

Detailed ECS Notes from 10/13/2023

Report from the Chair

- *On the Faculty Forum on the Evaluation of Teaching:* The faculty fora on the evaluation of teaching were well attended and robust discussions were had. A synthesis of copious notes taken, Zoom recording and chat will be shared with all faculty within the next few weeks.
- *On the Teach-In:* The 11th Annual Teach-in will be held Wednesday 11/8 and Thursday 11/9 in a hybrid format. The purpose is mutual education among students, faculty, and staff. The Teach-In is intended to address topics related to inequality and systems of oppression, as well as social justice and liberation. Faculty are encouraged to submit proposals.
- *On BOT 4.2.10.2:* Each College must decide if the Dean will attend as ex-officio, non-voting member of the College Personnel Committee and the results of the decision shall be reported to the Chair of the University Academic Senate. Currently, UL, PCEC, CHP, BCOIS, KCON, CECI, and CLAS have responded. We are still waiting to hear from SCB.
- *On the Next UAS Meeting of October 27:* The October 27 UAS meeting will be a virtual meeting and will include the following agenda items: Briefing on the COACHE Survey; General Education Committee (GEC) Memo on Modification to GEC Bylaws; and Discussion on Proposal for Reorganization of PICEC.

Report from the Provost

- *On the Faculty Fora:* The Provost appreciated the constructive conversations at the faculty fora.
- *On the November Board of Trustees Meeting:* The Provost is preparing for the November Board of Trustees meeting.
- *On Conference Attendance:* The Provost attended the 5th Annual Climate Change Resolution Summit and the CECI Teaching Equity Conference.

Report from the Student Senate President

- *On Restructuring Processes:* The Student Senate is working on restructuring processes.
- *On the Teach-In:* The Diversity Affairs Committee is spearheading the Student Senate's help with the Teach-In.
- *On Supporting University Committees:* The Student Senate is appointing senators to university committees.

New Business

- *On the General Education Committee (GEC) Memo on Modifications to GEC Bylaws:* The memo proposed adding “b) to provide materials to assist instructors in teaching and assessing the general education knowledge and skills goals” to the bylaws language, making this a standing charge of GEC. GEC has been doing this to help instructors teach the skills goals, and thought it made sense to add it to the standing responsibilities. The motion to support with recommendation to UAS unanimously passed.
- *On the GEC Memo on Development of Assessment Materials:* GEC updated ECS on their development of assessment materials as charged. The motion to accept and thank the committee for its work was unanimously supported.
- *On the GEC Memo on Example Curriculum Assessment Report:* GEC updated ECS on their generation of exemplars. The motion to accept and thank the committee for its work was unanimously supported.
- *On the GEC Memo on Training Materials for GEC Members:* GEC updated ECS on their work on developing training materials for committee members. These materials will be posted on the faculty governance website and the GEC Blackboard site. ECS plans to work with standing committee chairs to ensure that their Blackboard sites are used for the committees as permanent repositories of the committees' work. The motion to accept and thank the committee for its work was unanimously supported.
- *On the Proposal to Modify SG 2.06:* Questions have been asked about centers, especially those that take a large amount of resources to maintain. There is a process for creating centers, but not for reviewing them. This proposal would provide a policy on reviewing centers, which allows us to ensure that resources

are properly allocated. There was a question about non-academic centers in original policy; this meant not a teaching unit. If it relates to teaching/research/engagement of Academic Affairs, these are academic centers. Additional nuance to academic/non-academic. This handbook language needs to be developed collaboratively. One reason SG 2.06 was designated non-academic was to ensure it did not run afoul of the SG bylaws. In SG1.01 we have language about shared responsibility. The motion to record in the minutes that the proposal to modify SG 2.06 was discussed and Charles Pazdernik and Amy McFarland will discuss this with Dr. Smart and thank him for the proposal was supported.

- *On the Discussion on Reorganization of PCEC:* This opportunity was triggered by the announcement of Dean Plotkowski's upcoming retirement and discussions of PCEC's current state and visions for the future. There were several reasons for considering separating PCEC into two colleges. These include the following. Technology week reflected the increasing focus of the Grand Rapids community to want to become a tech hub for the region. Technology is playing an increasing role in everything. In MI the economy is changing faster than in other places as we move from fuel-based to renewal energy, a blue and green economy. Our governor wants our economy to become greener and to build on our water resources. The two colleges would fit within Blue Dot ecosystem that the university is investing in to be the core of the engagement of GVSU with the rest of the community in technology. There is a need to grow our capacity to produce engineers and computer scientists. The two disciplines are at different stages. Engineering is in the phase of the changing face of engineering. Computing is different because it is both a discipline and a platform for everything else. People cannot do their work without some understanding of computing, whereas in some fields people do not need to have knowledge of engineering. The proposal will include a College of Engineering with resources needed to grow and expand in additional subdisciplines and a College of Computing to grow to meet the needs of students who want to major in computing as well as students who need digital literacy and to collaborate with other disciplines. We have compared GVSU to other Michigan universities. We have a lot of capacity for growth. Other Michigan universities have a larger percentage of graduates who are in engineering or computer science. Our computer science portfolio is similar to that of other universities. The engineering portfolio has grown in other universities, and we would like our engineering portfolio to grow. A question was asked regarding programs that exist in other colleges that might be compatible with one of these colleges and whether there will be a rearrangement of other colleges. There is no plan to reorganize other colleges, but other programs will work in collaboration with the two colleges.