**General Education Advisory Council**

*Friday, October 20th, 2023*

10:00am – 11:30am

MINUTES

Recorded by: Jamie Votraw

Attendance:

Dani Peterson, Steve Chase, Martin McClinton, Rebecca Harris, Randy Moffett, Joyce Rollins, Mary Schultz, Don Ransford, Joel Reinking, Elijah Pritchett, Alex Schimel, Cara Minardi Power, Elizabeth Schott, Jennifer Grove, Jamie Votraw, Shawn Moore, Suzanne Biedenbach, Esmaeel Samaliazed, Ken Belcher

1. Approval of the minutes from the last meeting (September 1st, 2023)
	1. The minutes were approved.
2. Information Items
	1. Exploratory conversation about developing a technical writing course, Dr. Shawn Moore
		1. Dr. Moore explained that ENC 1102 previously had three sections, but recently with the addition of simple syllabus, there is not a way to create distinctions for each emphasis.
		2. The English faculty is moving back to a “regular” ENC 1102, where the general education competencies are *research* and *investigate*. Accordingly, the course description for ENC 1102 was updated to remove those emphases. However, the English faculty will have the academic freedom to continue to use the emphases, if they wish.
* Some schools, such as the SoBT, prefer students to take tech writing if it is an option. So, the English department is developing ENC 2110 – technical writing. Technical writing is supposed to focus on accuracy in technical writing, so that is the current focus for the course development. Dr. Moore presents a question, could students take ENC 2110 instead of ENC 1102?
	+ 1. Dr. Harris explained that ENC 1102 satisfies the second part of the Gordon rule – and some other colleges will accept ENC 2110 in place of ENC 1102. She added that at FSW we only accept ENC 1102 because we only have ENC 1102. As a caveat – she notes that we do not have the capacity to hold 100 sections of ENC 2110, so it will always be a small group of students from specific programs. The state requires ENC 1101, so as long as ENC 1101 is a pre-req for ENC 2110, EC 2110 can be offered in place of ENC 1102.
		2. Dr. Moore wants to discuss how the GEAC feels about this change. Professor Ransford mentioned that the science programs are excited about this course, and he asked for clarification that the English faculty are working to make a broader technical writing course. Dr. Moore confirms this is accurate.
		3. Professor Peterson clarifies – this course isn’t currently offered, but it will be beneficial to students in math and science pathways. Dr. Moore agreed that there is a need in these pathways, and that some academic programs ask the English faculty to teach the type of writing their students need. Unfortunately, this isn’t feasible to cover this in the current English program. Dr. Harris points out that while it would be beneficial for these other programs to reinforce APA lessons throughout their curriculum, this new technical writing course will support them by teaching APA.
		4. Professor Grove asks – can students take all three ENC courses? Dr. Harris and Moore say yes, but note that one would count as an elective. Dr. McClinton adds that there are 6 “floating” general education credits that a third course could fall into.
		5. Professor Moffett notes that it is the intention of general education to provide students with a broad education, so he asks if a technical class push students away from learning literature. Dr. Moore explained that ENC 1102 is an advanced rhetorical approach to composition. So, even when there was a literature emphasis, it was meant to use literature to aid students in learning advanced rhetorical approach. Dr. Harris underscores this is valid.
		6. Professor Ransford asks if students took all three ENC courses, and two satisfied the Gordon rule, would the third could count as a writing intensive course? Dr. McClinton says it could, but currently the catalogue says WI courses have to come from SS or HUM. Dr. Harris adds that this is true, but that rule was intended to be changed last semester. Thus, although the catalogue says that is the requirement, there is nothing in the state statute that says WI courses have to be SS or HUM.
		7. Professor Peterson is going to review past meeting minutes to determine where the committee stood on this matter. Randy said that GEAC didn’t do anything to make this change – the committee was planning to vote, and it seemed like we were going to make the change, but we didn’t follow through with an official vote.
		8. Dr. Harris noted that if we change the WI requirement, there likely won’t be a big shift in enrollment because there hasn’t been much interest from the science discipline in developing WI courses.
		9. Dr. Pritchett commented that if the debate about WI courses was left unsettled, he’s wants to engage in that conversation. One concern he presented is that students are automatically going to be exposed to science and English classes, but humanities classes need a little more institutional protection, and he wants to preserve the institutional support for these classes.
		10. Another committee member spoke in support of Dr. Harris’ effort to get WI classes in the sciences, explaining that students are greatly in need of learning how to communicate scientific information and FSW would be a great place to start. Dr. McClinton agreed enthusiastically. He says it’s also very important to clarify what WI means.
		11. Professor Peterson says we should continue to explore this.
		12. Professor Votraw asked if the technical course serve as a pre-requisite for the capstone course. Dr. Harris says it’s up to Dr. Vivyan, but she imagines it’ll be updated to accommodate. Similarly, a batch memo could be used to update all courses in this similar situation. Dr. McClinton’s recommendation is to generally make ENC 1101 required and either ENC 1102 or ENC 2110. However, if ENC 2110 was required for a program specifically, then there could be future cases where students would only take ENC 2110.
	1. Membership updates (from SoBT and SoPAS)
		1. Professor Peterson introduces new representatives.
		2. In SoBT, Ken Belcher joins GEAC and introduces himself.
		3. In SoPAS, Esmaeel Samaliazed joins GEAC and introduces himself.
1. Action Items
	1. Goals Updates: Professional Development opportunities
		1. CLOs – Should we offer any professional development opportunities to assist faculty in writing CLOs?
		2. Professor Ransford said during convocation day, there was a captive audience, but he asks how could we go about gaining interest in this now? He suggests an alternative approach, like a Canvas course with a group discussion follow-up.
		3. Dr. Schott expressed support for Professor Ransford’s asynchronous idea. She adds that it would be useful to have the CREATIVE competencies listed somewhere that is easily accessible.
		4. Professor Peterson asks the committee if CLOs are covered in DEV 101. Dr. Minardi Power answered that DEV 101 is more about assessments.
2. Reports/Updates from departments or committees
	1. Professor Peterson asks Dr. McClinton and Dr. Harris for an update on SB 266.
		1. Dr. McClinton reviews the bill and explains that a general education review will happen every four years. By Dec 2024, FSW has to report to the state all courses, indicating what each course counts for and identify how many other state universities and colleges that offer the courses. He mentions that FSW also needs to have general education courses approved by the board.
		2. The state general education course list was developed by faculty around the state. Dr. Phil Wiseley represented FSW. The course list aligns well with FSW core courses, so FSW general education courses shouldn’t change too much. Courses that may face issues staying in our gen ed core are ones that aren’t offered at many other institutions.
		3. Here is the general education course list: <https://www.fldoe.org/core/fileparse.php/7744/urlt/101323ACCAgenda-A.pdf>
		4. Dr. Harris suggests that GEAC members review with their departments which of their courses count as general education and how frequently the courses are taught across state institutions. This might prepare departments for upcoming changes by the state.
3. The meeting adjourned at 11:16pm.