

In This Issue

- From the Executive Director
- General Education “in Flux”
- Conference Notices

- Reforming, Implementing, Assessing Gen Ed
- Collaboration During Transition
- Measuring What Matters

AGLS News

The Newsletter of
the Association for General
and Liberal Studies

WWW.AGLS.ORG

Volume 26 Number 1
Fall 2009



From the Executive Director

C.P. Snow in the Summer of 2009

This past summer, in preparation for our annual fall conference (1-3 October 2009, St. Louis, MO), I sat down to re-read C. P. Snow's *The Two Cultures and the Scientific Revolution* (New York: Cambridge UP, 1962). It was good to remind myself what Snow really said in 1959, what I had come to believe he had said, and what questions remain timeless for us as educators and learners.

Our conference theme in St. Louis is “Building Bridges: Tools for Pedagogy, Assessment, and Leadership.” In our first plenary on Thursday afternoon, “Bridging the Cultures: Humanities, Science and Art,” Pan Papacosta of Columbia College Chicago and Catherine Carter Goebel of Augustana College will offer a critical summary of Snow's *Two Cultures* and describe successful bridge building methods that link the humanities with the sciences and the arts.

I thought I might use a small part of my summer to do a little bit of advanced thinking about what Snow observed at the dawn of “The Sputnik Era.” In 1959 Snow was already worried about the effect of what he saw as a gulf between science thinking and what he calls at various times, “non-scientific,” “intellectual,” or “literary” culture. He was especially critical of dichotomous thought, calling the number “2” a “very dangerous number” (9). “Polarisation” he wrote, “is sheer loss to us all. To us as people,

and to our society. It is at the same time practical and intellectual and creative loss, and I repeat that it is false to imagine that those three considerations are clearly separable” (12).

Snow was also critical of what he saw as too much specialization in culture and education: “Nearly everyone will agree that our school education is too specialised. But nearly everyone feels that it is outside the will of [peo-

Is my 40-year rearview lens any clearer than Snow's? Would he caution us in a similar way about the information/digital revolution as he did about the scientific one?

ple] to alter it” (19-20). Snow also doubted that our urge to specialize would slow any time soon: “All the lessons of our educational history suggest we are only capable of increasing specialisation, not decreasing it” (20-21).

Surely on both these points—cultural splits mirrored in our academic lives, and the effect of over-specialization on learning—C.P. Snow still has much to say to us. Even more critical, though, for our work in general and liberal education, are his comments on the unnecessary split of the mind/body in life and in learning. Snow leaves no doubt where his sym-

pathies lie: “If one begins by thinking only of the intellectual life, or only of the social life, one comes to a point where it becomes manifest that our education has gone wrong, and gone wrong in the same way” (35). He continues: “Closing the gap between our cultures is a necessity in the most abstract intellectual sense, as well as in the most practical. When those two senses have grown apart, then no society is going to be able to think with wisdom” (53).

These words will be in my mind as I teach my three classes in the fall. And when I arrive in St. Louis I will want to think more about if Snow is right about separating learning from life, about the dominance of disciplines in curriculum, and about the insidious role of dichotomous thinking in learning. Is my 40-year rearview lens any clearer than Snow's? Would he caution us in a similar way about the information/digital revolution as he did about the scientific one? What bridges can be built using the best of what we know about leadership, pedagogy, and assessment? Is there another C.P. Snow in the room who can show us a way in 2009, as Snow attempted to do in 1959?

See you all in St. Louis on October 1st.

Paul Ranieri
AGLS Executive Director

Conferences

Association for Core Texts and Courses Conference

Theme: Engaging Worlds: Core Texts and Cultural Contexts

April 15-18, 2010, The Heldrich Hotel, New Brunswick,
NJ (*As little as 21 minutes from Newark Airport
and 42 minutes from NYC*)

This year's theme seeks to engage the plurality of worlds created by core texts or brought into contact through core texts. The conference seeks to explore how cultures and civilizations are created in and by core texts. The conference will explore cultural context not only as the historical conditions—past and present—of core texts, but as the created world of works of any discipline or the worlds within which individual characters act, think, and feel in the books in which they appear. The conference also seeks to explore how civilizations have made and are making contact with others through core texts. In adopting this theme, we are also seeking to learn of the relation between audiences and texts. Whether scientist, philosopher, anthropologist, or critic, whether from majority or minority cultures, whether books or civilizations are your center of interest, ACTC hopes that you will join our 16th Annual Conference. Still the same great deal: every panel has short papers (5 pages, double-spaced) and real discussions, and the conference fee buys you six great meals—and a reception. See www.coretexts.org to register your proposal or intention to attend. As always, first-time attendees are most welcome.

Association for Integrative Studies Annual Conference

Theme: Creativity and Play Across the Disciplines

October 8-11, 2009, Tuscaloosa, Alabama
Hosted by the University of Alabama and New
College

The conference invites attendees to reflect upon the dramatic changes in the knowledge economy that make urgent approaches to learning, scholarship, research, and engagement that activate the creative capacities of higher education communities. Nearly 100 proposals for papers, roundtables and workshops were submitted to the organizing committee for this year's conference.

The keynote speaker will be Timothy K. Eatman of Syracuse University and Director of Research at the Imagining America Project, which in 2008 released the report, *Scholarship in Public: Knowledge Creation and Tenure Policy in the Engaged University* (see www.imagingamerica.org/TTI/TTI_FINAL.pdf).

Hotel Capstone is the host hotel, which is conveniently adjacent to the conference site. Tuscaloosa is best reached by travel to Birmingham Shuttlesworth International Airport. Conference organizers will provide airport shuttle service for \$25 to attendees arriving and departing during the active conference period. Tuscaloosa is also conveniently reached by Amtrak (from Atlanta and New Orleans) and is located on I-20/59 for those traveling by car.

For more information or to register for the conference go to the conference website, aisconference.ua.edu.

From the 2008 Ashville AGLS Conference

Where We've Been, Where We're Going: Strategies for Collaboration During Transition

When Champlain College began the process of moving from a menu-driven approach to general education to an integrated, interdisciplinary curriculum, the institution faced some unique challenges. As a professionally-focused school, Champlain had been granting baccalaureate degrees for only a decade; prior to 1995, the college awarded only associate's degrees and relied heavily on adjunct faculty. The full-time faculty members who taught the general education courses were used to quite a bit of autonomy; while their courses were not highly valued, they, themselves were ranked among the best teachers on campus, and yet they received little administra-

tive support or supervision. The introduction of a rigorous interdisciplinary program in general education stretched and stressed the generalists, but intentional strategies of collaboration facilitated the implementation of the new curriculum and resulted in increased confidence in and support for the massive undertaking that now stands as an equal partner in Champlain College's "Education in Three Dimensions."

The challenges:

- The mandate to create a new, interdisciplinary model of general education was announced by President Finney at his November, 2005 inauguration. Faculty generally dislike top-

down mandates, but there was some enthusiasm for this one, because many faculty members viewed Finney as a visionary wholeheartedly committed to transforming Champlain College from a school struggling to shape a new identity after becoming a four-year institution to a leader among schools offering professional degree programs.

- The pace Finney announced was unprecedented – the new curriculum would be in place to greet the Class of 2011. The campus community spent a couple of months brainstorming "blue-sky" plans and met in May, 2006 to work together to meld viable ideas into a compromise proposal. That proposal was adopted unani-

From the 2008 Ashville AGLS Conference Where We've Been continued

mously by the Faculty Senate at the end of May. The Provost convened a team of three faculty members to begin work on designing master courses (the curriculum is a vertical sequence of thirteen courses) in August, 2006, and the first-year courses were rolled out to the Class of 2011 in September, 2007.

- General education faculty at Champlain prior to the new curriculum taught exclusively in their areas of specialty; the historians taught history, the English faculty taught expository writing, American literature, Shakespeare; the philosophers taught courses in critical thinking, logic, and ethics. The new model called for all general education faculty to become, almost overnight, interdisciplinarians. Perhaps the greatest challenge Champlain faced was how to prepare existing faculty to do this kind of teaching, and to integrate new hires trained in interdisciplinarity with Champlain veterans.

- Finally, students entering Champlain in the fall of 2007 hadn't been adequately informed of the change in the general education structure. Most choose Champlain for its professional focus and view any other coursework as a distraction. In spite of the fact that the new interdisciplinary curriculum amounted to the same number of credits as the old model of general education, students met the new curriculum with suspicion and even hostility, a reaction that was intensified by the uncertainty they sensed on the part of the faculty working through it for the first time. By October an anti-Core Facebook site had sprung up, and faculty were dealing with overt questioning in their classrooms.

I came on board as dean in August, 2007. The outline of the curriculum had been approved a year before, the Course Development Team was hard at work and had produced the first-year courses, six new faculty members had been hired, and a consultant had been brought in to do some train-

ing in integrative teaching. In spite of the good work that had already been accomplished under the very tight deadline, I quickly recognized that my primary goal had to be to build confidence and collegiality among individuals used to independence and specialization. Daily I reinforced positive attitudes and reminded often-discouraged faculty that we were all in this together and that we were, as a group, committed to each other's success. Although we had many agenda items to take care of at division meetings, we always took time to share what was going well and what was challenging. I also set up an informal meeting time every Wednesday afternoon when faculty could get together to share assignments that they were working on, to offer suggestions on curriculum development, and sometimes just to vent. I offered written talking points to faculty around common issues (the adoption of a required electronic portfolio was one that many students raised) so that they wouldn't have to confront student questions on their own. Our classes are linked and I distributed coupons to the campus coffee shop to foster collaboration between cohort partners. I also held brown-bag lunches around topics of professional interest, such as the inquiry method, which we were utilizing as our primary pedagogical strategy in all the classes. Although faculty were often only one class ahead of their students, dancing as fast as they could to integrate art, psychology, literature, and neuroscience in our introductory first-year course, most made time to participate, reaching out to their colleagues to offer and receive support. The ethos of the first year was one of "surviving."

Now in our second year of the new curriculum, we talk about "thriving." The Wednesday meetings have become a Core Division tradition, a faculty learning community around the scholarship of teaching and learning has developed, not one but two "Super Friends" groups (faculty

cohorted together working with several partners) meet weekly, and faculty with specialized knowledge, particularly in science and religion, voluntarily prepare and distribute background material. We are experimenting with ClearSpace, wikis, and blogs as collaborative tools, and even the technophobes are beginning to become believers. I have involved students in the collaborative process as well, hosting a Dean's Advisory Council dinner monthly to get student input, hiring student mentors to assist each class with the electronic portfolio requirement, inviting students to present their work at Open House and Family weekends, and organizing a campus-wide exhibit of student self-portraits, the common assignment in one of our first-year courses.

What have we learned? Chief among the many lessons of a whirlwind first year is this: If you build community, they will come. Collaboration develops when attitudes are positive and individuals feel supported. Faculty need to be encouraged (told, even) to collaborate; many are lone rangers who are not accustomed to talking about what they do when they close their classroom doors. The enormity of the transition at Champlain, nothing less than a seismic shift in how teaching and learning are being conceived, has caused faculty to experience precisely what we designed the new curriculum to present to our students – the opportunity to step out of one's comfort zone, to ask informed questions rather than seek definitive answers, and to partner with others in inquiry and investigation.

Elizabeth Beaulieu, Ph.D.
Dean, Core Division
Champlain College
www.champlain.edu/Core-Division.html
ebeaulieu@champlain.edu

From the 2008 Asheville AGLS Conference

General Education “in Flux”: Reform, Assessment, & Redesign in a Period of Transition

As universities realize that accountability is more than a passing fad, departments and programs have had to establish and maintain assessment systems that provide meaningful information on student learning outcomes. While fairly painless at the department level, assessment has been difficult for General Education programs, given their inter-departmental character. In 2003 Shippensburg University established the General Education Coordinating Committee (GECC), charged with creating an assessment program (since previous ad hoc committees performing only periodic reviews of the program were structurally unable to undertake the task). At that same time, within two years the university gained a new President, academic Deans of two colleges and Associate Dean, a Provost, and many mid-level management positions. It was the perfect storm in which to begin to enact change. However much perfect storms create opportunity for change, they are also fraught with danger.

Once established, the first task of the new GECC—one of the most representative bodies on campus—was to create an assessment strategy for the program. Subcommittees for each of the six areas of our General Education program (i.e., Skills and Competencies and five “Categories of Knowledge”) were established to articulate the common learning objectives for courses within each area. Since the current program was established in the mid-1980s with little revision, the sub-committees were challenged not to revise the program but to “discover” skill or conceptual commonalities among the courses that could serve as Categories of Knowledge Learning Objectives (CKLOs). Sub-committee members took these back to their respective departments for approval, from which departments devised content-area specific rubrics reflecting the General Education CKLOs. The content-spe-

cific rubrics were then submitted by each department back to the GECC for review and suggestions were made for revision when and if necessary.

It was determined that the General Education assessment would work on a three-year cycle with the fourth as a year of reflection and analysis of the process. Sample sizes were determined, and a timeline designating which courses would be assessed when was established to ensure all offerings were assessed over the three-year cycle. Once departments retrieved the data, it would be submitted to the relevant sub-committee for review and comment to move its way back up to the GECC and eventually to the Associate Provost, responsible for university-wide assessment. The plan went into effect in the fall of 2006, and we are now in our third year of the cycle. (For the complete Shippensburg University General Education Assessment Plan link here: webspace.ship.edu/kmlong/GECC.pdf)

This process has uncovered the lack of “logic” in the courses that comprise the Categories of Knowledge and the outdated approach to General Education in general. Not unique to Shippensburg University is the resistance to change a university-wide program that generates approximately 40% of a student’s program and departments’ primary resource line. Undertaking change, even under the best of circumstances, is like sailing into very rough waters.

The GECC, therefore, undertook a faculty survey in the spring of 2008 to gauge the level of satisfaction with the current General Education program, as well as openness and responsiveness to change. Results were notably ambiguous. Only 35% of the faculty responded. Additionally, over 60% of faculty responding to the survey expressed satisfaction across nearly all present Categories of Knowledge. Following the analysis of the present program, however, was a series of questions relating to Program Enhancement ideas, ranging from cre-

ating a first-year experience to providing increased course flexibility to re-organizing the program and starting over again. Here, faculty also showed levels of interest in change above 55% for most ideas. Therein lies the ambiguity.

Our next step this spring is to organize a series of open forums and focus groups to gather together ideas of what the “Shippensburg Graduate” should look like as a way to focus our efforts in General Education reform and to catalyze a community-wide deliberation on Shippensburg’s mission. After the first round, the GECC and the forum facilitators will consolidate the information and hold another round of forums to begin the specific process of General Education reform. Through this process the GECC hopes to encourage broad participation, creativity, support, and in the end, a program that is responsive to the needs, aspirations, and future of our graduates.

We hope that by continuing assessment in various forms, we can move forward confidently in making improvements to the program that most people will support. With the senior leadership team in place now, our assessment efforts will help both the faculty and the administration use data to help steer change. What we have is not perfect by any means; however, we have an assessment plan in place that focuses on student learning outcomes and should help us to move into the 21st century in General Education, confident that we can move from individual departments and courses to a university-wide coherent program, sailing our SHIP into new waters.

Doug Birsch, Cynthia Botteron, Kim Martin Long, Allison Predecki, and Jose Ricardo-Osorio Shippensburg University of Pennsylvania

From the 2008 Ashville AGLS Conference

Reforming, Implementing, Assessing and Sustaining General Education as a Whole

Eastern Michigan University, a recipient of one of the 2007 AGLS Awards for Improving General Education, has taken a systematic and faculty-driven approach to reforming, implementing, assessing, and sustaining its new General Education Program. A series of concrete strategies for involving all stakeholders in the continuous process of implementing the new program has been developed. These strategies provide the foundation for the faculty and staff development initiatives essential to sustaining the program.

Immediately following the development and approval of our new General Education Program, our focus turned to creating structures and initiatives designed to implement the program in a systematic manner and to help every member of the campus community become familiar with it. The structure that was thoughtfully, and quickly, established, consisted of five subcommittees: (1) Course Vetting (CV) – to evaluate courses for inclusion in the Program; (2) Writing-Intensive (WI) – to evaluate upper-level writing-intensive courses in the major; (3) Learning Beyond the Classroom (LBC) – to evaluate events, courses, and activities proposed for the LBC category; (4) Faculty and Staff Development (FSD) – to provide opportunities for focused and constructive faculty development initiatives; and (5) Assessment & Evaluation (AE) – to develop and carry out plans for assessing the program. Additionally, three task forces were created that focused on administrative policies related to catalog and program development, transfer, and advising and auditing. Once the basic infrastructure was in place, Faculty and Staff Development became essential in educating all constituents about the program and in transforming the culture of the campus.

Institutes and Mini-Institutes.

During the early phase of implementation, a week-long Summer Institute

was held that included all committee and task force members. The purposes of the Summer Institute included familiarizing all committee members with the new curriculum and giving committee members the opportunity to get to know each other and to make decisions about how their committees would function. The Summer Institute became a model for subsequent professional development initiatives designed to educate faculty and staff beyond the committees about the new curriculum. Cross-Divisional Mini-Institutes were held the following academic year to help individuals from all areas of the university understand and better appreciate the role that each University division (e.g., Academic Affairs, Enrollment Management, and Student Affairs) has in the General Education Program. The agendas for these institutes were modeled after the Summer Institute with “experts” in the various areas of the curriculum giving presentations on those areas (e.g., Effective Communication, Quantitative Reasoning, Perspectives on a Diverse World, Knowledge of the Disciplines, and Learning Beyond the Classroom), followed by cross-divisional conversations.

Workshops. Vetting Workshops were held to assist faculty members with re-thinking their current courses and with creating new courses for the program. These workshops gave faculty opportunities to review and discuss the vetting process, share ideas for and receive feedback on course proposals, and develop ideas about how to meet the new General Education outcomes. Similar workshops were held for Writing Intensive courses and for Learning Beyond the Classroom courses and experiences. Advising Workshops provided a foundation for clearly and consistently presenting the General Education Program to students. These workshops, which were targeted at both faculty and staff, focused on the requirements of the new curriculum,

as well as its substance and value. One goal of the reform process was to achieve greater transparency and intentionality with the new program and to move away from the attitude that General Education was just something to get out of the way. Advising would be key in this. Finally, “Teaching Gen Ed” Workshops continue to be held for any faculty teaching General Education courses. These half-day to day-long workshops provide opportunities for faculty to reflect on the overall value of General Education, to plan instructional components for teaching their General Education course(s), and to reflect on General Education as a coherent, intentional, integrated program. These workshops use planning matrices to help faculty develop and connect their instructional approaches to the new outcomes.

Writing Across the Curriculum

Institutes. Week-long Writing Intensive Institutes are offered every spring by Eastern Michigan’s Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC) program. Faculty apply to participate in these institutes based on their interest in teaching the required writing-intensive courses in the majors or in infusing writing into their General Education courses. During the Institute, they develop assignments and instructional strategies to meet their writing-intensive and other course outcomes. They also develop strategies and plans for assessing their students’ writing and their courses. An Advanced Institute, for faculty members who have previously attended a WI Institute, focuses on the identification and scholarly investigation of issues faculty encounter in teaching writing-intensive courses. Particular emphasis is placed in both of these Institutes on developing meaningful and contextualized assignments and assessment strategies.

Retreats. Annually, General Education Retreats are held that focus on issues and priorities for that year. Retreat 2006 was held to brainstorm

From the 2008 Ashville AGLS Conference Reforming, Implementing, continued

innovative ways to launch the new program and to convey its value to both internal and external constituents. Retreat 2007(A) brought together stakeholders to review best practices for assessment and to begin developing effective assessment strategies. Retreat 2007(B), held later in the year, oriented new committee members and revisited the roles of all committees and task forces in implementing, launching, and sustaining the program. Retreat 2008, held last summer, was focused on developing specific strategies for “Realizing the Potential” of the General Education Program. While the work of launching the program is behind us, we recognize that the real work of achieving its aims, realizing its potential, and sustaining it is just beginning.

As a result of these initiatives,

faculty and staff familiarity with and commitment to the new program have increased. In fact, one of the more noteworthy and exciting aspects of these processes has been watching interest and investment in the program grow as increasing numbers of faculty and staff become advocates and promoters. In short, the process of educating faculty and staff about the program has been productive and very rewarding. Changing a university culture and sustaining a curricular change of this magnitude requires a deliberate and carefully thought out process that includes ongoing professional development for the entire campus community.

NOTE: Materials (e.g., agendas, emails, memorandums, readings, etc.) featured in this article can be

accessed by visiting Eastern Michigan University’s electronic course reserves. From EMU’s home page (www.emich.edu), click on any of the links provided to access the Halle Library. Click on Course Reserves, then click on Electronic Reserves & Reserves Pages. Locate General Education in the Course Reserves Pages by Department box, scroll down to GENEDAGLS, and, when prompted, use the password “aglse-mu.” Email Chris Foreman at chris.foreman@emich.edu if you have any difficulty accessing the materials.

**Chris Foreman, Ph.D., Director,
General Education Program,
Eastern Michigan University
Ann Blakeslee, Ph.D., Director,
Writing Across the Curriculum,
Eastern Michigan University**

From the 2008 Ashville AGLS Conference Measuring What Matters: Ways to Assess the Humanities

Assessment is a permanent feature of the academic landscape. However, tension sometimes arises because of the disparity between what faculty members value and what is measurable. This is particularly true in the Humanities where faculty want their students to appreciate beauty, to love knowledge for its own sake, and to foster understanding of one’s self and others. Rather than providing a skill, where one can demonstrate how to do something, Humanities often provide a new way to be in the world—one in which a person’s heart, mind, spirit, and imagination are more engaged, perhaps even more wise. To address this goal, Humanities faculty at community colleges are experimenting with assessment that is meaningful for faculty, administrators, and students.

However, this is not without its challenges. Because community college students usually focus on their general education requirements, faculty can’t measure students’ growth in their majors over time. So, the temp-

tation is to measure surface knowledge through multiple-choice tests rather than deep learning where students make interdisciplinary and intellectual connections. In Humanities disciplines especially, faculty are interested in gauging not only knowledge and skills, but also attributes that develop over longer periods and that are less tangible. English faculty want to develop students’ analytical and interpretive powers and enlarge their perspectives on the world. One way to do this is to include surveys, along with more standard measures such as portfolios, which ask about how the study of literature has affected some of their behaviors, such as reading books for pleasure, attending literary readings, understanding people from situations or cultures other than their own as a result of their reading, etc. History has a number of similarities with literature in the ways students view the two disciplines and the challenges instructors face. Students sometimes view history as a clanking

old file cabinet stuffed with facts, names, and dates. History faculty strive to help their students understand that history is made up of narratives constructed for particular purposes and audiences to interpret events and also to understand the impact of the past on the present. One desirable model of assessment is the use of portfolios, long a standard in the arts and in composition. To adapt portfolios to community college work, short pieces written throughout the semester can be gathered; at the end of the term, students can choose several pieces which they feel best represent their mastery of various skills such as analysis of history events using factual data, an ability to interpret historical narratives, an ability to support the analysis with evidence, etc. They can be given some questions to guide a metacommentary in which they discuss the extent to which studying history has influenced the way they analyze, seek, and see multiple interpretations of contemporary events.

From the 2008 Ashville AGLS Conference Measuring What Matters continued

As in other Humanities disciplines, Philosophy is concerned with the development of analytic, interpretative, and critical abilities, the examination of different belief and value systems, and the knowledge of major thinkers and movements. Philosophers also hope that students will carry over these habits of mind into their lives so that it will enhance their ability to think more deeply, logically, and ethically about complex issues. They want students to be able to question common knowledge and assumptions, to make reasonable criticisms, and to formulate alternative solutions to problems so that

they can be educated citizens in a democratic society. Toward this end, philosophers are also concerned with students' ability to fairly explore perspectives and values in other disciplines as well.

As a first step, a portfolio can be adapted to incorporate this kind of assessment. Students can submit one piece of writing from their Philosophy course and one from another course. They can also be given some guiding questions to provide metacommentary about what they have learned in Philosophy and its impact on their thinking in other courses, for instance, regarding ethi-

cal issues in another discipline. In all of these Humanities areas, such approaches, adapted to community colleges, can provide "sustainable assessment," in which learning contributes to the development of knowledge, skills, and attitudes towards life beyond college to build a more thoughtful and humane future.

Sheryl A. Mylan, Ph.D.
Associate Dean of Communications
College of DuPage
Glen Ellyn, IL 60137
mylans@cod.edu

AGLS Executive Council

If you have any issues, concerns or questions you would like taken up by the Executive Council, please contact us. We would like to hear from you.

Oct. 2008 - Oct. 2010 President

Stephen Bowen, Dean, Oxford College of Emory Univ., Oxford, GA 30054
770-784-8300 Fax 507-784-8440
stephen.bowen@emory.edu

Past President/Oct. 2004 - Oct. 2006 President

Michael Gress, Coor. of Gen. Ed., Prof. of Philosophy and English, Vincennes Univ., 1002 N. First St., Vincennes, IN 47591
812-888-5441 Fax 812-888-5531
mgress@vinu.edu

vice President / Oct. 2008 - Oct. 2010 President Elect

Larry Kaptain, Dean and Prof. of Music, Shenandoah Conservatory 1460 University Ave., Winchester, VA 22601-5195
540-665-4600 lkaptain@su.edu

Secretary

Susan Feiner, Dir. Women's Studies Univ. of Southern Maine P.O. Box 9300, Portland, ME 04104-9300
207-780-4966 Fax 207-780-5532
sffein@usm.maine.edu

Treasurer

Peter Watkins, St. Joseph's College P.O. Box 896, Rensselaer, IN 47978-0896
219-866-6350 Fax 219-866-6300
peterw@saintjoe.edu

Editor of AGLS News

Marianne Hopper, Dean, University

Programs, St. Edward's Univ., Box 801, 3001 S. Congress Ave., Austin, TX 78704-6489
512-448-8551 Fax 512-637-1999
marianh@stedwards.edu

2009 Conference Planner

Donna Dare, Vice Chancellor St Louis Community College 300 S Broadway St Louis, MO 63102
314-539-5364 ddare@sticc.edu

David Starrett, Dean, Univ. Studies and Academic Info. Services, Southeast Missouri State Univ., MS 4650, One University Plaza, Cape Girardeau, MO 63701
573-561-2298 dstarrett@semo.edu

Executive Director

Paul Ranieri, English Dept., Ball State Univ., RB 2109, Muncie, IN 47306-0460
765-285-8406 Fax 765-285-3765
or 765-285-2384
pranieri@bsu.edu

Secretary to the Executive Director

Rebecca Amato, Univ. Core Curriculum, NQ 323, Ball State Univ., Muncie, IN 47306
765-285-2385 Fax 765-285-2384
bamato@bsu.edu

Executive Council Members Oct. 2006 - Oct. 2009

Lonnie Schaffer, Assoc. VP for College Transfer Education Tidewater Community College

121 College Place, Norfolk, VA 23510
757-822-1065 Fax 757-822-1060
tcschal@tcc.edu

Dr. Karyn Z. Sproles, Dir. of Faculty Development & Prof. of English, Library 2026, Univ. of Southern Indiana, 8600 University Blvd., Evansville, IN 47712-3596
812-461-5476 kzsproles@usi.edu

Sukhwant Jhaj, Univ. Studies – Academic Affairs, Portland State Univ., Portland, OR 97207.
503-725-8996 jhaj@pdx.edu

Executive Council Members Oct. 2007 - Oct. 2010

Alyson Colwell-Waber, Prof. of Dance, Meredith College, 3800 Hillsborough St., Raleigh, NC 27607-5298
919-760-8388 Fax 919-760-2341
colwella@meredith.edu

Marge Jackman, Assoc. Dir., Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education, One Dupont Circle, NW, Suite 530, Washington, DC 20036
202-887-6791 x253 Fax 202-887-8476 mjackman@aacn.nche.edu

Emily Johnson, Chair of Psychology, 335A Graff Main Hall, Univ. of Wisconsin - LaCrosse, 1725 State St., LaCrosse, WI 54601
608-785-6888
johnson.emil@uwlax.edu

Executive Council Members Oct. 2008 - Oct. 2011

Matt Smith
Univ. of Saint Francis, 2701 Spring St., Ft. Wayne, IN 46808
260-399-7700
msmith@st.edu

David DiMattio, Dean, Clare College Core Curriculum, St. Bonaventure Univ., Box 35 St. Bonaventure, NY 14778
716-375-2221 ddimatti@sbu.edu

Pan Papacosta, Science/Mathematics Dept., Columbia College Chicago, 600 S. Michigan Ave., Chicago, IL 60605
312-369-7443
ppapacosta@colum.edu

Representative of Council for Administration of General and Liberal Studies

Ed Katz, Univ. of North Carolina - Asheville, CPO #1411, One University Heights, Asheville, NC 28804
828-251-6490 Fax 828-232-5102
ekatz@unca.edu

Representative of Historic Black Colleges and Universities

Barbara Frankle, Dean of Faculty Academic Affairs, Lemoyne-Owen College, 807 Walker Avenue Memphis, TN 38126
901-435-1200 Fax 901-435-1223
barbara_frankle@loc.edu



AGLS NEWS

c/o Marianne Hopper, Ph.D.
(marianh@stedwards.edu)
Dean, University Programs
St. Edward's University, Box 801
3001 S. Congress Ave.
Austin, TX 78704-6489

Non-Profit Org.
U.S. Postage
PAID
Austin, TX
Permit #1315

WWW.AGLS.ORG

Is your membership in AGLS due for renewal? Look at your mailing label on this newsletter. The date following your name is the year your membership expires. Use the membership renewal form included here. If you think our records are wrong, or if you have questions about your membership, contact the Executive Director.

AGLS Membership

New Membership Renewal

Name _____

Department or Program _____

University/College Address _____

City, State & Zip Code _____

Phone _____ E-mail _____

Membership Fees

Faculty/Administration: One Year \$40 Two Years \$70 Three Years \$100
 Student \$10 Adjuncts \$25 Institution \$500

**Send with your check made payable to AGLS and mail to: Paul Ranieri, AGLS Executive Director,
English Dept, Ball State University, RB 2109, Muncie, IN 47306-0460**

Institutional Membership Benefits

- AGLS has designed this enhanced institutional membership package both to promote an institution's general/liberal studies program and to allow institutions to support individual members at their institutions. Benefits include the following:
- Listing of the member institution in AGLS newsletter, programs, website, and other appropriate publications.
 - Hot linking the AGLS website with the program description of the member institution
 - Three individual memberships to AGLS, designated by the member institution. Each membership includes a subscription to the *Journal of General Education* and *AGLS News*, as well as access to the AGLS listserv.
 - Those same three designated institutional members receive a 20% discount on fall conference registration fees.
 - An additional copy of the *Journal of General Education* and three additional copies of *AGLS News*.