

Committee Meeting Minutes
Strategic Planning Standing Committee, Faculty Senate

November 21, 2014, 8:00 AM
History Department Seminar Room, TLC 3205

Meeting started at 8:00 AM

Attendance

Chair Nadya Williams (History)

Member Cathi Jenks (Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment)
 Micheal Crafton (Academic Affairs)
 Danilo Baylen (ETF Education)
 Christopher Jett (Math)
 Angela Pashia (Library)
 Betsy Dahms (FLL)
 Heather Vinson (Art)

Guest Elizabeth Kramer (Senate Chair)
 Debra MacComb (English, QEP)
 Denise Overfield (COAH)
 Gail Reid (Mass Communications, substituting for Randahl Morris)

- A. Approval of Nov. 5th meeting minutes
- B. Discussion continued about revising Core Area B in order to comply with SACS and our new QEP on Writing.

Debra MacComb summarized the two meetings with department chairs in Area B that took place on Nov. 17 and 18. Based on the discussion that took place at the meetings, new first Learning Outcome recommended for Area B: “Adapt written and oral communication to specific rhetorical purposes and audiences.” This is a simple modification of one of the two current learning outcomes for the area, which is currently solely on oral communication.

Micheal: It is unclear whether the addition of writing to an existing outcome without otherwise modifying it would require BOR approval, but we should assume that most likely, it is a substantive enough change to warrant it. That said, this outcome would likely get that approval.

Denise: addressed the concern raised in this meeting and earlier meetings with the chairs that the outcome “oral communication” would have to involve an oral presentation. While the old phrasing currently in the catalog specifically requires students to make an oral presentation, the new wording of “oral communication” does not actually require a presentation, so it would be up to professors to define how to assess oral communication in their classes.

Elizabeth: it is odd that the current B2 courses are not required to meet the area B outcomes, at least as they currently are listed in the catalog. Micheal clarified that the current B2 classes actually do meet one of the area B outcomes – the one on information literacy. Nadya pointed out that this is not actually specified clearly in the catalog right now.

Danilo: as we move forward, the focus in reconfiguring area B must be on the students and what is best for RPG. Micheal responded that adding writing to the first learning outcome to area B while retaining the second learning outcome would be the least disruptive to students and faculty, and thus most conducive to RPG.

The committee unofficially endorsed the following language for the two learning outcomes for Area B, and tasked Debra as the QEP Director to come up with draft catalog language for presentation at the December Senate meeting:

Learning Outcome 1: Adapt written and oral communication to specific rhetorical purposes and audiences.

Learning Outcome 2: Identify, evaluate, and use information, language, or technology appropriate to a specific purpose.

As is currently the case, in the new area B, all courses in B1 must meet both learning outcomes, whereas courses in B2 must meet at least one.

Micheal clarified that all current area B courses will have to be re-evaluated and re-approved, but this could be done in batches, rather than just one by one.

Angela Pashia shared the draft of the learning outcomes and catalog language with the rest of the committee for editing. Committee agreed to conduct an official vote via email over the Thanksgiving Break. Since this proposal must also be approved by UPC, the UPC will have to participate in the electronic vote as well.

Concerns were raised by Heather Vinson and seconded by several committee members over the need for proper faculty education on the new area B.

Debra noted that the new writing-related learning outcome that has to be added to core areas C-E would be more likely to be approved by BOR if it is more akin to the area B LO1. Micheal concurred. Debra will work on a revision, and the proposed new LO's for all core areas affected by the QEP should be ready to go for BOR review in February 2015.

C. Peer and Aspirant Institutions (KPI – Cathi Jenks)

Cathi Jenks presented a report on the new peer and aspirant institutions for UWG, and explained the methodology that went into the selection process (see Senate Minutes from Nov. 14th for a recap of the more detailed Senate presentation and full list of the peers and aspirants).

Committee endorsed the peer and aspirant list.

Meeting adjourned at 9:05am