

Minutes of the 2007 Advisory Committee on English Meeting

East Georgia College

Swainsboro, GA

January 25-26, 2007

Sessions Held in Physical Education Building (D), Room D146

Attending: Charles Heglar, Albany State University; Beverly Head, Atlanta Metropolitan College; Lillie Johnson, Augusta State University; Susan Hunter, Clayton State University; Michael Hannaford, Coastal Georgia Community College; Mary Nielsen, Dalton State College; Ulf Kirchdorfer, Darton College; Dana Nevil, East Georgia College; Patricia Worrall, Gainesville State College; Elaine Whitaker, Georgia College and State University; Lanelle Daniel, Georgia Highlands College; Carol Senf, Georgia Institute of Technology; Ted Wadley, Georgia Perimeter College; Curtis Ricker, Georgia Southern University; Margaret Ellington, Georgia Southwestern State University; Marti Singer, Georgia State University; Steve Raynie, Gordon College; Bob Barrier and Bill Rice, Kennesaw State University; Debra Matthews, Macon State College; Carmine Palumbo, Middle Georgia College; Tanya Bennett, North Georgia College and State University; Mark Nunes, Southern Polytechnic State University; Michael Fisher, South Georgia College; Jane Hill, University of West Georgia; Leslie Caldwell, University System Office [Liaison]; Dorothy Zinsmeister, University System Office [Liaison]; Mark Smith, Valdosta State University; and Gary Simmers, Waycross College.

Thursday, January 25

Welcome and General Remarks

At 1pm Dr. John Black, President of East Georgia College, welcomed the ACE group to campus. Chair Dana Nevil then gave an overview of the agenda for the two days, asking participants to check their names and emails on the Regents roster list passed around.

First Session—Quality Assessment

1:15-2:15—Dorothy Zinsmeister, Regents Liaison, lead a discussion on Value-Added Assessment, referencing an article by that title from *Perspectives*, journal of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities and linking it to USG needs. (See http://www.aascu.org/pdf/06_perspectives.pdf). She stated that assessment was one of the ten major projects headed by system presidents, which is a new model “with strong accountability” as the system revises its core curriculum. This will be a new framework (not just learning outcomes; performance assessment). After some further delineation of the new initiatives, Gary Simmers asked if we had established a working definition of “liberal education,” and Dr. Zinsmeister replied that the definition is on the system website but perhaps we have not followed it up enough yet. Assessment is linked to transferability: if we have valid assessment, we will have valid transferability.

Discussion followed about the difficulty of defining proficiency across the system in particular courses, for instance ENGL 1101 and a particular outcome, such as “critical thinking.” These changes will provoke much discussion, and faculty should keep up with the Regents’ agenda on its website and attend BOR meetings. Some meetings are now webcast (such as the Chancellor’s recent State of the System Address). This is a time for to participate in discussion, she said, referring to the ongoing Regents’ Test as an example: “You would be pleasantly surprised by Regents’ questions about the test” and the support for the test.

In response to a question whether the BOR is thinking of a system-wide test, DR. Zinsmeister replied that there are no plans as yet for one, perhaps a pilot test, but that groups could do so.

This new initiative will have two aims: instruction “renewing commitment to liberal education” and remaining “affordable to comparable institutions.” This emphasis will lead to a new budgeting process. Some will get more; some less. Another initiative will lead to a significant reduction in part-time faculty.

In relation to this emphasis on efficiency, productivity, and program quality, Dr. Zinsmeister said that our systems keep almost no data on faculty research, teaching, and even who are faculty on various campuses. How do we know we have quality programs? We have comprehensive reports on degrees, publication, service, facilities, but “no one has said what students have learned, what they do with their degree.” Granted, we have made some progress toward capstone courses but there is a good deal more to do regarding assessment.

Second Session—Regents Testing

2:30-4:00--After a short break, Leslie Caldwell spoke on the ongoing discussion regarding the Regents’ test after the ACE group requested a year’s time to study the test and implications of changes. We were given seven months.

Dr. Caldwell then spent some time describing the history of the Regents’ test and the recent discussions about changing it. Last year ACE reaffirmed its willingness to study the test but maintained the need to maintain standards. After a semester of input from various departments, the Vice-Presidents decided that assessment would be the main focus of the summer meeting.

There are four possible alternatives to the current Regents’ Test: 1) No test; 2) Exempting Students who earn an A or B in ENGL 1101 and 1102; 3) Keeping the current Regents’ Test as is; and 4) Providing each institution a limited number of exceptions by appeal. The issue is the appeal process and remediation for frequent failures. We need some methods to relieve extreme anxiety of these people, a longer time frame, individualized attention. Some few take the test eight or nine times. He suggested that those who failed several times write another essay online, then brainstorm 15-30 minutes, return to the draft, and finally return to complete it. General comments to these suggestions were that most eventually pass the test as currently constructed, that there was a certain unfairness against those who passed the essay the first time, and that this approach might dilute assessment for all. Another issue raised by Dr. Caldwell and discussed was the Reading Test. Gary Simmers asked about general criteria for International Students taking the Reading Test

Dr. Caldwell related the idea of value-added assessment to the degree of improvement of the student writers, that they could write to the satisfaction of the instructor. Carlos Palumbo stated that the satisfaction of the instructor means satisfying the remedial teacher for Regents’ remediation.

Another issue brought up by Dr. Caldwell concerned the new rating system, 1-3, and doing away with the 4. He stated that recent tests showed the same number of 1’s, with some gravitation toward the middle (2). Relating to the SAT/ACT new writing sample and its relationship to the test., Curtis Ricker stated that the sample had a 95%

probability, similar to the Regents' test. The testing subcommittee will discuss these topics and others at their subcommittee meeting.

Subcommittee Meetings

Subcommittee minutes are appended to this document.

Social Hour and Dinner at Flat Creek Lodge

7pm-on

Friday, January 26

8-9am--Breakfast Buffet

Subcommittee Reports

9:10-10:00am

The first order of business Friday was subcommittee reports (see minutes appended to end of this document). The Freshman Composition Subcommittee, chaired by Lillie Johnson, dealt with two main issues: the relationship of the Regents' essay test to first-year composition and course requirements for ENGL1101 and ENGL 1102. There needs to be a clear definition of what the test measures, whether it is "minimal competency" or "basic competency." Though most campuses have testing services available, raters vary from graduate students to English professors. The committee believes that the student once failing should be automatically given extended time. In relation to the courses, the committee thinks that for transferability there should be a C or better. And it wants to hear about portfolio assessment and best practices soon.

Dorothy Zinsmeister stated that the grade of C is not a system policy though she would like it to be. Discussion followed as to various campuses policy regarding the transfer grade and the C in 1101 as requirement for going into 1102. Jane Hill spoke of the administrative pressures for retention, and several agreed that when administration changes, the policy shifts. Regent's policy states that in regards to accepting grades native and transfer students should be treated equally. Leslie Caldwell observed that a D may reflect one grade at one institution and a C at another, and Dorothy Zinsmeister agreed: "C's and D's are not the same in the same department—and across the state. This is one of the drivers for assessment, consistent assessment. Discussion followed in agreement as to the vagaries of grading. Jane Hill observed that one of the obvious problems is itinerant faculty, therefore little consistency: a stable faculty is needed for stable, valid assessment. Peggy Ellington asked whether or not the group could make a policy that transfer grades should be a C or better; others agreed that we are doing students a disservice by letting underprepared students go into the next grade. Dorothy Zinsmeister suggested that members should return to their campuses and do homework to see what support exists.

After further discussion Michael Hannaford moved that the committee adopt a recommendation that English departments not accept a D for 1101/1102. Curtis Ricker and Ted Wadley seconded the proposal. The proposal was modified to state that system-

other institutions are doing and Gary Simmers sent a sheet around for quick report. The recommendation passed unanimously.

The sophomore subcommittee, led by Michael Hannaford discussed the challenge of developing performance-based outcomes in courses such as world literature and English and American literature without becoming prescriptive. Some standardization is needed. One problem, again, is the large number of part-time teachers at many institutions. Some institutions are doing unique things to promote excellence, for example Macon State's publishing best essays. Another issue discussed by the committee was the existence and use of Turnit.com, its pedagogical and ethical value. Among the committee the consensus was that those who use it are favorable.

The major programs subcommittee, led by Ted Wadley, discussed the issue of diversity in world literature, how it is obtained, and related to that which staff members are scheduled to teach the course and what texts and approached they use. (See minutes are end of document.)

The testing subcommittee announced that since former member Joyce Jenkins is now a dean she is no longer on the committee and has been replaced by Peggy Ellington. A major issue discussed by the subcommittee was the difficulty in obtaining sufficient raters from each school. The consensus was that every institution should make an effort to provide and sustain supportive graders. Regarding specific aspects of rating, most graders liked the new use of PDF files for the essays, finding them much easier to grade. In a few instances, though, graders disliked the PDF form so intensely that they will not grade again, but a very large majority approved the new approach. Leslie Caldwell traced the system to be used in the coming year, as the rating goes online, with some more pilot studies in the spring and summer and extensive online grading later. The plan is to reduce the number of suggested essays to be rated from 120 to 96, and raters will be paid a dollar an essay. This new world of grading will eventually do away with the "community and camaraderie of a Saturday tradition: "no more coffee and donuts," lamented Gary Simmers.

General Business Discussion, Assessment and Beyond, 10:15-11:30am

Returning after short break, the Chair passed around the roster for signing in as formal representatives and as others representing their institutions. She called attention to Nelson Hilton's updates on <emma>: UGA has converted to a portfolio-based final using <emma>, one that contains a biography of the student writer, a reflective essay, two "polished" essays of four essays written in class, an essay that represents the student's revision process, an example that demonstrates student's peer review abilities, and one "wild card" sample chosen by the student. An <emma> workshop will be held in Athens on May 14, and the Chair encouraged attendance there. In addition, she called attention to the fact that UGA has been selected to host the 2008 Computers and Composition Conference, May 21-24, 2008.

Discussion then turned to the charge given at the Executive Committee meeting to deal with common assessment and to relate what various campuses are doing in assessing courses and how much support is given from each institution. The Chair related how assessment at East Georgia is still in the beginning stages. Other representatives contributed what their institutions were doing in regards to assessing beginning classes. Mary Nielsen said that at Dalton every faculty member had been assessing his or class

outcomes. That approach was more manageable. This single course assessment revealed, for instance, that ENGL 1101 labeled a “killer course” by outside observers actually had 82% passing with a C or better. Another representative observed that at her college individual faculty make their own assessment and that 70-80% attain objectives. Yet another stated that his institution pulls portfolios for every student and the entire faculty examines it. Georgia Highlands works with common learning outcomes with assessment teams for every area. Carmine Palumbo said that he would like to focus on common assessment across the state and perhaps put common outcomes online. Debra Matthews wondered about the value-added assessments and statistical models, whether the phrase suggests pre- and post- tests. She thought that perhaps workshops on assessment were needed.

Leslie Caldwell spoke on the need and difficulties of a statistical models, which does seem to imply in some sense pre-and post tests, and the importance of emphasized institutions’ responsibility to the public, a webpage needed for all to see (parents, legislators). Jane Hill stated that to do a better job with assessment we need to be trained in assessment. One of the West Georgia faculty attended a national conference on assessment and will presenting to the department. Other faculty stated that we have outcomes but they are not measurable, a Platonic ideal about what is happening. “If you can’t measure it, you can’t say you are doing it.” Curtis Ricker replied that often English faculty resist because they believe it smacks of educationese and that they resent that people say we don’t have outcomes because they are not measurable. We are not used to measuring quantitatively. Gary Simmers said that even small schools are under the same pressures. He discovered that a great deal can be measured through various methods. He suggested Bloom’s Taxonomy as one means of evaluation of critical thinking and suggested rubrics.com as a place to look. (All the high school teachers, who deal with this challenge all the time, know this site.) Other representatives called attention to their use of portfolios, research papers in the majors, common syllabi, and in-house committees. Carmine Palumbo reminded that Leslie Caldwell’s reporting of Regents’ data on pass rates is another assessment report.

Dorothy Zinsmeister summed up this part of the discussion by stating that SACS undertakes regular assessment of the general education core but that the question is how to access the major. She stated that even though the Board of Regents reviews even individual courses, a comprehensive program review would contain all components, with some agreement about outcomes. We need a much broader discussion. “If you have learning outcomes and you do not assess them, you might as well not have them. You have no way of knowing whether you are making any progress or not.” They need to be accessed both individually and generally, comprehensive program review. She stated that the analysis piece is what matters, not the individual analysis, the learning outcomes higher upon one axis and the individual courses lower on another axis.

She suggested that a workshop on assessment could easily be arranged and that perhaps ACE could meet more often than one time a year, a one day meeting, for instance, to carry on its work. She also suggested subscribing to the journal *Teaching Professors* as a means of keeping up with the assessment issues.

Dr. Zinsmeister turned briefly to another issue. She briefly listed some changes in Middle Grades Education, area F, which has three essential, required courses in English language arts in contrast to Math Middle grades, in which, for instance, a student could go through a whole program of study and never take pre-calculus. This group has recommended that students take pre-calculus in either area A, B, or F. In Middle Grade

suggested that one of the subcommittees look at world literature to see if it should be is essential for Middle Grades Education.

And finally, Dr. Zinsmeister concluded by pointing out— to applause—the news that the BA in English (with a track in teacher education) is on the BOR agenda for approval for Macon State College

Business Meeting, 11:30-Noon Carmine led this

The session then moved into a short business meeting, conducted by Carmine Palumbo. First order of business was recognizing and commending Dana Nevil for conducting the meeting and for arranging such an exceptional location for Thursday night's dinner.

The next order of business was the nomination and unanimous election of Debra Matthews of Macon State as 2008 Chair and two at-large members, Marti Singer and Ted Wadley.

The Executive Committee for 2007 consists of five members:

1. The incoming chair, Bob Barrier
2. The 2008 chair, Debra Matthews
3. The immediate past chair, Dana Nevil
4. At-large member, 2 years sector--Marti Singer
5. At-large member, 4 years sector--Ted Wadley

At that point the Chair turned over the reins of office to Bob Barrier as incoming 2007 Chair. He thanked Dana for her work, the meeting, and the dinner location, stating that he did not believe he could find a better or even comparable restaurant location as the Flat Rock Lodge in the Kennesaw area. He announced that the 2008 meeting would be held at the same calendar time as usual, January 24 and 25, in Kennesaw.

The meeting was unanimously adjourned at 11:58.

Adjourn with Buffet Lunch

A buffet lunch followed in the meeting room

Respectfully submitted,

Robert G. Barrier

2007 Subcommittees

Regents Testing Sub-Committee –

Bob Barrier (Kennesaw State University), Leslie Caldwell (Regents Testing Service), Margaret Ellington (Georgia Southwestern), Carmine Palumbo (Middle Georgia College), Curtis Ricker Georgia Southern University), Marti Singer (Georgia State University), and Patsy Worrall (Gainesville State College) (Chair)

Freshman English Subcommittee—

La Nelle Daniel (Highlands), Beverly Head (Atlanta Metro), Lillie Johnson (Augusta State), Ulf Kirchdorfer (Darton), Lisa Mallory (Atlanta Metro), Dana Nevil (East Georgia), Mary Nielsen (Dalton State), Steve Raynie (Gordon), Gary Simmers (Waycross), and Luke Vassiliou (ABAC)

Sophomore Subcommittee—

Michael Hannaford (Coastal Georgia Community College), Debra Matthews (Macon State College), Michael Fisher (South Georgia College), Barbara Hunt (Columbus State University), Mark Smith (Valdosta State University), Renva Watterson (Georgia Highlands College).

Major Programs Subcommittee—

Tanya Bennett (North Georgia College & State University), Charles Heglar (Albany State University), Jane Hill (University of West Georgia), Susan Hunter (Clayton State University), Mark Nunes (Southern Polytechnic State University), Bill Rice (Kennesaw State University), Carol Senf (Georgia Tech), Ted Wadley (Georgia Perimeter College)-- chair, Elaine Whitaker (Georgia College & State University)

Subcommittee Minutes

Freshman English Subcommittee
01/25/07, Art Studio, East Georgia

Attendance: La Nelle Daniel (Highlands), Beverly Head (Atlanta Metro), Lillie Johnson (Augusta State), Ulf Kirchdorfer (Darton), Lisa Mallory (Atlanta Metro), Dana Nevil (East Georgia), Mary Nielsen (Dalton State), Steve Raynie (Gordon), Gary Simmers (Waycross), and Luke Vassiliou (ABAC).

The Subcommittee on Freshman English met for about 50 minutes and submits two (2) areas of concern for your consideration: first, issues surrounding the impact of the Regents' Exam on Freshman English courses and, second, course requirements in English 1101 and 1102.

Area 1—Impact of Regents' on Freshman Composition

- The subcommittee suggests that the Regents' Academic Committee on English ask for a clear delineation of skills/knowledge measured. The group is sure that a statement of this kind exists already but would like it to be more openly publicized. The group agreed that the test should be defined as assuring “minimal competency” or “basic proficiency,” that is, reading and writing literacy of all USG graduates.
- On the issue of performance anxiety, the subcommittee suspects that most campuses have counseling offices, workshops, or testing guidelines to help alleviate or to address this problem. But more publicity of such services would be useful.
- Who rates the Regents' Exam? It was noted that raters vary from campus to campus. Some members of the subcommittee assumed that only English instructors or graduate students in English scored exams, while other members explained their use of instructors and professors in other fields.
- Finally, the group talked about the advantages of having students who fail the Regents' exam once automatically qualify for extended time in reading, writing, or both areas. (One member of the subcommittee was very familiar with this practice in the Florida State System.)

Area 2—Instruction in English 1101/1102

- The second general topic of concern, course requirements, led to a discussion of the degree to which the Regents' Exam influences instruction in college-level writing courses. Some chairs see their programs geared toward higher level critical and rhetorical skills; others find their courses weighted by pressures to improve Regents' Exam pass rates.
- Transferability took the floor briefly, as it became apparent that a few institutions accept the grade of D as passing the second composition course. Most colleges and universities in the System require a C or better.
- Comments about portfolios and writing-across-the-curriculum surfaced—suggesting a need for discussion of Best Practices by the English Academic Committee at some point in the not so distant future.

The Subcommittee on Freshman English does not have formal recommendations for this body at this time.

Lillie Johnson, Augusta State, Reporting for the Group

Major Programs Subcommittee

Attending our subcommittee meeting on January 25, 2007 were Tanya Bennett (NGC&SU), Charles Heglar (ASU), Jane Hill (UWG), Susan Hunter (CSU), Mark Nunes (SPSU), Bill Rice (KSU), Carol Senf (GT), Ted Wadley (GPC), Elaine Whitaker (GC&SU). Dorothy Zinsmeister also sat with us and contributed to the discussion.

Area F for English majors is posted online at
http://www.usg.edu/academics/programs/core_curriculum/areaf/english.phtml

USG institutions must accept those courses for transfer if the area is complete.

Two-year colleges are pushed for retention and graduation, but USG lets most students transfer early. There is a recommendation, however, for 2 + 2 fixed tuition for those who complete an associate's degree.

We discussed diversity in World Literature courses. Jane Hill said the West Georgia is considering letting foreign language professors teach classes, since they are trained in literature.

There really wasn't anything pressing for the subcommittee, and that was true last year as well (see below). Maybe that means we could set our own agenda. Please let me know if you have any ideas, additions, or corrections.

Thanks

Ted Wadley

Minutes for the ACE Testing Sub-Committee – January 25, 2007

Attending the meeting: Bob Barrier, Leslie Caldwell, Margaret Ellington, Carmine Palumbo, Curtis, Ricker, Marti Singer, and Patsy Worrall (Chair)

Sub-Committee changes:

The Committee thanks Joyce Jenkins from Fort Valley State University for serving on the Testing Sub-Committee. The Committee wishes her well in her new position.

The Committee welcomes new members: Bob Barrier (Kennesaw), Margaret Ellington (Georgia Southwestern State University), and Marti Singer (Georgia State University).

Discussion Item and Statement:

An institution should make every effort to obtain supportive Regents' Essay graders to meet the number of individuals needed for each grading session.

Announcement:

The trial period for using PDFs of essays will continue in the Spring. Leslie

The graders who used the PDF's instead of going to the grading centers liked grading the essays in that format and felt the grading process was much faster.

End of Report from the Testing Sub-Committee
Submitted by Patsy Worrall (Chair)

Minutes of the Academic Advisor Executive Committees

Macon State College

September 27, 2008

Thanks to Ted Wadley

The executive committees of the academic advisory committees met September 27 at Macon State College. Among the some 50 attending were the ACE committee: Bob Barrier, our chair, of Kennesaw; Marti Singer of Georgia State; Debra Matthews, Macon State College, and Ted Wadley, Georgia Perimeter College. USG downtown was represented by Dorothy Zinsmeister, Sandra Stone, Leslie Caldwell, and Felita Williams. Most of the information presented is on the website, <http://www.usg.edu/academics/>

One topic of discussion was the function of the academic committees and the procedures for academic decisions. In particular, a major effort to restructure the core curriculum is underway, and a conscious decision was made not to involve the academic committees (reps from 36 institutions being too unwieldy). The new curriculum will be "performance driven," and the goal this year is to identify "core competencies" that students should have learned by the end, and then "work backwards" to identify which classes teach those competencies. The plan includes the words, "workforce development," which have been used to reduce courses in literature, history, fine arts, etc. in other states all over the country. See <http://www.usg.edu/regents/strategic/>

The final decision on promotion and tenure is now at the presidents' level, and no longer goes to the BOR. There is a "two-thirds rule," or guideline, on the dangers of granting tenure to more than two-thirds of the faculty in a discipline. In case of economic downturn, budget reduction, loss of enrollment, having too many tenured faculty hinders lay-offs. The presidents are being given more authority but also held accountable. In this case, they will be evaluated for "risk management."

Another system goal is to double the number of courses offered online, in response to demand and in the name of serving students. A new website, "Georgia on My Line," will show all online courses at all institutions. A software program to be developed by the end of this year will allow students to register at more than one institution.

There will also be a new version of the Academic Affairs Handbook by the end of the year.

A constituent complained to a state legislator that he had requested a system-wide policy on giving credit for International Baccalaureate courses from the BOR, and received only silence. So the state legislature passed a bill earlier this year mandating that USC

institutions grant 24 credit hours to student who complete an IB diploma (this is done in Florida, Texas, and California). The chancellor went to the governor and persuaded him to veto it, but BOR must come up with a proposal by the end of October. The current proposal is for the system to grant mandate credit for “diploma completers”:

	standard level	high level
score (1-7)	4 – no credit	0-4 credits (possible lab)
	5 – 0-3 credits	3-6 credits
	6-7 – lots of credit	6-7 – even more credit

It was stated that the academic committees would determine which courses would be included, but they have not been notified yet. The English committee, for example, meets annually in January, and this proposal is due in October.

These will be minimum standards; institutions can grant additional credit, also to “certificate holders,” students who take one or more IB subjects but do not complete the whole diploma.

Credit for AP exams is under discussion again, too.

For the Regents’ Test being given to first-time freshman, the reading scores will be used to separate those who fail into two groups. Those scoring in the 50s, for example, might be expected to improve their skills to a passing level merely by taking college-level classes, but those who score lower could be placed into immediate and prolonged remediation. The desire is to do the same for the Essay Test, but there is only one failing score. We could add a zero score for an essay whose author would need more than English 1101-1102 to succeed, or since the essays are now scanned and graded online, a pop-up box might appear when a rating of 1 was entered, asking the rater to indicate how likely the student is to pass after taking freshman composition.

Gainesville State has developed seven practice Compass Writing tests which are online at <http://www.gsc.edu/humanities/mhorton/LSEnglish/compasspractice/passage1/compass1.html>

Proposal from Philosophy Executive Committee re Core Curriculum Changes

RECOMMENDATION FROM THE

UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA ACADEMIC COMMITTEE

COMMITTEE ON: PHILOSOPHY

CHAIRPERSON: GEORGE RAINBOLT **DATE:**
11/26/07

RECOMMENDATION

The Philosophy Board of Regents Academic Advisory Committee recommends to the

1. the chairs of all the Board of Regents Academic Advisory Committees be resources to the Steering Committee, the Core Curriculum Competencies Committee, and the Curriculum Design & Assessment Committee;
2. the chairs of the departments that play a large role in the core but have no Academic Advisory Committee (e.g., communications), should elect a faculty member to be a resource.

As resources, these faculty members should be sent the agendas of upcoming committee meetings, the minutes of past meetings, and their input should be sought before key decisions are made.

RATIONALE

It is crucial that the new core curriculum reflect the diversity of programs offered in the University System of Georgia. As it stands, many disciplines (e.g., communications, criminal justice, fine and applied arts, geological sciences, sociology, anthropology, and social work) have no representation in the new core curriculum process. Some disciplines (e.g., communications) have no Academic Advisory Committee. In these cases, it seems best for department chairs to elect a representative.

By Board of Regents policy (http://www.usg.edu/academics/comm/aa_docs/procedures.phtml), the Academic Advisory Committees are charged not only with studying “the curricula and programs of instruction in the discipline or disciplines within the purview of the committee” but also “to make reports and recommendations concerning the improvement of instruction and the curriculum.”

Both sound education practice and Board policy speak in favor of the motion above.

The Philosophy Academic Advisory Committee urges other Academic Advisory Committees to support this motion.

The ACE Executive Committee along with five or six other committees joined in supporting this recommendation.

The following is a reply from the USG Core Curriculum Initiative:

December 20, 2007

Dear Colleagues:

Some of you have expressed concerns about the USG core curriculum initiative, and the purpose of this message is to bring you up to date.

A website has been developed to keep faculty across the USG informed about the initiative. Apparently, some people have had difficulty finding the site and it has thus been moved to a more prominent location. You can now find a link to the site on the USG homepage at <http://www.usg.edu/> under the “Spotlight” heading. We call your attention in particular to the FAQ, which may provide answers to some of the questions that you or others have regarding the USG core curriculum initiative. Also, the committee tab will soon be updated with a list of USG resources that the project committees may consult.

Rumors that core curriculum framework revisions are taking place secretly are false. The faculty committees that will carry out the initiative have been appointed and the first meeting of these committees will occur in early February. This will be a two-day working retreat during which committee members jointly will develop and debate possible models for the USG Core Curriculum Framework. Shortly after that retreat, the results of these preliminary deliberations will be communicated to faculty system-wide and feedback from faculty will be sought through an online questionnaire.

The committees charged with carrying out the USG core curriculum initiative will be challenged to create a curriculum framework that is intellectually coherent and compelling and also broad enough to provide institutions with the flexibility they need to create unique programs of study responsive to their student populations and missions. The talented faculty selected to respond to this challenge will benefit from input and feedback from their colleagues at key milestones along the way. Meanwhile, log onto the project website to keep informed about the project. The website will be updated on a regular basis for the duration of the USG core curriculum framework development process.

Thanks for your contributions to the USG and its students.

Sincerely,

Dorothy

Dorothy Leland
President
Georgia College & State University
Chair, USG Core Curriculum Initiative