

TEXAS HIGHER EDUCATION COORDINATING BOARD
Summary Notes/Minutes
English Language & Literature
Field of Study Advisory Committee Meeting
1200 East Anderson Lane, Board Room
Austin, Texas
March 26, 2018, 1:00 PM – 5:00 PM
March 27, 2018, 8:30 AM – 12:00 PM

The webcasts of these meetings are available at the following links:

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YCd3QR-qTbU&t=749s>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LMqfITEMQt4&t=23s>

March 26, 2018:

1. Call to order and introductions

Allen Michie called the meeting to order at 1:00 PM.

The following committee members were present:

Ann Beebe, The University of Texas at Tyler
Jason Berger, University of Houston
Glenn Blalock, Texas A&M University-Corpus Christi
Gretchen Busl, Texas Woman's University
Karen Campbell, Grayson College
Everett Chesnut, Ranger College
Howard Cox, Angelina College
Charles Hatfield, The University of Texas at Dallas
Sally Henschel, Midwestern State University
Clifford Hudder, Lone Star College-Montgomery
Anna Kantor, Navarro College
Iris Lancaster, Texas Southern University
Zeb Lowe, Lamar State College-Port Arthur
Joe Noe, The University of Texas-Rio Grande Valley
Jen Osborne, Alamo Community College-St. Philip's College
Kevin Porter, The University of Texas at Arlington
Kelli Reed, Texarkana College
Elizabeth Scala, The University of Texas at Austin
April Sikorski, Brazosport College
William Smith, Weatherford College
Kandi Tayebi, Sam Houston State University
Kimberly Torres, Cisco College
Apostolos Vasilakis, Texas A&M University
Shane Wallace, Galveston College

Coordinating Board Staff present:

Allen Michie, Program Director

Garry Tomerlin, Deputy Assistant Commissioner

2. Consideration of appointing a recording secretary

April Sikorski volunteered to serve as recording secretary and was elected by acclamation.

3. Consideration of election of Co-Chairs

Karen Campbell (Grayson College) was nominated to serve as co-chair from two-year institutions and was elected by acclamation. Kandi Tayebi (Sam Houston State University) was nominated from four-year institutions and was elected by acclamation.

4. Public testimony

No one was available for public testimony.

5. Break for consultation between Coordinating Board staff and Co-Chairs

The committee recessed for 15 minutes.

6. Overview of Field of Study rules and mission – Dr. Allen Michie

Michie provided an overview of the Fields of Study (FOS) statute, how it is part of a wider range of transfer success initiatives, and how it contributes to the Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board's 60x30TX strategic plan.

Michie stated the goals of the meeting:

- Review curricula from programs at representative two- and four-year institutions
- Review approved courses in the *Academic Course Guide Manual* (ACGM)
- Decide which lower division courses are necessary for success in upper division courses in a major
- Adjust course objectives and descriptions as necessary
- Balance student freedom with institution priorities
- Create a guaranteed pathway to the degree and minimize the number of excess hours that students take

Michie answered questions about FOS and the approval process.

7. Discussion and consideration of the English Language & Literature Field of Study curriculum

Consideration began with Composition I (ENGL 1301) and Composition II (ENGL 1302). Committee members discussed the role of the courses in the core curriculum and therefore whether they should be included in the FOS. Members noted that students must have the skills from Composition as a foundation for all other courses in the major, and they are often prerequisites for other English courses. One member stated that Composition should be in the FOS because it is a symbolic affirmation of the courses' importance to the discipline. It was noted that not all universities accept Composition I and II in transfer, and many students place out of the courses.

Noe made a motion that the FOS not include Composition I and II. Noe stated that the courses do not belong in the FOS because they have a place in the core curriculum. Osborne responded that inquiry-specific and discipline-specific reading and writing is very important to students, and she recommended adjustments to the ACGM descriptions of the courses to have them move toward career contextualization and discipline-specific writing.

The committee discussed the general preparation courses at the lower-division level and the requirements for the English major at the upper-division level. Noe withdrew the motion when members pointed out that Composition I and Composition II are not always required in the core curriculum at each college.

Discussion followed about the number of lower-division semester credit hours (SCH) required for the major at institution. Answers varied from 3 to 9 SCH.

Cox made a motion to add Composition II (ENGL 1302) to the FOS. Hatfield made a friendly amendment that the course description be modified to make the course more discipline-specific, but Cox did not approve the amendment.

Michie clarified that an FOS must apply to the 120 SCH degree program, but it can do so as a core requirement, a requirement for the major, or as an elective.

Osborne and Campbell asked if Composition II needed to be discipline-specific and if it needs a research requirement. Smith responded that ENGL 1302 is not an Introduction to Literature course, and the exit assessment is not always a research paper.

Campbell proposed adding an Introduction to Literature course. Hatfield stated that similar courses are sometimes at the upper-division level.

Scala said that the description of Composition II should be left open in terms of what counts as a “text” and what is “literary” so that the course can fit into existing curricula. Tayebi cautioned against changing the language in the *Lower-Division Academic Course Guide Manual (ACGM)* because of its wide-ranging effects on programs across the state.

Kantor asked committee members to remember dual credit students. Wallace said that high school students and teachers want Technical Writing. Smith said that dual credit is popular, but the FOS is exclusively for English majors, and high school advisors are more concerned with workforce needs.

A vote was called on the motion to include Composition II (ENGL 1302) in the OFS, and the motion passed with 20 in favor and 3 abstaining.

Discussion turned to how the FOS can serve as a pathway for students from community colleges to universities, how it serves as an advising document, and how it serves as part of a degree plan for the major. A key function of the FOS is to prepare students for success in upper-division coursework.

The consensus was that the number of SCH in the FOS should be kept small in order to allow students and institutions flexibility with the upper-division degree requirements. Tayebi recommended a 6 SCH FOS. Michie explained that if the associate degree is 60 SCH, and 42

SCH is for the core curriculum, then that leaves 18 SCH for degree-specific courses. Courses can simultaneously fulfil requirements in both the core and the FOS.

The committee discussed the inclusion of literary survey courses. Members pointed out that Introduction to Literature is not in the ACGM, so the literary survey courses will need to provide students with similar competencies.

The committee then discussed the possibility of multiple tracks in the FOS, including separate tracks for Literature and Rhetoric & Composition. It was agreed that the committee would break into groups for the next day's meeting for in-depth discussion of Writing Studies and Literary Studies.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 PM.

March 27, 2018:

1. Call to order

Campbell and Tayebi called the meeting to order at 8:30 AM.

2. Discussion and consideration of English Language & Literature Field of Study curriculum

The committee broke into two discussion groups: Writing Studies and Literary Studies.

Reporting back for the Writing Studies group, Osborne said that a 9 SCH FOS would be difficult for the community colleges and for dual credit students. The FOS would serve as an alternative to the associate degree. Kantor said that students would not take extra courses if the FOS did not require them. Noe said that the committee needs to consider what is best for the English major students, and institutions will adjust to the FOS as necessary.

Kantor recommended that the committee work with what is currently available in the ACGM.

Each committee member reported their preference for the courses to be included in the FOS, based upon an assignment from the day before for each member to come up with their own ideal FOS. Tayebi reviewed other results from the assignment. The commonalities were a 12 SCH FOS, the inclusion of both Composition I and II, and a pair of the literary survey courses. Another option mentioned was a choice of Technical & Business Writing (ENGL 2311) or Creative Writing (ENGL 2307).

Osborne said that this selection would start a positive alignment between two- and four-year institutions.

Wallace asked what happened to the Forms of Literature course in the ACGM. Michie explained how courses are added and deleted from the ACGM based upon the number of institutions that offer the course over time. Tayebi suggested that this is a concern for another committee.

Berger stated that there are inherent problems with FOS in the Humanities, because English does not have a shared group of classes like Biology (for example). Some universities offer these courses at the upper division.

The committee discussed the rigor of community college courses in the discipline and whether the ACGM courses adequately prepare students for upper-division work. Sikorski said that the FOS is an opportunity for colleges and universities to align their curricula and their expectations to provide the best transitions for students.

Wallace said that there are large numbers of dual enrollment students, and that not including literary survey courses in the FOS would create problems for both colleges and students. Kantor said that colleges have been teaching courses in the ACGM and trying to align with P-16 pipelines, and that changes to the ACGM would be disruptive.

Cox moved that Composition I (ENGL 1301) and Composition II (ENGL 1302) be added to the FOS. The motion carried unanimously.

Osborne, Berger, Porter, and others discussed how foreign language courses may necessitate a low number of SCH in the FOS. Scala asked if the FOS should include a course if it is outside the major. Michie replied that a foreign language requirement could be added to the FOS if a particular language is relevant to the discipline. Tayebi said that any course could be included, and foreign language might be something that the committee wants to say is philosophically important for English majors. Osborn argued that only English courses should be in the FOS, and Berger added that most universities allow students to take foreign language at the upper division.

Osborne made a motion to include 6-8 SCH of foreign language in the FOS. Noe said that there are already enough SCH in the FOS, and there is not enough room for literature, creative writing, or technical writing courses. Wallace said that a foreign language requirement would likely come at the expense of students taking literary survey courses.

Osborne tabled the foreign language discussion.

Scala moved that the FOS include 6 SCH of literary survey courses, in or out of a pair (British/World/American). In discussion, Campbell recommended taking courses in pairs. Hatfield offered a friendly amendment that the choice include the Mexican American Literature survey.

Reed said that survey courses should be available in any combination, so long as there is no repetition in course content. Chesnut pointed out that students sometimes prefer to take one half of a survey pair, and then another half of another survey pair. Hatfield suggested that students be required to take one early historical survey and one late historical survey. Busl, Lancaster, Smith, Berger, and others discussed potential problems with these courses transferring as the equivalent to upper-division survey courses.

The motion was clarified to read that students take 6 SCH of literary survey courses of any kind, but they may not take a one-semester survey and then take one-half of the pair of courses from the same region (for example, no single-semester survey in American Literature and then

American Literature I or American Literature II). The motion passed, 19 to 2, with one abstention.

The committee discussed having tracks within the FOS, including tracks for English Literature and Writing. It was noted that at The University of Texas at Austin, the Rhetoric & Composition program is completely separate from the English program.

Beebe stated that the more general the FOS is, the better. Beebe proposed a 15 SCH FOS, and Berger countered with a proposed 12 SCH FOS. The consensus was that the committee would first decide on the course content, then determine the necessary SCH.

Osborne made a motion to continue tabling the discussion on including foreign language courses. The motion passed 18 to 5.

Osborne made a motion that the FOS be 12 SCH and contain the following courses: ENGL 1301, ENGL 1302, and a choice of two literary survey courses that do not repeat course content across one-semester surveys and one half of another survey: ENGL 2321, ENGL 2322, ENGL 2323, ENGL 2336, ENGL2327, ENGL2328, ENGL2331, ENGL2332, ENGL2333, and ENGL2351.

Discussion returned to the possibility of separate track for Writing programs. Several committee members suggested inviting more Rhetoric & Composition faculty to participate in, or give testimony to, the committee. Tomerlin pointed out that adding committee members would greatly delay the approval and implementation of the FOS. Tayebi added that the FOS would go out for public discussion, so institutions and faculty will have their opportunity to give feedback.

Osborn expressed the concern that students would not take courses that are not in the FOS. Smith responded that Technical Writing is required for many different majors, and Creative Writing is a popular elective course.

3. Overview of the timeline for public comments and Field of Study approval – Dr. Allen Michie

Michie stated that the proposed FOS would go out for a 30-day public comment period. Committee members would be given a copy of each comment for a response. If changes are made, the revised FOS would go out for a second 30-day comment period. The FOS curriculum would go before the Coordinating Board's Committee on Academic and Workforce Success committee and the full Board for final approval.

4. Consideration of authorization of Co-Chairs to approve minutes and final Field of Study documents

Sikorski made a motion that the committee co-chairs be authorized to make non-substantive changes to the FOS as necessary for the Board approval process, to approve the meeting minutes, and do other relevant business on behalf of the committee. The motion carried unanimously.

5. Adjournment

The committee adjourned at 11:50 AM.

Final Proposed Field of Study:

Prefix & Number	Course Name	Semester Credit Hours
ENGL 1301	Composition I	3
ENGL 1302	Composition II	3
I. ENGL 2321 II. ENGL 2322 III. ENGL 2323 IV. ENGL 2326 V. ENGL 2327 VI. ENGL 2328 VII. ENGL 2331 VIII. ENGL 2332 IX. ENGL 2333 X. ENGL 2341 XI. ENGL 2351	Choose two of the following Literature Survey courses: ¹ I. British Literature (single semester) II. British Literature I III. British Literature II IV. American Literature (single semester) V. American Literature I VI. American Literature II VII. World Literature (single semester) VIII. World Literature I IX. World Literature II X. Forms of Literature XI. Mexican American Literature	6

TOTAL: 12

¹ To avoid duplication of content, one-half of a two-semester survey in British, American, or World Literature cannot be taken in conjunction with the single-semester course in the same topic. [For example, World Literature I (ENGL 2332) cannot be taken with World Literature (ENGL 2331).]