FDEC Minutes for Wednesday, April 13, 2011

Members Present: Meredith Wallace, Joel Goldfield, Mary Frances Malone, Vishnu Vinekar, Angela Harkins (Chair), William Abbott, Emily Smith, Jessica Davis

Invited guests: Tracy Immerso, Cinthia Gannett, Kathy Nantz, CAE and Roben Torosyan, CAE

Chair Harkins called the meeting to order at 11:02.

Chair Harkins asked for a motion to approve the minutes from March 30 with a thank you to Bill. Angela asked Bill to include a thank you to the subcommittee for all their hard work. Move to approve by Vishnu as amended and seconded by Meredith.

Moving onto IDEA Updates, Angela informed the committee that the student communication goes out this week. She suggested that Bill send his editorial to The Mirror. Bill amended his editorial to include Emily’s suggestion (from e-mails). The communication to students is being prepared by Suzanna Klaf and will be put on the web for students. Students are busy and Angela suggested that the communication be condensed for the students. Angela would like the committee to communicate via e-mail in drafting the final version of the communication. Mary Frances would like the communication to also be sent to Residential Life and RAs so discussion can be started in dorms. Roben suggests incorporating this into FYE.

The motions sent to the Academic Council were approved in the April 4th meeting; however, the wording is still being discussed.

Angela informed the committee that faculty received the FIFs on 4/6 and will have until 5/13 to submit or to change the form. Students will begin receiving emails 4/15 until 5/6. Angela asked that we let students know that they will be receiving the e-mails in our own classes. Bill suggested making hard copies of the form so that students will know what to expect and professors can discuss the form with students, however, it was noted that this counters the idea of going green.

There will be ongoing use of the Yellow Narrative Forms for at least two years. Angela suggested we develop a survey instrument to gauge faculty desire for this form. For the record, some faculty have expressed a strong desire to retain this form in its current format. At the end of two years (end of ’12) the decision to keep them will be made. Tracy suggested we find out faculty desire to have the form online. Kathy asked if we want to start asking this question now or wait for the decision to come up. Angela asked if by going online we will lose student accountability from the last 2 questions (grades/effect/etc). Tracy said we can keep this, but the gender/grade will not be
associated with the comments. Kathy suggested that this should be a pending item for the fall.

Linda Henkel has suggested making the IDEA form optional for established faculty who may teach the same course every semester with little observable variation. Angela does not think this will happen for most courses, with internships being a possible exception. Mary Francis said that as the institution becomes more used to the form, some professors may only want to do this every other year, for example, if they are full professors. Angela will let Henkel know that this is not something we will do in the near future, but may be something that will be considered if different schedules are used in other institutions.

Angela asked the committee to read the information distributed on discipline codes for our May 4th meeting. Angela told us that the university wants to have a code system for groups to generate group reports. Since our departments and programs are not distributed the same as the IDEA codes, the local code will capture more specific information. These codes are for more specific course information, student groups, and core courses. Roben distributed an information sheet on Local Codes from the IDEA center. Angela emphasized that we want to finalize this over the summer so that it is ready for the fall. Bill asked to what extent the forms will be pre-printed. Tracey answered that, for Fall, courses are already in with registrar so the local codes will be separate. Once it is established, the local code will be incorporated on the FIF. Vishnu asked about splitting these into more categories so that more than one code can be used for a course.

Invited guest Cinthia Gannett joined the meeting. Cinthia explained that she has been in regular contact with Howard. Jessica has been the liaison for the FDEC and the involved parties have met once. Howard has given an overview of what she has planned for the event. This is the second of the Humanities Grant talks. Howard has made a lifetime study on this topic. We have tried to invite the entire University to participate on this topic. All of the events that have occurred will culminate in the FDD. Howard will first give a workshop for students. The afternoon workshop focuses on her most recent work, citation practices for students. The idea of this presentation is to provoke useful conversation. Angela asked what the FDEC can do to help. Cinthia asked if the information she distributed is in sync with what we expected. Bill asked if the morning will be only students or if faculty is allowed to attend. Cinthia said that staff will be present and Angela mentioned that this is at the same time as the large meeting of the General Faculty. Cinthia explained that this will be more than just a presentation. Kathy offered to put her in touch with people at the university that are already engaged in this topic. Cinthia asked Howard her to solicit the students for understanding of
plagiarism so that we can get an idea of student perception and if there exists an "expectation conflict" between students and faculty. She would like to see how we might line up for a more common culture. Emily responded that this does look like what we want and the faculty workshop looks great. She mentioned that this is for undergraduate and graduate faculty and maybe should be written for more than just people that teach composition. Using the words "student's writing" may be more appropriate. Bill asked if a math professor would find this interesting. Mary Frances said that building on Emily's point; maybe include a section to the workshop that deals specifically to graduate students and quantitative citation. We need to acknowledge that this can be very different for different audiences. Cinthia explain that what this research deals with is when students are not reading well or not understanding what they read. Roben also suggested using different language that would be more inclusive to all faculty. Cinthia said that she will make some language suggestions to Howard. Angela suggested that this can go directly to the learning goal "Analyzing and critically evaluating ideas, argument, and points of views" and that we can maybe connect it to this IDEA learning objective. Jessica suggested that this still may be a little too restrictive to the type of faculty as not all faculty choose this learning goal. Kathy suggested maybe only choosing the goal above since that is important among faculty. Cinthia emphasized that we want to make sure we are disseminating the information on the workshop effectively. Howard is working primarily with text, and most of us are still really interested in that area. We all want students to be able to put ideas into compositions of their own. Cinthia will take all these ideas back to Howard but doesn’t want stretch her too thin. She would like to have some information of the conversations that have already occurred to send to Howard so that she knows what is going on.

Roben offered to compose a blurb and post the registration link. Cinthia said the schedule is lunch from 12:30 – 1 in the Kelley Presentation Room and the workshop is 1 – 3. Beth Boquet is taking care of ordering lunch. Meredith offered to take care of evaluations and Jessica suggested getting some objectives from Howard. Meredith has a tool she uses and can incorporate anything Howard sends. Cinthia was thanked by the committee and left.

The conversation turned to peer review of teaching. Angela mentioned that the due dates are rapidly approaching. Emily said that the application is very simple and only takes 5 minutes to fill it out. Roben mentioned that there are only two questions on the application. Bill said that the department chair may need to get the department okay. Meredith suggested making the introduction material shorter by taking out the 2nd paragraph. After the second bullet, change “deliver” to “attend”. August is a tough month, can we possibly do September so that it doesn’t conflict with vacations. Roben asked if we can take the language of what peer review is in the second paragraph and move it to the first paragraph. Emily will take the last sentence and put it in the first
paragraph. Joel suggested changing the second bullet from “and” to “and/or.” Kathy stressed that we want to be inclusive and put this out to everyone, but we can only work with so many departments. And we don’t want to hand pick departments. Meredith asked if we can make the date the last week in August. Emily asked if there are any other suggestions in terms of content. Mary Francis asked that from a cost perspective giving $1000/person, how many people in total? And how many departments will this represent? Kathy said that they will be sensitive to this. Angela asked what would be the real hands-on commitment. The frequency is a little bit vague. What are the goals for group work and does it have to be face-to-face? Emily suggested that teams have to figure this out and have support for what they want to do. Bill suggested deans ask chairs what the state of their peer review is and that the Fall is a good deadline for this. Bill said that they will revise according to feedback and will send it out to all faculty. Emily asked if the subject line is good. General consensus is to get rid of “Receive” and start the subject with “Funding opportunity for peer review project”. Everyone unanimously agrees to the application.

Adjourn 12:02

Respectively submitted,

Jessica M. Davis