translation from a different language or a cultural /contextual translation.

By taking ENGL 2000-level literature classes,
students will demonstrate evidence of:

Critical thinking,
critical writing,
oral communication,
aesthetic appreciation,
knowledge of literary and historical periods as well as genres,
values reflection through exposure to texts,
an implicit introduction to basic approaches to literary theory,
and a professional manner of working with texts."

Motion seconded and approved unanimously by full committee.

Testing subcommittee offered information about the upcoming online trial of Regents Test administration.

According to Dr. Burk, the Praxis I reading test is a good predictor for passing the reading portion of the Regents test, but essay data are not conclusive. At any rate, since the 45 hour rule would remain in effect, the replacement of Regents by Praxis I may be largely moot. Exempting Praxis I does not spell exemption from Regents test.

The SAT writing test will start with the freshman class of 2006. It will be graded on an 800-point scale, so the maximum SAT score will rise to 2400. The writing test will include multiple-choice questions taken from the current SAT-II test in English, as well as a timed essay (20 or 30 minutes).

Questions from Dr. Burk to the committee: 1. research universities have indicated that they will require the test. Will any other institutions use the new test for admissions or placement? 2. Would we recommend using a "high-enough" score on the writing test to satisfy the Regents' Essay requirement (a score high enough to predict passing with 95% confidence)?

The committee took no action on these questions, but several committee members wondered if the new SAT test would lead to teaching the "twenty-minute essay."

There is ongoing discussion with federal government to seek re-inclusion of Regents remediation courses eligible for federal support.

Curtis Ricker handed out a draft for change in the scoring instructions for the Regents test, promising the submission for different cut-off models on a three-step model.

Motion: that the committee endorse a three-step rating scale.

Discussion centered on why some institution rejected the P/F option.

Question: have we considered allowing the test takers more time for reflection and revision? **Answer:** the history has run the gamut from 30 to 45 to 60 minutes. At this point we are still treating Regents essays as drafts. It would theoretically be possible to give an untimed essay online, but for now we're staying where we are.

Motion to endorse three-step rating scale seconded and unanimously approved by full committee.

Though invited to offer further comments, Curtis Ricker replied that "we're behaving this year."

11:35 a.m.:

Business Meeting

Executive committee nominates Dana Nevil, East GA College, as chair-elect.

Full committee voted unanimously to confirm nomination.

Executive committee will now consist of:

Thomas Austenfeld, chair

Dana Nevil, chair-elect

Joyce Jenkins, immediate past chair

Lillie Johnson, member-at-large

Carmine Palumbo, member-at-large.

Curtis Ricker offered a formal appreciation of Dr. Burk, endorsed with ringing applause by the full committee. Both Curtis Ricker and Thomas Austenfeld offered thanks to Joyce Jenkins for her service as chair and for hosting the meeting. Ringing applause from the committee followed.

Thomas Austenfeld previewed next year's conference, to be held January 27 and 28, 2005, at Unicoi State Park Lodge near Helen, Georgia.

The meeting adjourned at 11:58 a.m. for lunch and official conclusion.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas Austenfeld, recorder.

tcaustenfeld@ngcsu.edu