

Board of Regents Advisory Committee for the Fine and Applied Arts  
University System of Georgia  
Annual Meeting Friday 27 March 2009

Members in attendance: Jeff LeMieux (acting Chair, College of Coastal GA), Robert McTyre (Chair Elect, Middle GA College), Pam Sachant (North GA College & State Univ.), John Gaston (Valdosta State Univ.), Masoud Nourizadeh (Gordon College), Thom Harrison (Macon State College), Bobby Dickey (Fort Valley State Univ.), Betty Oliver (Southern Polytechnic State Univ.), Jeff Green (GA Southwestern State Univ.), Randall Reese for Tom Cato (Armstrong Atlantic State Univ.), Kevin Hibbard (Univ. of West GA), Brian Barr (Georgia Highlands College), Robert Vaughan (Board of Regents Liaison), Cheryl Goldsleger (GA State Univ.), Frank Clark (GA Institute of Technology), Donna May Hatcher (Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College), and John Moss (Gainesville State College).

Jeff LeMieux called the meeting to order at 10:13 a.m. instead of 10:00 a.m. to allow persons detained by weather and traffic to arrive late. The meeting took place in room 396 of the Jones Building on the Macon State College Campus. Representatives in attendance introduced themselves.

The 2008 Minutes were approved unanimously.

Dr. George Rainbolt, Chair, USG Core Curriculum Evaluation Committee, was our guest speaker. He opened by directing our attention to the USG Core Curriculum Policy Proposal Rough Draft of March 23, 2009. This is available on-line at <http://core.usg.edu/uploads/CorePolicy2009-03-23.pdf> or <http://core.usg.edu/>.

It is noted that this is the first rough draft. There are two goals: 1) ease of transfer (up to 60 semester hours) for students within our system, and 2) maintaining flexibility to allow schools to create cores that comply with their mission statements. Though not explicitly stated, the present times have also dictated that budgetary issues are minimizing “additional cost.”

The size of the Core is recommended to stay the same. Over sixty-one percent (61%) of USG instructors polled stated the Core is the right size with over 1,000 instructors participating. The major change with the present Core is to require a combined eleven fewer hours in areas B, D, and E, split area A into Communications Skills and Quantitative Skills, and allow selection of eleven hours in any combination of Areas B, C, D, and E. This would give students the option of taking more Area C classes than with the present Core.

Additions to the present Core include “overlay requirements” and critical thinking. The overlay requirements involve classifying Core classes as US Perspectives (US) and Global Perspectives (GL). Students would have to take minimum hours in each area, but classes would be counted in both Core Areas A-F and in the overlay requirements area. Jazz Appreciation could be both a Humanities class and a US Perspectives class. World Music Appreciation could be both a Humanities class and a Global Perspectives class. Global is fairly “vague” so that classes that are “Euro-centric” or “Asia-centric” are acceptable.

When instructors were asked to rank learning outcomes, critical thinking ranked highest. It is also part of the curriculum of other states with a Core. Schools have flexibility in how they will implement this requirement in their curriculum. Recommendations on how to do this include designating course(s) in areas A-E or requiring a portfolio. Though critical thinking is

(hopefully) taking place in all classes, explicitly presenting it to students should be of value to their education because it makes it “apparent” to them. Care should be taken in not linking it to something specific so that it will be understood as having universal application.

There were numerous concerns expressed with these recommended changes. Core credits earned through testing, like Advanced Placement, would be impacted by these additional requirements. Students may transfer in as many as thirty (30) credit hours through these tests, but their classes could not also be classified in the overlay requirements.

The only discipline that expressed a desire to decrease the size of the Core was music at sixty-four percent (64%). Speculation on why music would want a smaller Core is to allow for meeting minimum requirements in the Core required in Area F for music (especially Education) by the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM). Also, a Conservatory model of music education requires more music courses than typical of other majors.

If music is made an exception, then transferability would be hard to maintain. This new Core does allow schools to require specific classes in Areas A-E for a specific major. For example, music majors could be required to take a course like Music History as part of their Core in Area E.

Because the University of Georgia has already changed its Core, there was speculation on how this would impact students transferring to UGA. It would seem that this would make transferring to UGA easier because of the increased flexibility in the system. Additionally, this allows other schools to change their Core as UGA was previously allowed to do.

Other points of note are the following:

- Requirements in Areas A2 and D are still intended to respect variations in science and non-science majors.
- Creativity is absent from our Core. Of note, it is absent from the Core of the other 25 states with a Core.
- Our present Core does not allow studio, performance, and ensemble classes from being allowed in Areas A-F (sic). There is a recommendation in the system to have this changed.

The presentation ended at 11:58 a.m., and we adjourned for lunch.

NOTE: for those interested in looking up the Core for every school in the state, do the following:

- Go to <http://core.usg.edu/>
- Click documents
- Click institutional documents
- Click core curriculum

After Lunch, New Business began with a presentation from Brian Barr from Georgia Highlands College discussing recommendations in Drawing I. Drawing I has presented problems in transferability. It is hoped that issues can be resolved so that students can more easily transfer this course within the system, yet allow flexibility at schools to meet the needs of their student populations. The hope is to develop conformity with the topics, not the approach. Additionally, it is hoped to minimize “reviewing” Drawing I in Drawing II. In general, Drawing I tends to cover Technical issues of content, subject, and form. Drawing II is more likely to discuss conceptual and contemporary topics.

In order to proceed with this project, Brian Barr and Donna May Hatcher will co-chair research on what schools presently include in their syllabus for Drawing I. There will also be

research on what the National Standards are. Upon reviewing the guidelines that are common, a recommendation will be presented next year on how to proceed.

After delightful discussion, the charts with Area F Guidelines in Music, Art, and Theatre were changed by unanimous vote. Eighteen (18) semester hours selected from the following:

Old Area F Guidelines

Art

Drawing I	0-6 hours
Drawing II	0-6 hours
Two-Dimensional Design/Color Theory	0-6 hours
Introductory Studio	0-6 hours
Art History I and II	0-6 hours
Three-Dimensional Design	0-6 hours

Theatre

Arts Appreciation and History	0-6 hours
Basic Theory and Performance	0-12 hours
Basic Technical Theatre and Design	0-6 hours
Literature	0-6 hours
General education electives appropriate to the goals of the theatre student	0-6 hours

Music

Music Theory/Ear Training	0-9 hours
Ensembles	0-6 hours
Applied Music	0-6 hours
Music History/Literature	0-6 hours

New Area F Guidelines

Art

Drawing I & II	3-6 hours
Color Theory/Design	3-9 hours
Introductory Studio	0-6 hours
*Art History I & II	3-6 hours

\*Art History I & II may appear in area C

Theatre

Basic Theory and Performance	3-12 hours
Basic Technical Theatre and Design	3-6 hours
Dramatic Literature	0-6 hours
Theatre History	0-6 hours
Approved Electives	0-12 hours

Music

Musicianship/Theory/Aural Skills	3-9 hours
Ensembles	0-6 hours
Applied Music	0-6 hours
Music History/Literature	0-6 hours

Additional New Business included the following:

- There is no need to further discuss Art Appreciation recommendations.
- There is a preference to continue meeting in person rather than on-line or by teleconference.
- There was encouragement for combining our meeting with another function in order to attract more representatives to attend.
- There is a concern that an annual theatre event prevents theatre instructors from attending the last weekend in March.
- We would like to agree to have one person in each Fine/Applied Arts area attend next year for round-table discussions in our areas.

- Though meeting at another location may help with attendance, committee agreed that the distance for many would prevent their attendance. We will meet again at Macon State College. Thom Harrison will make room reservations.

Brian Barr was elected to Chair-elect by unanimous vote.

To initiate our announcements section, Robert Vaughn discussed the possible merging of Technical Colleges with Community Colleges. We are being asked to “seek a closer relationship” at this time by establishing a unified “mini-core” curriculum. Only SACS accredited schools are involved in this process. Subcommittee will meet with technical college instructors to discuss changes. We should consider including Speech/Communication as well as the Fine and Applied Arts in this process.

Respectfully submitted, Robert McTyre