

**Minutes**  
**Foreign Language Academic Advisory Committee to the**  
**Board of Regents (FLAAC)**  
**Monday, April 11, 2016**  
**Macon State College**  
**Macon, Georgia**

**Chair: Trino Prados, Middle Georgia State University**  
**Chair-elect: Mark Greger Georgia Highlands College**  
**Secretary: David de Posada, Georgia College & State University**

**Attendees:**

Darren Broome (Gordon College); Dorothee Mertz-Weigel (Armstrong-Atlantic State); Lisa Noetzel (Coastal Georgia); David de Posada (GCSU); Kristina Watkins Mormino (Georgia Gwinnett); Eric Karthner (Georgia Southern); Jana Sandarg (Augusta University); David Shook (Georgia Tech); Trino Prados (MGSU); E. Joe Johnson (Clayton State); Mariana Stone (UNG); Mary Barnard (FVSU); Mark Greger (Ga Highlands); Dennis Miller (Clayton State); Ofelia Nikolova (VSU); Brian Hibbs (Dalton State); Oscar Moreno (GSU); Marci Middleton (BOR); Michaela Claus-Nix (DOE); Rich Robinson (Perimeter/GSU); Paige Crump (MGSU).

The meeting was called to order at 9:10. The chair welcomed all participants, and everyone introduced themselves.

The April 2015 minutes were approved unanimously.

**I. Update from the BOR : Marci M. Middleton, Ph.D., Assistant Vice Chancellor**

Academic Degree Productivity Enrollment Monitoring and Academic Programs in the USG

Institutional Review of USG Degree Productivity

- Institutions provided with data as of Spring 2015 with three rounds of productivity confirmation.
- Requested that presidents and vice presidents for academic affairs confer with academic deans, department heads, faculty, and campus leaders on data and program directions.
- Reviewed all academic programs approved prior to year 2010.

- Utilized graduation data points for years 2012 through 2014.

## Action

### Institutional Review of USG Degree Productivity

- Programs not included in degree productivity reviews involved deactivated programs, programs approved from year 2010 to the present, general education and support related disciplines that form the foundation of the core curriculum, and programs without three years of graduation data (e.g., years 2012 to 2014).

## Thresholds

Three – Year Average Criteria of Degrees Conferred per Program per Institution, FY 2012 to FY 2014

<b>Degree Level</b>	<b>Minimum Degrees Awarded</b>
Associate programs	Less than 5 graduates
Bachelor's programs	Less than 10 graduates
Master's programs	Less than 5 graduates
Specialist in Education programs	Less than 5 graduates
First Professional programs ( <i>M.D., D.D.S., J.D., D.V.M., Pharm.D.</i> )	Less than 3 graduates
Doctoral programs ( <i>Ph.D., Ed.D., D.S.W., Dr.P.H., etc.</i> )	Less than 3 graduates

## Resultant Institutional Actions

During year 2014 – 2015, a total of 38 programs and 28 substantive changes were approved.

### Program Terminations

During year 2014 – 2015, a total of 20 programs were terminated.

### Degree Productivity Initiative

Since the degree productivity initiative's inception in early year 2013, a decrease occurred in the number of low producing programs from approximately 642 degrees and majors in October 2013 to 303 programs as of academic year 2014 – 2015.

## **Comprehensive Program Review**

Subcommittee Objectives:

- 1) Determine system-wide indicators of quality, productivity, and viability that need to be collected from university system institutions based on institutional comprehensive program review assessments;
- 2) Develop elements for a template by which university system institutions and the system office are looking at foundation level metrics, both qualitative and quantitative, for system office review and feedback to institutions concerning their internal comprehensive program review assessments; and,
- 3) Within the framework of comprehensive program review and using the resultant template, determine the elements that need to be reported to the Board of Regents.

There will be no further tuition increases. Tuitions are to remain flat.

There is an initiative to assess and to give raises.

Tech colleges: All institutions are SACS accredited.

Recommendation from FLAAC member: Instead of having spot checks, it would be more beneficial to require institutions to share the health of their academic programs. It is important to keep in mind that academic reviews are part of the culture of most departments.

A FLACC member remarked that overlay requirements were too specific for the different institutions. Found them to be a hurdle for the students. Requirements completely removed.

Another committee member asked that since no institutional comprehensive review is being replaced, what type of systematic review will be asked from institutions?

Dr. Middleton: Reviews comprise two steps:

- I. Prospectus: Institution's justification for need and demand
- II. Formal Proposal: By invitation after review of prospectus and considering both fiscal and faculty sufficiency.

There is an extra step for doctoral programs: an external review to further inform the review process.

Q: Are minors and concentrations being considered?

A: No

A committee member remarked that because some institutions have a huge number of minors it would be a good idea to advocate that the BOR take into account the role of the minor in program reviews.

Another member identified a current problem in FL education where the teacher does not need a major to teach a language; passing the GACE is sufficient for employment. Students know they don't need to minor or major in a language to teach it. There is no need to take content courses.

A third member requested that content and FL pedagogy be added to requirements.

Dr. Middleton underlined that:

- The need for math and FL teachers is dire
- School districts can waive certification
- Each district may have different certification rules and standards

## **II. Presentation: Online Modern Language Classes, Paige Crump, MGSU.**

### **Purpose of Thesis Study**

- Students should have similar achievement levels in both the online and on-campus courses.
- Research Questions Addressed:
  - Is there a difference between traditional and online course scores on the final oral exam?
  - Is there a difference between traditional and online course scores on the written final exam?

### **Discussion of Research Findings**

SPAN 1001 could reach similar levels of achievement

SPAN 1002 could reach similar levels of achievement on the final written exam but not on the final oral exam.

Use the textbook as a supplement, not the main component of the course. It is better to build your content and lecture materials and reference the text or assign activities/readings from the text or electronic workbooks/lab manuals than to just assign pages to read and complete.

- Maintain excellent contact with students. Provide online hours they know you are grading and answering e-mails. Answer e-mails in a timely manner. Provide News updates and reminders. Keep the courses updated with changes or upcoming due dates.
- Keep the unit format consistent. Introduction -> materials -> practices -> reviews -> exams -> conclusions as an example. This way they get used to the format and page settings. It makes navigating the course easier on

the students. Navigation is often one of the hardest things for students to grasp.

### **Characteristics of an online course that allow it to function well in a modern language**

- The instructional design should support the teaching style of the instructor. The content and function of the course should mirror how the instructor would teach a course.
- Contains an introduction that tells students what will be covered in each unit, and it contains objectives based on the skills/tasks you wish for them to complete.
- Contains a conclusion at the end of each unit that summarizes the topics and skills from the unit.
- Contains detailed notes and audio lectures. Essentially, you build the lecture notes in written form and record an audio lecture in the target language that students listen to and read the written notes at the same time. If you do strictly audio lectures, there has to be a written script of what you say for the hearing impaired.
- Use the textbook as a supplement, not the main component of the course. It is better to build your content and lecture materials and reference the text or assign activities/readings from the text or electronic workbooks/lab manuals than to just assign pages to read and complete.
- Maintain excellent contact with students. Provide online hours they know you are grading and answering e-mails. Answer e-mails in a timely manner. Provide News updates and reminders. Keep the courses updated with changes or upcoming due dates.
- Keep the unit format consistent. Introduction -> materials -> practices -> reviews -> exams -> conclusions as an example. This way they get used to the format and page settings. It makes navigating the course easier on the students. Navigation is often one of the hardest things for students to grasp.
- Break units and lessons into manageable chunks. For example, you may find you need a part A and B to each unit. Part A may be vocabulary and culture, and part B may focus on grammar. This helps the students be able to grasp the materials better as there is less per lesson and unit. However, a unit may have as many as 8 lessons depending on the content and topics that need to be covered. The lessons are broken down by topic for each part of subpart of the unit. Ex. Unit 1A: Vocabulary and Culture: 6 lessons: topics: introduction to studying a foreign language, alphabet and letter pronunciations, greetings/farewells/introductory questions/courtesy, titles, question words. This of course varies based on the curriculum you teach, the topics you cover or the content of the chapters of the text you use.
- Keep your time frame equal from one unit to the next. Ex. 9 days per unit for a 10-unit 16-week class.
- Use overlapping open/close dates. When one ends, the next one starts on the same day. Ex. Unit 1A starts on 1/11 and closes on 1/20; Unit 1B would open on

1/20 and close on 2/1, etc. The open and start times should be consistent. Good times have been: open at 12:00 AM, and close at 11:59 PM. As long as the open/close times are consistent and the length of days are consistent, students know what to expect. All open/close dates should be listed in syllabus. Having one start as one ends also helps the procrastinators realize they are behind since 2 units will be open at the same time. It is a good idea to avoid due dates on the weekends, especially Fridays, because of system upgrades and closures.

- Have a reliable and quality instructional designer/technologist that is familiar with using technology for pedagogical purposes. The creation and coding of activities can be tricky when working with audio overlays and several other things because D2L requires specific formatting. This is someone you will work closely with as you develop materials that function at the best level for instruction and student learning. There are work arounds to these issues, but the overlay is the best way to present the audio for vocabulary. The instructional designer is the one that can

### **Things to keep in mind about fully online modern language courses**

- These were custom designed courses per the instructor's specifications and teaching style.
- Many features were built from scratch and have been edited and re-edited to maintain specific formatting required by learning systems to ensure students and instructors are able to maintain engagement in the course content.
- By building custom and quality courses, we have been able to edit and change them as necessary based on changes in coding, availability of programs, and available technology while maintaining the integrity and quality of the courses. This has helped to keep them viable and as successful as the on-campus courses.

A committee member remarked that this particular model doesn't seem to follow ACTFL national standards, and added that this model seems to be content, not proficiency-based.

P. Crump replied that while ACTFL standards are not the basis of this model, the model works well for her particular population of students. She added that all four basic language skills are addressed in this model of delivery.

### **III. Discussion: In-House Materials, *Mark Greger*, (GA Highlands)**

Until recently, programs were able to maintain publisher-produced materials. A committee member expressed concern about the possibility of administrators mandating the replacement of publisher-produced textbooks and ancillaries with open-source textbooks or "in-house" materials.

Questions raised and comments expressed by various committee members:

- Does this infringe upon academic freedom?
- What is the value of publisher-produced materials VS in-house produced materials?
- The work entailed in producing materials is time prohibitive.
- While the advent of the internet makes it easier to produce these materials, the application of standards and cohesive pedagogical organization is not always present in in-house produced programs.
- Materials produced in-house may not be of the same quality as professionally produced materials.
- We are not prepared / equipped academically to produce our own materials. Most of us are trained as literary critics, not instructional designers.
- Is there an understanding of fair compensation associated with a mandate to create in-house programs / materials?
- Can a department / chair / dean chose what materials are to be used for a course / program?
- Multi-sectional / large programs need to maintain the same textbook and same curriculum for uniformity. This requires the imposition of a textbook.
- Affordable does not mean free. There seems to be a misunderstanding about the affordable Georgia initiative.
- It is very cost effective to adopt a textbook and use it for four semesters.
- There seems to be some confusion between academic freedom and academic integrity.
- Faculty is in charge of curriculum. The department chair has the responsibility to ascertain that all courses are taught similarly.
- Deans and administrators outside departments should not be dictating and deciding what materials faculty should be using.
- There should be a statement in the institution's faculty handbook about curricular cohesion and academic freedom.

The committee began preparing a resolution. A committee member objected to formulating a resolution that may not be fair for all institutions including those with multiple sections.

There was a motion to make a general recommendation with the understanding that a more comprehensive resolution would require more time. The committee decided to produce a more detailed recommendation via LISTSERV discussion.

**Recommendation:** Decisions on curricular and instructional materials should be left to current subject area specialists.

The recommendation was approved unanimously.

Following the FLAAC meeting on 4/11/16, an online discussion yielded the following, more detailed, resolution:

Current open-source textbooks for foreign languages are not sufficiently comprehensive to provide an acceptable alternative to the publisher-produced textbook

programs used in the majority of foreign-language programs in institutions across the state.

Whereas (a) vocabulary, grammar, and cultural practices are intertwined in communication; (b) students are expected to learn to comprehend, verbalize, and write in the target language; and (c) more advanced lessons must build on knowledge acquired in previous lessons; beginning and intermediate foreign language classes should be taught using structured and interrelated materials.

1. While world language faculty are encouraged to supplement their courses with appropriate resources, an assemblage of unrelated resources should not be considered an adequate alternative to coherent textbooks and online programs.
2. Whereas the creation of a coherent textbook or online program would require enormous time and resources, no faculty member should be compelled to undertake such a task without considerable compensation, support, and recognition.
3. No faculty member in modern languages should be compelled to use as the primary textbook for a class any materials that have not been rigorously peer-reviewed.

Approved by a majority via online vote.

#### **IV. Presentation: World Languages and Workforce Initiatives. Michaela Claus-Nix, Program Specialist, DOE.**

Jobs tied to international trade: 23 million jobs in 50 states. 1,072,231 in Georgia.

International Businesses & World Languages Education in Georgia:

Countries in GA:

- # 1: Germany - 490
- # 2: Japan - 402
- # 3: UK - 284
- # 4: France - 255
- # 5: Canada – 230
- # 6: Netherlands – 149
- # 7: Switzerland – 129
- # 8: Sweden – 113

World Languages Offered:

- # 1: Spanish – 398,563
- # 2: French – 81,293
- # 3: Latin – 18,709
- # 4: German – 14,658
- # 5: Chinese – 7,232
- # 6: Japanese – 1,287
- # 7: ASL – 1,219



•# 8: Arabic - 908

Global Competence is a Job Soft Skill

Careers Using World Language Skills

Businesses are Looking for Multi-Lingual Employees

### **Enrollment Data 2014-2015**

ASL - 1219 (+171)  
Arabic - 908 (+30)  
Chinese - 7,232 (+1,010)  
French - 81,239 (+784)  
German - 14,658 (+1020)  
Greek (Classical) - 31 (+30)  
Italian - 50 (-3)  
Japanese - 1,219 (+171)  
Korean - 8 (-1)  
Latin – 18,709 (+886)  
Portuguese - 326 (+166)  
Russian - 112 (+12)  
Spanish-398,563 (+22,897)  
**Total-524,504 (+18,060)**

- Teaching for Proficiency
- Teaching Cultural Competence
- GADOE Supports International School Partnerships:

France  
Germany  
Spain  
German-American Partnership Program (GAPP)  
Friendship Connection

- GaDOE Supports Local Consulates' Initiatives:
  - German Consulate General: Greenopoly
- GaDOE Supports school-business partnerships:
  - SFHS – Siemens State Pilot
- GaDOE partners with cultural institutions:
  - Alliance Française
  - Goethe-Zentrum
  - Atlantic Institute

## **CTAE & World Languages = Partners Educating Georgia's Future Workforce**

### **GaDOE's World Languages and Global Workforce Initiatives:**

- International Skills Diploma Seal
- Dual Language Immersion
- Georgia Skills Initiative
- CTAE Sample Units
- DSD Statewide
- Seal of Biliteracy
- Professional Development for Teachers

### **The International Skills Diploma Seal**

- Recognize high school graduates with an international focus
- Provide a tool for business & industry, colleges & universities to distinguish among applicants
- Encourage schools to increase course offerings with an international focus
- Encourage engagement with international stakeholders within communities
- Prepare our students for the global market, teach them the soft skills they need to be competitive in job hunting and sustained employment  
67 schools applied, 61 were approved for 2015/2016

### **Dual Language Immersion**

- To increase the number of students proficient in another language
- To provide a model for schools to narrow the achievement gap
- To provide students with intercultural competence
- To give students a competitive advantage in a global economy  
To provide challenging instruction

### **DLI in Georgia**

- 2013-2014 = 3 schools
  - 2015-2016 = 20 schools
  - 2016-2017 = 30+ schools
- Spanish
    - 14 programs
    - APS, Clayton, Cobb, Dekalb, Douglas, Fulton, Gwinnett, Hall
  - French
    - 5 programs
    - Dekalb, Fulton, Gwinnett
  - Chinese
    - 4 programs
    - Dekalb, Fulton, Henry
  - German
    - 2 programs
    - Dekalb, Fulton

### **The Georgia Skills Initiative**

- Help solve the skills-gap challenge
- Showcase successful local school-business partnerships
- Enable students to receive instruction in real-world settings
- Provide businesses access to potential employees
- Facilitate dialogue between important community stakeholders
- Inform students and parents about career readiness and alternative pathways to careers

### **CTAE Sample Units**

- French – Health Science
- German – Introduction into Business
- Spanish – Agriculture

### **Seal of Biliteracy**

- DOE proposal
- <http://www.legis.ga.gov/Legislation/20152016/156090.pdf>

### **Data Reporting**

- FY 2016
  - FY 2017
  - FY 2018
- ISDS as Graduation Program of Study
  - Seal of Biliteracy as Graduation Program of Study
  - Add data elements that will allow the school to report up to 3 languages that a student is proficient in. These will be on the student level.
  - Add data element(s) to report Dual Language Immersion (DLI) by student, by language.

### **Monthly Webinars**

- September Michaela Claus-Nix, *A New GaDoE Initiative: The International Skills Diploma Seal*
- October Michael Göttert, *Meet the New German Language Advisor for the Southeast*
- November David Jahner, *AP Updates*
- December Dr. Pete Swanson, *ACTFL Updates*
- January Svetla Dimova, *Connecting with the World*
- March Felix Gaspar Koch, *Meet the Spanish Language Advisor*

V. Nomination and election of next secretary: Mariana Stone (University of North GA) volunteered to be secretary for 2017.

VI. Date of next FLAAC meeting: April 10, 2017

VII. Other Business: No new business discussed.

VIII. Meeting adjourned at 3:35 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

David de Posada, Ph.D.

Georgia College & State University

FLAAC Secretary - 2016