Improvement of Learning Committee—Minutes
Tuesday, 7 April 2009
4:00pm—1510 Ullsvik Center

Attendance:
Carol Sue Butts        Amy Parsons        David Schuler        Keith Thompson
Kevin Haertzen        Shawon Rahman (guest)    George Smith        Qi Yang
Tom LoGuidice          Matt Roberts          Adam Stanley

Kevin Haertzen chaired the meeting, and David Schuler took minutes.

Minutes:

1. The meeting was called to order at 4:03pm.

2. The minutes from March 3, 2009 were approved.

3. Announcements:

   a. Val Wetzel is gathering information on possible candidates for next year’s distinguished lecture. She will be contacting the ILC subcommittee in the coming weeks, so they can meet and begin narrowing the list of candidates.

   b. Keith Thompson announced that the ESL Award subcommittee should be receiving applications from Nicole Herring soon. He reminded the ILC that there is currently no BILSA representation on the committee, and a representative needed to be found.

   c. Carol Sue Butts announced that UW-Stoudt and Stevens Point have applied to offer doctoral degrees. Only Madison and Milwaukee currently offer doctoral programs. Masters degrees in specialty areas are offered at the other four-year campuses.

   d. Carol Sue Butts updated the committee on current budget meetings. UWP needs to cut 5.5 million dollars from the present budget. As a result of the current economic climate, UW System is looking to reduce majors system-wide and is currently studying the following numbers at each campus:

      Bachelor Degree Programs Offered by Number of UW Institutions
      Junior/Senior Enrollment in Currently Active Programs
      Bachelors Degree Recipients
      Bachelors Degrees by Major (target number is 30 degrees conferred over a 10-year period between 1998-2008)

At UWP, students are no longer being accepted into the Economics and Speech majors.

   e. George Smith is giving a presentation on sabbaticals on April 8, 2009 in the Pioneer Student Center.

   f. Tom LoGuidice announced that the Teaching Advisory Committee would meet in the next two weeks to discuss Teaching Excellence Center programming for 2009-2010.

   g. Kevin Haertzen shared an email from Val Wetzel expressing concern over student behavior and response to the distinguished lecturer’s visit to Platteville HS last week. Carol Sue commended Val for her handling of the situation and said Val will continue to work with the school to rectify the situation for the future.
4. New Business:

a. The CIF-SoTL subcommittee (Adam Stanley, Kevin Haertzen, Amy Parsons) reported its recommendations. Twelve proposals were received including 11 CIF grants and 1 SOTL applications. The twelve were ranked in order of the strength of their proposals, and 7 CIF grants (@$3000 per) and 1 SOTL grant (@ $1000 per) were recommended for funding. They include:

- Fundamental Revision of Courses on the History of England
- Revising and Expanding the Theater Program Curriculum
- Gay and Lesbian Studies
- Integrating International Collaborative Learning Modules across the Curriculum
- Promoting Scholarship for Newer Faculty through SoTL
- Implementation of Community-Based Learning in Quantitative Analysis Course
- A Sourcebook for Math for Educators Courses
- Development of Self-paced Graphics/Visualization Tutorials

The four proposals not funded were all submitted by EMS. A discussion followed regarding difficulty in getting CIF proposals funded. Highlights of the discussion were:

- Faculty don’t communicate the urgency or need of the proposal clearly. What is the project going to do? Maybe the EMS faculty needs further instruction and guidance on this (Kevin).

- Faculty have had problems in the past few years with the editing and quality control of their CIF applications (George).

- Adam Stanley suggested that part of the problem is a failure to adequately define terms in layman’s language.

- Keith Thompson asked for clarification on page limitations.

- Carol Sue Butts suggested offering a workshop presentation on CIF proposal guidelines. Newer faculty often don’t know expectations.

- Feedback is essential to strengthen proposals for next year (Matt). Comments from the subcommittee should be provided with the rejection letter (Qi).

George Smith moved to accept the subcommittee’s recommendations. Qi Yang seconded, and the vote to accept the subcommittee’s recommendations passed.

b. George Smith reported on two proposals that were submitted for the Closing the Achievement Gap System Grant. Carlos Wiley’s MERC proposal—Making Goals Attainable, Practical and Possible—held together nicely, and George shared suggestions to improve it. The Chemistry proposal—Diversifying Undergraduate Student Population in Sciences through a Dual Approach—was not strong. It didn’t follow the guidelines and needed an overhaul—major changes in content and structural editing. George doesn’t recommend the Chemistry proposal move forward as is. Keith suggested making any positive comments possible, providing suggestions for improvement and suggesting Chemistry resubmit the proposal next year. Kevin inquired whether a rewrite was possible for this year. The OPID deadline for proposals is April 17th. George suggested that the proposal abstract be double-spaced and limited to one page.

c. Tom LoGuidice introduced the pilot use of emerging technology—Turning Point clickers—in the classroom and asked for policy endorsement and suggestions and guidance on policy implications. How do we proceed in implementing policy? Who maintains the clickers? How do we increase use? Which Gen Ed courses should be targeted for clicker integration?
Assistant Professor of Computer Science Shawon Rahman gave the committee a demonstration overview on the integration, functionality and usefulness of clickers in the classroom:

**Applying Clickers in the Classroom**

Four UW peer campuses were involved in the pilot project—Eau Claire, Green Bay, Oshkosh and Whitewater.

Technology allows for plug n play capability using radio frequencies
Standard Turning Point clickers cost $28 with the receiver running $99. The newer technology advanced version clickers cost $40.

They supplement and complement lecturing by encouraging and improving active learning.
They are good for testing preconceptions, useful in diagnostic testing, and are anonymous. They allow you to evaluate student comprehension and understanding as you go.

The program set-up software can be downloaded for free and interfaces easily with PowerPoint. It can also be run with D2L and other Microsoft programs.

Tom LoGuidice believes that one of the clicker’s advantages is that its universal design makes it user-centered and user friendly.

Tom stated that procurement and faculty training are major issues for campus-wide use. The TEC purchased 100 clickers to use that can be checked out through Media Services.

Engineering has also purchased some and is incorporating them into its classrooms.

Keith Thompson suggested targeting core courses in English Composition and Math. He also brought up the possibility of students purchasing clickers as freshman and having them as a tool/resource throughout their matriculation at UWP.

Kevin Haertzen wondered whether it would be difficult instituting clickers as university policy given the lack of sufficient high tech classrooms on campus. He also suggested introducing clickers to faculty via committees.

Carol Sue Butts suggested creating a subcommittee of the ILC to explore implementation of clickers into the classroom. Matt Roberts, Keith Thompson and Kevin Haertzen agreed to serve on a subcommittee with Tom LoGuidice and meet before the end of the spring semester. A formal subcommittee will be created in the fall.

5. George Smith shared information on membership proposals to the ILC Committee and suggested they be looked over and discussed at the next meeting.

6. The meeting adjourned at 5:22pm.

7. Next meeting: Tuesday, April 21, 2009
   4:00pm—1510 Ullsvik Center