IMPROVEMENT OF LEARNING COMMITTEE
Tuesday, April 4, 2006
4:00 pm - 320 Brigham Hall

Chair Tom Lo Guidice called the meeting to order at 4:03 pm. Members present: Ben Collins, Kevin Haertzen, Dick Klawiter, Tom Lo Guidice, Ester Ofulue, and George Smith. Members absent: Karen Allen, Carol Sue Butts, Mu-Ling Chang, Martha Drummond (sab), Osama Jadaan (sab), Stan Lukowski, Louis Nzegwu, Nadar Safari-Shad, and Kris Wright.

1. **Approval of the minutes** - Minutes of the March 28 meeting approved by consensus. Lo Guidice said he would "assume" a quorum unless challenged. The group was silent.

2. **Appointment of a secretary for the day** - Klawiter volunteered.

3. **Action on NSEE motion - see minutes of the last meeting** - Smith noted the minutes of the last meeting (March 28) indicated there was no action taken on his [following] motion because the meeting was adjourned due to the time. The motion:

"The Improvement of Learning Committee members meet with members of the Student Senate to help define the issues identified as concerns in NSEE with first attention to: - 1.) Don't write as much; 2.) Prompt feedback; and 3.) General Education."

Comments were made by Committee members about various NSEE items including the above three items. Points made:

Smith - Maybe these are student perceptions, not real problems. Responses may reflect how the questions were structured.

Collins - How should this Committee proceed?

Smith - Maybe a Focus Group to look for general perceptions (activity for next year).

Lo Guidice - Set aside the other items?

Smith - Address these items first.

Collins - These are important and they may be easier to handle.

Haertzen - Not as concerned about the art one. Everyone has a busy schedule so focus on key items.
Lo Guidice - Disagree, should not set aside any but understand can not do them all at once.

Smith - HLC will not accept "no action."

Ofulue - Answers reflect what students think is important.

Collins - That is value of Focus Group to determine those items to receive "first attention" but include others.

Following the discussion, Smith reminded the Committee his intention was this becomes a fall 2006 activity. Questioned called, motion carried.

4. Action on CIF Proposals (Kevin Haertzen) - The subcommittee [Haertzen, Lo Guidice, and Ofulue] met on April 3rd. The subcommittee was generally impressed with the proposals, recommending 14 for partial funding [budget $12,000] and rejecting four. Haertzen distributed a listing of the 17 proposals including requested funding, funding recommendations, and reasons for the four rejections. Collins moved, Klawiter seconded, to accept the recommendations of the subcommittee. Motion carried (note Smith abstained).

There were some general comments about the proposals:

Smith - There were many vague comments, "Maybe we will present the results…

Lo Guidice - Note the funded proposals only received one-third of the requested amount of money.

Ofulue - Perhaps should fully fund seven or eight rather than partial funding for all (focus on quality).

Smith - Some of the proposals are things that should be done anyway (without funding).

Lo Guidice - Traditionally faculty thought of these proposals as summer employment. Maybe we need to provide “new” directions to the subcommittee how to review proposals or to the applicants on funding expectations. Lo Guidice will add this topic to the next agenda to consider changes for next year. (See attached CIF Proposals and recommendations)

5. Forum on NSEE
   a) DEEP Schools – The NSSE is receiving national attention. Lo Guidice attended a meeting addressed by President of the Carnegie Foundation (.Lee Schulman ). Schulman addressed the President’s Commission on Higher Education, noting there has been discussion in the press that the Federal government may take action similar to No Child Left Behind for the public schools. Schulman believes
it is more likely that that higher education testing will be encouraged rather than required. The Chair of the Commission in a recent NPR radio program (ONPOINT) talked about NSEE and the College Level Assessment (CLA) as examples of desirable higher education assessment tools.

Lo Guidice also referenced the book, Student Success in College (2004,AHE) that discusses 19 HIEs that are doing an exemplary job of education related to NSEE. He believes the lessons from those institutions should be considered as we take action on NSEE on the Platteville Campus.

b) Institutional implications of NSEE - Smith - "not put all our eggs in the NSSE basket."

Ofulue - Good to have someone (area) be in charge of NSEE.

Smith - NSEE came out of Student Affairs. Need to have long-term answers from alum 10& 20 years out.

c) Faculty Development implications of NSEE - Haertzen – FSSE (Faculty version of NSEE) might be good to use to see results.

Lo Guidice - Might be interesting because of our professional studies mission. General Education is viewed differently than major, but faculty may value both the role of majors and general education in a way different from students.

Haertzen - Look at trends over time; General Education viewed as negative now but in the future, when you are 40 you see the world differently.

Smith - Value added. Only 50% graduate from here - follow through, freshmen to senior. Faculty and students may not think about how course should be valued as General Education, only how it satisfies the majors.

6. Next meeting: Tuesday, April 18, 2006, 4:00 pm - 320 Brigham

7. Adjourn - Lo Guidice called for adjournment at 5:18 pm.. It was moved by Ofulue, seconded by Smith. Motion carried.

Respectfully submitted,

Dick Klawiter
Secretary for the Day
Curricular Development Proposals

1. Diagnosis and Assessment of Psychopathology
2. Going from Lecture Mode to Learner-Centered Education.
3. Developing a Project Based Learning Curriculum for Biogeography (GEOG 1340) Laboratory.
4. Development of Employee Training and Development Course.
5. Development of a Course in “Courtroom Testimony”.
8. Theatre Curriculum Revision and Educational Theatre Curriculum Development.
9. Revising, Coordinating, and Updating the Women’s Studies Curriculum at UW-P.
10. Improving The ME4840 Vibration System Design Course.
11. Developing the Modern European History Curriculum at UW-Platteville.
12. “Improving Students” Learning in Financial Management (BSAD 3620/5620) by Developing an Online Tutorial Package Within D2L.
16. Integration of Labview into Electrical Engineering Curriculum.

SOTL Proposal

17. Improving Classroom Performance & Learning.
The subcommittee was impressed with the overall quality of the proposals. We recommend that the ILC rejected 4 of the 17 proposals, and we recommend that the ILC award partial funding to each of the remaining 14 proposals. There is a total of $12,000.00 which can be awarded. Our recommendation for funding is given in the table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal Number</th>
<th>Requested Funding</th>
<th>Funding Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$3000.00</td>
<td>$1000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$2000.00</td>
<td>$700.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$3000.00</td>
<td>$1000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1500.00</td>
<td>$800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$800.00</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$3000.00</td>
<td>$1000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>$3000.00</td>
<td>$1000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$3000.00</td>
<td>Not Recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>$3000.00</td>
<td>$1000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>$3000.00</td>
<td>$1000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>$3000.00</td>
<td>$1000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>$3000.00</td>
<td>$1000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>$3000.00</td>
<td>Not Recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>$3000.00</td>
<td>Not Recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>$3000.00</td>
<td>Not Recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>$3000.00</td>
<td>$1000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>$1000.00</td>
<td>$1000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reason for rejecting proposal requests:

Number 8, “Theatre Curriculum Revision and Educational Theatre Curriculum Development”. We felt that the proposal did not give the subcommittee enough information to base a decision. We recommend that they contact TEC and submit again next year.

Number 13, “Development of Multicultural Education Curriculum”. We felt that the dollars being requested were for practices that should already be in place.

Number 14, “Linking Biology and Geography: Development of a Joint 2007 Winteri, Field Course”. A very good proposal. We felt that our first priority should be to core curriculum and that because this is a winterim offering, we could not vote for funding with limited money.
Number 15, “A Proactive Approach to Assisting Students in Completing Introductory Financial Accounting”. Did not appear to be curriculum development. It appears that we would be paying for teaching.