

COMMITTEE: Foundations Curriculum and Instructional Effectiveness

DATE: Monday, September 28, 2015

PERSON PRESIDING: George Bailey, Chair of FCIE

REGULAR MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Anna Froula, Purificación Martínez, Jean-Luc Scemama, Sherilyn Steadman, Paul Schwager, Michelle Wallen

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Chuck Boklage, Gerald Prokopowicz, Ying Zhou

OTHERS IN ATTENDANCE: Ron Mitchelson, John Stiller, Bill Downs, Sylvia Brown, Lori Lee

Special meeting to receive and discuss the Foundations Curriculum Work Group report.

The committee was called to order at 12:30.

Provost Mitchelson and Dean Sylvie Brown reviewed the events that led to the formation of the Foundations workgroup and the production of its report. This included reference to a specific recommendation in the ECU Productivity committee's report (PPC report). Dean Brown reviewed the recommendations made in the Chancellor's Foundations Curriculum Workgroup report with the members of the Foundations committee.

There was no discussion of the report's Stage One recommendations. (The report suggests that State One recommendations be addressed this academic year.)

The group discussed the report's recommendations for Stage Two, including:

- Whether the General Education learning outcomes listed in the UNC General Administration's strategic plan were likely to remain in place after a new system president is appointed, and how this might impact deliberations on ECU's General Education student learning outcomes.
- Whether it might be good to have some interdisciplinary courses in ECU's General Education requirements, something not addressed in the Foundations report.
- The relation of new student learning outcomes to the existing cognate requirements.
- The possible need to accelerate discussion of some of the recommendation in the three-year horizon of Stage 2 in light of the five-year SACS review and other considerations.
- The formation of a representative Stage 2 General Education sub-committee.
- The potential decertification of existing Foundations courses and review and approval of new general education courses under a model with new learning outcomes.
- Resource allocation.
- Whether a reconsideration of foreign language requirements should be part of the process.

Dean Bill Downs articulated the need to identify a unique vision for ECU's General Education program prior to creating General Education learning outcomes. He noted that this is how the campus proceeds when initiating the development of a Strategic Plan and referenced how this guided the development of our current Strategic Plan.

The meeting was adjourned at 1:11

NEXT MEETING: October 19, 2015 at 2:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Anna Froula, Secretary.

From: Martinez, Purificacion

Sent: Monday, September 28, 2015 1:33 PM

To: Bailey, George; Foundations Curriculum and Instructional Effectiveness Committee; Brown, Sylvia; Downs, William M; Mitchelson, Ron

Cc: Lee, Lori

Subject: My comments about today's discussion

Dear colleagues,

I apologize, but I had a technological problem during the meeting, I could hear you, but you could not hear me (even though at the beginning you could). Because of that I was not able to participate in discussions.

I would like to share with you some of your thoughts.

I see no problem with the stage 1 implementation. The changes are slight and we could do them within the timeframe allocated.

I hope that, as George suggested, we get ambitious in stage 2. In my opinion, the goals of our current Foundations Program are very outdated and need a lot of revision. We need to adapt them to the 21st century. That means rigor but also innovation. I hope that if a subcommittee or subcommittees are created to provide a new framework, that they are not named by the administration, but selected by the faculty. For example, the humanities faculty can determine who would be their representatives in the humanities subcommittee.

I would prefer not to have a social science subcommittee, humanities subcommittee, etc. But one committee formed by all of them. We need to get away from silos as much as possible, the point of Foundations Programs is to get students out of silos, if we start thinking about our program by going into silos we will not do our job.

I like the idea that students get a "free cognate" in the program, but I would like to expand it to the categories already there. For example, foreign language could be a free cognate. Everybody agreed that it is desirable in foundations, but nobody knows how to fit it in there. This might be a way. I must say that I have done extensive research into foreign language requirements, and in some form or another (for example, as part of fulfilling a cultural diversity or globalization requirement), we are there. As Dean Downs mentioned we are part of the strategic plan, we should be part of how the university understands Foundations. (At some point in this conversation about foreign languages I completely lost you, I think John said something about studying abroad??? I am not 100% sure. Please confirm, because if that is true, I have a lot to add to that conversation.

Another thought, the way we present our foundations curriculum to our students and the public is simply horrible. We need to have a web page in which we do a better job about explaining what we do and why. Also make it attractive and coherent.

Thank you for reading me, since you could not hear me.

Puri

Purificacion Martinez, Ph.D.

Associate Professor of Hispanic Studies

Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures

East Carolina University

Greenville, NC 27858

U.S.A.

Office location: BATE 3308

martinezp@ecu.edu
