

## 2016 Spring Faculty-to-Faculty Conference – April 15, 2016

### NOTES – Afternoon Session: Brainstorming

#### 1. Future Fac2Fac Conferences

- a) Review CLEP and DSST for alignment with GT Pathways
- b) ~~Create signature assignments using rubrics?~~ (not a popular idea)
- c) What do 4-years expect of 2-year students (i.e., who have followed a STAA/DwD)?
  - A good conversation to have. Could inform GT Pathways reviews. Could be good for reviewing STAA/DwDs in future. Within and cross-discipline good conversation too.
  - Discipline specific discussions good.
- d) Prepare for re-review of GT Pathways courses?
  - Great idea for other disciplines to discuss while Written Comm and Math faculty start the process.
  - Even do the peer review during a Fac2Fac.
  - Would be good to see examples of what is accepted vs. what is not.
  - Some revisions may not be clear enough to provide good guidance for reviewers so would be good to get more guidance/clarity on those instances. (e.g., what is a high-impact educational practice and what is immersive learning?) Need to watch jargon. Come to common understanding of what terms mean.
  - As part of final review of revisions look for examples of above terms that need defining.
  - Revise the nomination form and resubmission form with more explanation.

#### 2. Re-Review of GT Pathways Courses

- a) Training on how to revise existing GTP courses based on the new content area criteria and competencies?
- b) Logistics of peer review process?
  - Doing it online by oneself would be difficult for new reviewers because your peers aren't there to help you figure out what things mean.
  - Good to start with Writt Comm and Math.
  - What if reviewing online and need more information from submitting faculty/institution? Sometimes there's a quick question a fellow peer reviewer can answer so if you're doing it in isolation online, you don't have peers available to help you figure out answers to questions (for instance, you're reviewing an anthropology course but you're not an anthropologist but one of the other peer reviewers is).
  - Pro: take all the time you need.

- Con: allows some peer reviewers with pet issues to dominate the forum (Could be solved by having a GEC moderator?).
  - We think most would prefer face-to-face.
  - If we would spend the money for online, why not spend that on mileage reimbursement and maybe a stipend? If funding can be reallocated to in-person, then do in-person. Maybe use the online platform to hybridize and support in-person? But not crazy about ALL online.
- c) Items on syllabi that should be standard? Template?
- How do we address the fear of standardization and perception it could interfere with academic freedom? Where is the room for a pre-dialog on this, wider scale than today's discussion?
  - A standard statement about the course being a GT course could be a reminder to all instructors of all sections that they need to meet the GT requirements. Prevents drift.
  - Having 1 or 2 good examples would help. (Esp. for CCCS – tie in with Common Course Numbering System?)
  - Concerns about standard assignments and weights because of academic freedom.
  - What to reasonably require across instructors/sections?
  - What can be reasonably checked, by chairs or state or ??
  - How can peer reviewers turn down a syllabus for “not enough writing” when “enough writing” isn't defined?
  - Where is the 80% rule spelled out? (that they have to meet at least 80% of approved topical outline). We think it's just CCCS schools.