

Discovery Committee Minutes, November 13, 2013

Present: Barb White, Amy Cunningham, Kathie Forbes, Todd DeMitchell, William McKernan, Barbaros Celikkol, Stephanie Cheney

Absent: PT Vasudevan, Dan Beller-McKenna, Bill Ross, Steve Pugh, Sean Moore, Wayne Fagerberg, Sandhya Shetty, Gretchen Bean, Jing Wang

Next meeting: Wednesday, December 11, 2013

No votes could be taken due to having no quorum. Approval of the Minutes of the October 30, 2013, meeting will be voted on at next DC meeting.

The committee took the following action:

There were no courses for review.

The Committee discussed the following:

Due to such low attendance Barb asked the committee if they still wished to hold the meeting. The committee chose to continue with discussion portion of the meeting.

University Dialogue -

Amy shared history regarding the University Dialogue, explaining that prior to 2011 there was a separate Dialogue committee that discussed topic ideas for the next 2 academic years. The DC would then discuss the potential topics and make a final decision during one meeting in the fall. Amy and Barb worked together on language to officially make this part of the DC's role (Amy read the language) however the DC never voted on it. Barb's goal is to reaffirm the charge with the Senate because it is unclear that it lies within the Discovery Program and was never voted in. Question was asked if it's already residing with the DC is a motion to bring it forth to the Senate necessary? The need to tighten up the administrative piece and streamline the timeline of the process was discussed. In the past it was difficult to pull a committee together and therefore, faculty wasn't given enough time to prepare. Discovery attempted to incorporate faculty essays however, that piece was eliminated due to budget cuts and stipends were no longer available. Discovery's original design was that the Dialogue would be a unifying theme involving primarily first year students as one aspect of their "first year experience". It was noted that the "curriculum integration" piece is the most challenging part. In the past some faculty has built the topic into their curriculum, however it appears that many newer faculty members are unaware of what the Dialogue is. Some possible general topics were discussed. Amy also shared some of what was discussed at the most recent Orientation committee meeting where there was mention of a possible 6 week first year class. Amy wondered if Discovery might be able to somehow relate this to a Dialogue topic. The possibility of sending out a Qualtrics survey asking for feedback on potential topics and events was also mentioned. There were suggestions regarding how to open up the events to more people, how to make them more attractive to the student population and use a broader more cross-discipline approach. Comments and suggestions were made with regard to asking for faculty input and ways to go about doing that. After much discussion the DC decided no motion to bring it forth to the Senate was necessary at this time. It was then clarified that Discovery owns the Dialogue, all aspects of it should stay in-house and we will reach out for assistance when needed. A name change was also accepted and the University Dialogue will now be referred to as the Discovery Dialogue. The DC will continue discussion on this process and also explore topics in the next meeting on December 11th.

Further discussion of SI attribute -

DC discussed the draft proposal for the SI attribute. There was mention of concern regarding this potentially being a burden to students if it becomes an additional requirement. Barb reiterated the fact that this attribute is present in many of the already existing Discovery courses. Questions were asked regarding what it is we are trying to accomplish with these competencies. This topic will be discussed further at the next DC meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 1:30 pm.

Submitted by Alix Campbell