

## Minutes

### 2009 Meeting of the Psychology Advisory Committee

Date: February 26, 2009

Location: Atlanta GA: Crowne Plaza Perimeter

Chair / Meeting Convener: Barbara Brown (Georgia Perimeter College)

Past Chair / Minutes: John Murray (Georgia Southern University)

In attendance: Nina Lamson (Gainesville State College), Etta Lee (ABAC), Lugenia Dixon (Bainbridge College), Vickie Williams (Georgia Gwinnett College), James Collins (Middle Georgia College), Karen Hambright (College of Coastal Georgia), Nancy Hague (Georgia Highlands College), LaJuana Cochran (Southern Polytechnic College), Steve Smith (North GA College and State University), Greg Corso (Georgia Tech), Gary Fisk (GA Southwestern), Evelyn Schliecker (Gordon College), Alan Pope (University of West GA), Lee Gillis (Georgia College and State Univ.), Jerry Brenner (Fort Valley State Univ.), Mark Schmidt (Columbus State Univ.), Sharon Pearcey (Kennesaw State), David Washburn (Georgia State), Deborah Richardson (Augusta State), Linda Noble (USG Liaison), David Feldman (Macon State), Donna McCartey (Clayton State)

Meeting called to order at 9:30 am

#### I. Introductions and brief updates

Updates from the Psychology Departments across the USG system were provided by the attendees.

#### II. **Report from Linda Noble (Liaison from BOR)**

1. **Introduction:** Linda is a grad of GCSU and UGA. She worked at KSU for 22 years. She is now Assistant Vice Chancellor of Faculty Affairs and the official liaison for our committee.

##### 2. **Revision of the Core curriculum:**

This effort was launched two years ago. Dr. Herbst has reconfigured this effort with a smaller committee, chaired by George Rainbolt (Philosophy Chair, Georgia State). Dr. Rainbolt has created a full website (<http://core.usg.edu>) for transparency; this website is accessed from the USG website. Linda Noble is one of the system office representatives to this committee (along with Robert Vaughan). We were encouraged to read all recommendations that are posted on the website. There is a BLOG containing comments from anyone wishing to do so. The BLOG is unedited as long as your post comes from a valid USG email address. The results of a faculty survey on their satisfaction with the current core are posted as well.

**Three items regarding the revision of the Core were brought to the committee's attention:**

A. Establish learning goals for the core: Each institution is charged with establishing learning outcomes for these broad goals. Samples of learning outcomes have been provided (see website) but they are only samples. If we have recommendations, then the committee Chair can post our recommendations to the BLOG. Linda emphasized that the committee wants recommendations and comments.

Question: What was the impetus for revising the core?

Renew undergraduate education, relevant to "general education." Some specific institutions wanted to make changes in their core (e.g., UGA).

B. Core Flexibility: The proposal is to set minimum numbers of hours in areas A-E (with 42 hours total; 14 hours of flexibility). Institutions will have the flexibility to use the remaining hours. A significant challenge is the issue of transferring credits from one campus to another. This issue represents a trade-off between creativity and transferability. Even if this is approved it does not require that institutions will have to make major changes in the core which is a plus given our current budget situation.

C. Core Size. Maintain current core credit hours. Some degree programs (e.g., secondary education) need more courses in the core. A current proposal is for these kinds of programs to have a second course added to the core, however there would be constraints on this (e.g., second course needs to be out of the area of the requesting program). Also, the proposed second course would need to be approved by the appropriate BOR advisory committee; the only way a degree program could propose this would be to reduce credit hours in another area. As with everything at this point, all proposals are DRAFT.

Other comments related to this issue:

If you have any suggestions, then please put them on BLOG

The committee has also suggested overlay requirements: A requirement that at some place in the core student take a course pertaining to US perspective or global perspective. Students will have to take one of each. Currently, every institution has a core course that fits into either US perspective or Global perspective.

This committee's recommendations will go to Dr. Herbst, who will ultimately bring a proposal to the Chancellor; BOR must ultimately approve any recommended changes.

The committee's report must be on Dr. Herbst's desk by the end of April.

In terms of impact this endeavor may be analogous to semester conversion....in terms of impact. Linda said that she would also like to see our institutions focus on the way the core is being taught in order to enhance teaching effectiveness and ultimately student learning. Instructional delivery is very important regardless of the content of the core.

**3. *Proposal to move two-year schools over to Technical Colleges.***

Chancellor's response to this question has been: Governor put together a task force that made recommendations. This idea did not come out of USG. Governor wanted a resolution to the issue of how we service areas of the State that have little access to two-year degrees. Chancellor will attempt to address this with the Governor. Linda did not think this is imminent. Certainly not something that is pending.

Question: Why not have Tech colleges merge with two-year schools instead of the other way around? Linda – not sure if that possibility has even been discussed.

Discussion concerned transfer credits and job training versus education.

Linda suggested that we listen to our state legislators. Many are pushing career training per se more than higher education.

**4. *Academic Advisory committee's role in reviewing new degree programs.***

Drs. Herbst and Spencer (at the BOR) recognized the cumbersome nature of this process as well as the shortcomings of our Comprehensive Program Review process. With the former, they realized how little involvement the advisory committees had in review of new programs. Consequently, new degrees being proposed in the USG will now be sent out to the relevant academic advisory committee for review. The details of how each committee will do this should be articulated by each committee independently. Linda suggested that the Psychology Advisory Committee members articulate a process whereby they review new programs related to psychology. It seems reasonable for our committee to have input at the Letter-of-intent stage (before massive efforts are put forth by the institution putting the new program forward). If our committee objects strongly to a letter of intent...then the USG will flag at that time, so institution does not waste resources putting together a full proposal. It was suggested that if a particular institution has a major problem with a proposal, then the Advisory Committee Representative from the objecting institution should have a conversation with their VPAA, so he/she can put muscle behind the complaint or objection.

The committee recommended that we look at the proposed program and have input at the Letter-of-Intent stage.

Discussion then centered on the Clayton State MS proposal.

Break for lunch: 12:00

5. **Budget:**

The Governor has asked for another 1 percent. With 2 year lag (required by formula funding) the system is serving 23,000 additional students at FY06 funding levels. Discussion centered on additional means to cut the budget.

Regarding Economic Stimulus money: Request has been made by USG system. NSF has seen an increase in funding. Encourage grant proposals from faculty.

Future of PeopleSoft: New software to manage data (ADP).

**III. Strategy for Tracking Program Graduates:**

Issue to be discussed at subsequent meeting. Current technology (social networking and other web technologies) may provide a means to obtain data about program graduates.

**IV. Mental Health Resources in the USG:**

How do institutions handle students who are in crisis? Various committee members commented on the resources available at their institution to students in crisis.

Committee also provided some additional suggestions:

Team meeting about students.

Assessment committees.

On-line appointments (faculty making an appointment for a student at a counseling center).

Counselors: Meet with faculty (and students) to learn how to use the counseling center. What to do in an emergency

If a student is in distress, have faculty member walk them over to the counseling center.

Faculty need to know at what point they stop the conversation with students about students' personal lives. How to set boundaries, how to refer, when to refer

How to get faculty knowledgeable about how to deal with students: new faculty orientation, part of agenda for campus wide meetings; intermittent emails from counseling center;

Please email Barbara if you have additional suggestions; this would be a good item to continue throughout the year.

## V. Final Items

1. The committee should set up guidelines for how our committee reviews new programs in psychology.

Committee was formed to draft these guidelines:

John Murray (Chair), Greg Corso, Donna McCartney, and Sharon Pearcey.

**Charge to the committee:** Propose an amendment to the bylaws incorporating this process.

2. Committee to define competencies for the psych major at the end of the sophomore year.

Greg Corso (Chair), LaJuana Cochran, Lugenia Dixon, Etta Lee, and Donna McCartney.

**Charge to the committee:** Write a draft of these competencies for our meeting next year.

### Selecting a new chair & chair-elect:

Chair: GREG CORSO (will form agenda, follow up on action items)

Chair-elect (for 2010-11): Dan Harrison. Karen Hambright will assist.

Site: Jekyll Island

Send ideas or preferences to Karen or Dan.

Adjourned at 2:20pm