

Board of Regents Fine Arts Advisory Committee – Annual Meeting Minutes – Friday, February 22, 2013
Members Present –

Kurt-Alexander Zeller, Clayton State
Dwight Coleman, Georgia State University
Jeffrey LeMieux, College of Coastal Georgia
Richard Mercier, Georgia Southern
Robert McIntyre, Middle Georgia State University
Steven Arnold, Middle Georgia State University (visitor to comment on Film Studies)
Masoud Nourizadeh, Gordon State College
David A. Cook, Georgia Gwinnett College
John Gaston, Valdosta State University
Joe Thomas, Kennesaw State University
Kevin Shunn, University of West Georgia
Bobby Dickey, Fort Valley State University
Donna May Hatcher, Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College
Ron Ellison, East Georgia State University
Frank Clark, Georgia Tech
Betty Oliver, Southern Polytechnic State University
Pamela Sachant, University of North Georgia (2012-13 chair)
David Koffman, Georgia Perimeter College (secretary stand-in)

Pam called the meeting to order at 10:04am, introductions of members present

Agenda items included Kennesaw State University Master of Music, Discussion of Film Programs and Area F guidelines for these programs, discussion of approval process and the reduced number of programs being approved.

Kennesaw State University Master of Music discussion was first agenda item. Kennesaw received response from committee and responded with consultation from NASM to the BOR to address changes of proposal. GSU stated the case of duplicate programs being a point of controversy. A Statement from Steven Harper, Graduate Studies Coordinator was read by Dwight Coleman, GSU representative. The emphasis of the letter was on the proximity of Kennesaw and the duplication of programs and potential negative impact on the GSU program. Many other institutions Graduate programs were outlined and how each was distinct from others programs. It was noted that the other institution most likely impacted would be West Georgia University. It was emphasized that this would negatively impact the USG's core mission with these institutions. Comments ensued on proximity and duplication. Discussion ensued including data that indicates that this new program would drain enrollment from these other institutions, commuting in the metro area, demographics surveying, vagueness of system guidelines on duplication and proximity, competitiveness of programs, consolidation, expansion, and duplication, that board needed to address this, projections for enrollment (KSU did an informal survey indicated 97% interest, 93% confirmed needs of community, 23% already had degrees in music), questions about the survey sample size and that sample area had not been defined, the potential that if this proposal is approved how will it affect other programs across the system in other areas, the economic need and demand (or lack thereof), sets a precedent for duplication which will potentially be a system problem, board needs clear policy. Two sets of questions are coming up – proximity is indeed one, and the larger question on not knowing what committee should do due to lack of guidance at the board level. May not be able to move one way or the other on this issue until committee gets clarification from board. A core question is the viability of the proposal and that the committee could agree on this...from the curriculum

standpoint. Discussion took place on the course structure and availability and the disproportionate number of cross-listed undergraduate courses and how that impacts undergraduate scheduling. Also how graduate students are used to teach undergrad classes and that grads are typically used to teach non-majors. Mention that there is Music Appreciation and that this might be where these graduates are used to teach. Issues were discussed surrounding accreditation and the entrepreneurship component of the curriculum as a unique component. There were comments that the entrepreneurial component is not entirely unique. Also, there was discussion of tracks within the program. There were specific comments on diction and the requirement in vocal programs in foreign language. There were concerns of the lack of clarity concerning the cross-listing and teaching duties of graduate students, as well as accreditation requirements, infrastructure to handle the 27 new courses, the impact on quality of education in cross-listed courses. Concern for students recruited into program, admissions criteria in terms of entrepreneurial focus and that this isn't reflected in admissions requirements, the viability of internships, if the program is actually entrepreneurial with only one course in this focus, curriculum doesn't reflect this aspect which is the program focus. Pam asked for any additional comments and suggested that all these questions should be formally sent from committee to be addressed. A motion was set forth that all the committee questions should be addressed by Kennesaw. Motion was first and seconded and all were in favor. A second motion was put forth that the committee ask the board of regents on specific guidance concerning committee charge to address issues of duplicity and proximity. First and second and all were in favor.

Discussion on agenda item of how programs are being approved at board level. There was discussion of growth, expansion, boutique programs, etc. How is development and approval process being handled. Three requests each year has been the new standard. Three criteria are demand, meeting job needs, institutional priority. This point is that there may be creation and approval of programs that legislature are going to like. What is rationale behind the three proposal guidelines as it pertains to consolidation and expansion? There were comments on fast-tracking of STEM programs and convoluted system of approval. There was discussion on what types of programs, graphic design, etc. would be approved by board and that all programs were approved last year There are both institutional and system-wide issues that need clarification. Mention of tying in proposals into Complete College initiative. It was noted that we need Board liaison present to take committee concerns forward – Felita Williams is the committee board liaison. Discussion was wrapped up on this item.

Agenda item of Film programs. There was BOR Gen Ed committee suggestion that there is need to create additional committees to address programs and curriculum – note that Communications committee was just added. Should the Fine Arts committee be the committee to review Film curriculum. It should be acknowledged that there are many different film programs, such as digital media and that there are diverse theoretical and production oriented degrees that have formed organically across the system. There was presentation of NASAD and NAST guidelines on Film. Question on what programs exist in the system. GSU presented their Film degree program within Communications and some courses. There are many and most reside within communications curriculum. There was description of Film Studies and Production/animation program within Theatre program at UGA. There was discussion of the myriad national programs accredited by NASAD. Again there were questions about where these degrees reside, media studies within English, production within Communications, some programs within fine and performing arts, description of art film program at West Georgia University. Can we poll the faculty at institutions across state to get info on film programs and possibly make a recommendation to the committee? There was description of film program at University of North Georgia and the integration of art curriculum into this program. There was concern about the potential variation of Area F in all these programs. It seems there is separation between, art

film, TV production, and film studies. There was also mention collaborative nature of film involving many courses across the curriculum. Need to identify faculty in these programs across the system and possibility of creation of Film committee and that the Fine Arts committee would address art film programs. There was discussion that film needed broader representation to address its variation within the system. It was mentioned that Film would most likely fall under an umbrella committee – it was noted that the newly formed Communications committee might be more appropriate. It was noted that there was no film faculty representation on the Fine Arts advisory committee and that there was concern about making any kind of decision without film representation. There was emphasis on NASAD as the main accrediting body for film degrees nationally. There was history presented about film production coming out of art schools like Cal Arts and that art schools today all have film programs such as SCAD, Parsons, Pratt, etc. and that this is why they fall under NASAD. There was clarification that BOR charged this committee to address Area F film, but that this committee doesn't have the faculty representation to do this. It was noted that at one time this committee addressed Area F guidelines for Communications, so it wasn't a far stretch for film to be addressed. There was conclusion that the committee needed more information from the system film faculty in order to better address this issue. There was need to find out about degrees and where current programs fall institutionally. It was decided a uniform questionnaire be sent to film program faculty to gather responses and create a recommendation and that this should come from BOR to institutional administration for identification and dissemination. The questionnaire would ask baseline information about specific programs, in which department is degree awarded, what are courses, what the current Area F is for these programs, and what are outcomes expected of students. There was description of GSU's program Area F and note that there was only one production course at this level. There were suggestions of also asking opinions of system faculty on where the committee should lie – in Fine Arts or in Communications. Pam agreed to work up questions and forward to institutions and then forward responses to committee for recommendations.

There were additional questions about Humanities courses outcomes and where they needed to be approved. It was noted that this committee had worked on Area C and F course outcomes and these were posted online. As courses come through this body, then those outcomes are developed. There was discussion about hybrid forms of courses in Area C that might have applied content at this level. There was note that many courses were denied approval that had applied (including technological) content. There was discussion of Area B courses and that applied courses could reside in this area, but that since this was institutional credit that each institution's Area B could vary greatly.

Pam called on nominations for the rising chair and noted David Saltz would be taking chair duties for the next year. Committee approved of Kurt-Alexander Zeller as rising chair.

Pam asked for any additional questions or discussions.

The committee recognized the retirement of John Gaston and his service to the committee – all applauded, thank you John!

There was also question on institutional policies on intellectual copyrights of faculty (or student) produced material and a question posed by faculty at GRU. Some institutions have waiver about using student work for promotional purposes. This could have been an outcome of consolidation and different cultures of intellectual property. There is significant consideration with science and health faculty in terms of intellectual copyright, but that there is a push on many institutions within fine and performing arts. It was noted that if institutions are providing infrastructure, equipment, and materials

that this could be a concern in the arts for institutional ownership or at the very least institutional conflict of interest policies. There was discussion on the expectations of producing professional work for promotion and tenure practices and institutional expectations of this practice. There was a suggestion to look at NASAD recommendations concerning intellectual property, but that each institution's guidelines could potentially override those of accrediting bodies.

Pam thanked all for attending, noted that we addressed all business, and called the meeting adjourned at 1:07pm.

The committee thanked pam for her work as chair this year with applause.

(submitted respectfully by David Koffman)