

Discovery Committee Minutes, August 24, 2010

Present: Barb White, Marco Dorfsman, Heather Barber, Kathie Forbes, Wayne Fagerberg, Bill Ross, Lisa MacFarlane, Michele Holt-Shannon, Art Greenberg, Monica Chiu, David Richman, Stephen Pugh (by phone)
(Absent: David Hiley)

Next meeting: Wednesday, September 8, 2010

Opening remarks: Barb White welcomed everyone back; introductions of each member were made. It was noted that WSBE has not yet sent forward a representative to the Discovery Committee for AY 2010-11.

The committee took the following action:

Members of the DC agreed to meet every other week beginning Wed., Sept. 8th, 12:15-1:30pm. Lisa MacFarlane asked the group to please keep the time free should the need arise for a weekly meeting. Marco Dorfsman has a teaching conflict during the Wed meeting time and will go back to the Senate regarding a possible replacement.

The following courses were confirmed for Discovery in the category/attribute listed:

HHS

KIN 444C, Amped Up – WI (6 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain)

The Committee discussed the following:

The DC viewed the **Discovery Program video**. Comment was made regarding the “whiteness” of the video. The question was asked whether there was feedback on the video from the parents or students at First Year Student Orientation. Michele will follow up with Judy Spiller.

FY Orientation: The DC discussed orientation and the possibility of Discovery faculty having a role at orientation sessions. Presence during the individual one on one with students is where this needs to happen. Since orientation is moving to one day format, it will become more of a “fast moving train.”

University Dialogue: Last year the health dialogue attracted approx 1000 students attending a UD event. A faculty survey about the UD was sent out in Feb, and got little to no response. It was sent again in May and about 47 faculty responded. Comments were around having the topic, packet, and events organized and in faculty’s hands sooner.

This year’s topic is *TMI: Decision Making in the Age of Information Overload*.

Discovery Student Fellows are a new initiative this year. David Hiley is working with them. They will start the year off getting grounded in theory of dialogue, then will move to student directed dialogue events, with more interactive discussion, not just Q&A sessions.

The launch of the UD will be at Bill Ross’ event on Sept29 – *Digital Native, Immigrant or Exile?*

We will also have a table at University Day, Sept 14.

CETL and TA’s: Training started this week on working within the pilot courses in CEPS and COLSA. The faculty are also participating in the training session. For the most part, prep on the pilot courses has gone well with one hiccup.

The DC discussed the **assessment rubric** developed by CETL. Selected faculty who are teaching INQ courses have been asked to volunteer to be a part of this first assessment to see how it goes.

Samples of work would be requested from all participating INQ courses: about 30% of students' work in order to see if there is change over time (by the student). (The same student in the sample is assessed 3-4 times over the semester).

We have asked for a random sample of students. Can we ask that the 30% of work is from a range of student rather than self-selected to see if all types of students are engaged. One member noted that we should ensure that the sample is also stratified across ability.

In addition to the faculty assessment of INQ features using the rubric as a *trial*, we will collect the same 5 questions for students that have always been a part of the INQ courses. This will be on the
One member noted that this should remain voluntary – there are faculty who have feelings about assessment and may not want to participate. It was pointed out that this is a voluntary pilot to develop valid assessments developed by faculty that we can use for programmatic assessment overall. Without collecting information from faculty, we would not have anything on which to base program review, as required by the senate motions. In order to figure out how best to do this, we have to begin with a *pilot* process to evaluate strengths/weaknesses of such assessments. The only required participation is from those faculty who are teaching in the INQ pilots that we are reviewing (the DC) in 1-2 years time. These were understood by the provisionary confirmation by the DC (and noted in the letter to faculty & chair) to be reviewed early regarding INQ pedagogy. The information collected will, along with faculty self-perspectives, inform the committee whether INQ is being delivered as intended.

Suggestion that on the rubric, change the word “will” re the completion of the DP goals, to “should be expected” to.

CETL has asked who is permitted to grade the labs and breakout sessions on the pilot courses – faculty or TA's? Grading should be done by faculty for those assignments related to the INQ features and course assessment.

Update on CS 403: course has been withdrawn from DP consideration. They will develop a new course to submit that is more appropriate for the general education student.

Evaluating Discovery: Throughout the year, the DC will need to discuss and determine how we want to put the pieces in place to evaluate the Discovery Program.
Part of this will be the archiving syllabi project. This will allow review of the fidelity of the course and the stick-to-it-iveness to DP expectations. (Amy will work with department admins on collecting syllabi.)
We will want to know if their entire experience in the DP was rewarding and worthwhile. These are not P&T questions, these are student outcomes questions. How do we want to collect information on the overall program so we can say why we want to stay with this model and that this program working?
The issue of student outcomes is very difficult to measure – whether at the university or the K-12 levels. Student outcomes are important and will become more so to the state of higher ed. We should want to use our own designed pieces, rather than some standardized testing, etc.,
We have a lot of great talent on campus here to make it as best as we *can* make it and make it ours, and can develop it ourselves.

Policies need to put in place regarding meeting Discovery categories in different ways. This has come up with the WC category this past summer. We need to be explicit in WHY petitions for variance are approved, and WHY NOT. Past practices of the gen ed committee did not clearly explain WHY NOT. The exceptions being granted have been rare and should continue to be rare and should be taken seriously. We don't do waivers on transfer credits. The DC could start to develop a draft policy on the WC requirement.

The meeting adjourned at 2:10pm.