

## Discovery Committee Minutes, September 15, 2010

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

**Next meeting: Wednesday, September 22, 2010**

### **The Committee discussed the following:**

Lisa MacFarlane discussed with the committee the Provost's initiative - the title of the initiative is PROMOTING WONDER and INNOVATION in LEARNING.

\$200K is about Discovery only; the other \$200K can include other things. This is for grad and undergrad. Someone from DC should be on the review panel. A panel has been appointed that is representative of all colleges. Nominations from the deans were solicited by John Aber for panel members.

Comment: there needs to be someone from the Arts/Humanities to on the panel.

Breakdown of awards: Big award, smaller award, research academy (individual) - \$400K curriculum; \$400K research; \$200K research academy.

Feedback so far: assessing thoughtfully and systematically how the faculty group would each one contain assessment – the faculty could describe their own means of assessment. Faculty writing proposals should be mindful of student learning outcomes.

### **Questions:**

Can Cont Ed or non-degree programs participate? *The issue isn't whether a "cool" program is an okay thing for the proposal, but rather how that would be incorporated into a department's teaching load.*

If you are serving as a member of the review committee, does that preclude you from applying? *You cannot apply for the award of the review committee you sit on, other than that, it is fine.*

What about non-degree programs – core activities? *If the plan is to look at entrepreneurial programs they need to look at other pots of money. This is not the right "pot" for these.*

What about continuing costs? *The purpose of the curriculum award is for a department to redesign how they offer their courses (in addition to building new courses).*

Can the law school participate? *Yes, but it would have to have curricular impact on the university as a whole.*

What do we do about freeing up the faculty to teach the course? *It takes a little time to work these details out as far as how we would teach a collaborative course across colleges. Ongoing with staffing is not what this is designed for.*

What about initiating doctoral programs? *Yes, but not at the expense of what it is you are already doing.*

### **Comments/Discussion:**

Re money disbursements: the plan is that the money begins in the summer of 2011, then the pilot period is offering the program in 2012. Commitments to this need to be in place in order for the award to be given.

We're not just adding things we are changing the environment and structure in which they are offered. It's worth groups of faculty talking to the deans at the pre-proposal level and along the way, as to what the plans are or would be.

We are encouraging applications across colleges. Any group of faculty that makes sense for - within a department, across departments within a college, or across colleges.

A place where one time funds could be used is in the renovating of space. If there is space out there that a group is interested in using.

Over the years, every time there are wonderful innovative programs, the real constraints are continuing costs which cannot be maintained by these wonderful initiatives. It therefore is less helpful because it does not help with the staffing and maintaining issues.

That rests with the Deans. It is not in the Provost's office to hire staff. The hope is that there will be things that happen in the next 5 years that generate revenue that would allow us to hire staff.

Re-creating how you do things – departments need to look at how they deliver their courses and see where there is room for change and creative thinking.

This goes out on Tuesday, 9/21. Proposed deadlines - Pre-proposal, maybe ½ get through – should include 2-3 pages of support for the proposal (outline, okay from deans, recognize faculty resources needed, work plan/scope, outcome, impact, etc) with a timeline of Jan 20 – Feb 15 – April 15, decisions by May 15. There has to be enough work that it encourages people to go on with the full proposal. It may make sense to respond at the pre-proposal level with a note that says: resubmit with revisions, go ahead with proposal, or denied.

Regarding the Review Committee(s): As much as those who sit on the committee know the DP, could we have a stronger presence? Bill is on it which is great, but let's add someone else. This needs to be a faculty run competition so faculty on the review committee(s).

The Discovery proposals should come through the DC; grad proposals should go to Harry Richards; honors is honors, etc,.

**The meeting adjourned at 1:35pm.**