# Faculty Governance and Digital Intensive

## Background

As the revision to the general education curriculum has proceeded, a working group has advised and developed the new digital intensive requirement. In Summer 2019, this group developed learning outcomes, and in Fall 2019 and Spring 2020, this group received proposals and made recommendations for DI courses to the General Education committee.

During this period, the group initially consisted of Zach Whalen (CAS, ELC), Janine Davis (COE), and Angie Kemp (Library), with support and guidance from Debra Schleef. When this group hosted workshops and began reviewing proposals in Fal 2019, the working group expanded to include Jerry Slezak, Cartland Berge and Shannon Hauser from Digital Learning Support.

## Organizational Options

UFC is currently considering a proposal to streamline various pieces of faculty governance including the faculty advisory committees that recommend courses for various designations like Writing Intensive and Speaking Intensive. One option under consideration is to combine some or all of these into a larger committee that will handle all of the work previously covered by those other committees.

The DI working group has discussed this, and generally speaking we have reasons to support both options: either to merge with the larger committee or to charge a new faculty advisory committee to report to the UFC.

The main advantage of a super committee will be in streamlining the approval process and reducing redundancy in committee work. This argument is especially compelling for COE and COB whose faculty are under more pressure to serve on university committees.

The main advantage of a standalone committee is that the review work of approving DI courses, especially at this early stage in the life of this requirement, requires some expertise in related areas, which may be harder to coordinate within a larger committee.

Whether joining a super committee or proceeding as a standalone, the current DI group strongly feels that ex officio representation from the library and Digital Learning Support will be essential. This may be easier to coordinate with a standalone committee, but library and DLS representation in a super committee would also have advantages since those positions don't currently have representation on most other faculty advisory committees.

## Proposed Handbook Section

The following handbook language is not necessarily an endorsement of this option by the DI working group, but since if Digital Intensive is going to be a committee it will need to be defined in the relevant section of the faculty handbook, we offer this definition as a starting point.

---

**2.8.12?   Digital Intensive Committee**   The committee consists of three faculty members appointed as described in section 2.7.2. The committee also includes the following non-voting *ex officio* members or their designees: the University Librarian, and the Director of Digital Learning Support. The committee's duties are to:

.1 Study and recommend to the University Faculty Council procedures and criteria for approval, deletion, and alteration of course offerings in the digital intensive Across-the-Curriculum requirement;

.2 Review and approve or reject proposals from the various departments for courses to be designated digital intensive;

.3 Review at its discretion the frequency of offering and general relevance of courses so designated and make recommendations for changes as appropriate;

.4 Make information available regarding the procedures and deadlines for proposing courses to the general education committee;

.5 Review and coordinate support for digital coursework and pedagogy with the relevant centers and support units; and

.6 Perform other duties consistent with its charge as assigned by the University Faculty Council.