

Issues in Course Development Processes for the MATUL

The process of getting the MATUL launched is not as simple as the 21 steps document we have developed suggests.

The Objective

Prior to delivery of each course, new adjunct faculty practitioner-reflector experts (often team teaching so as to cover theology, praxis and social analysis) have been trained

1. Know processes of course design, and can generate a 5-7 page course outlines prior to teaching
2. Understand the philosophy behind the MATUL, and where their course fits within the overall progressions
3. Understand of the balance of character/spiritual formation, theology, praxis and social analysis goals across the degree and within their particular course
4. Understand the adult learning processes of mentoring, character and spiritual formation, field internships, story-telling integration, facilitative learning form action to theory vs. didactic download.
5. Skilled in drafting the mentoring and field education elements in their course outlines
6. Understand the difference between MA level outcomes and process and Bachelors level
7. Have developed a template for and begun work on a course manual (This would be finished by the end of the first years delivery)
8. Understand the role of story-telling, and learning from the grassroots play into this.

By the end of the second year of delivery to have course outline and 5 page course manual up to a commission standard.

To accomplish this

1. Program directors and at least two faculty in each program come together from more than 2 schools for 4 days writers workshop to work through the whole process and program philosophy
2. They return and implement a similar process with the rest of their potential faculty.
3. These are reviewed by the program directors of the school, and by one other leader in the Commission prior to teaching
4. These are revised up to Commission standard (Checklist available) before end of first course (see the 21 steps doc for more details).

The humanness of the process

- Faculty will tend to be adjuncts whose expertise is there because they lead NGO's or churches among the poor. They are very busy
- They will probably never have designed a course before, and certainly not at an MA level.
- They cannot take extensive time out for this process, so only half will show up for a writers workshop
- Some will not like the imposition of structure on their ideas of teaching
- Some will be unwilling to do anything except to download their wisdom
- Getting two people to team teach requires many hours of consultation
- Getting them to perfect this process seems unnecessary because nobody else does it like this.

Thus each school's director

- Needs very clear processes at the outset, as they are recruiting faculty
- Will probably have to work one by one with a number of these faculty to get this to happen
- May have to end up writing much of some of these courses for faculty
- Needs to not be overly sensitive if the commission member returns with major proposed changes to course design. See this as a servant input not as top down criticism.

The Commission's role

- It needs to be very clear that the commission is to serve the director who has the responsibility
- That servanthood requires the commission to review the courses against a checklist of critical features and make suggestions as to improvements
- This needs to be seen by faculty as supportive not demanding or domineering
- The best way it seems to do that is for one of the commission to be on site, team teaching with one faculty and working with 2-3 others each year.
- We might need to develop processes in a more detail for all this to occur