Improvement of Learning Committee
Tuesday, May 4th, 2010
4:00 p.m. – 1510 Ullsvik Hall

Members in attendance: Cathy Cornett, Shane Drefcinski, Provost Duane Ford, Beth Frieders, Leonida Ljumanovic, Tom Lo Guidice, Colleen McCabe, Tera Montgomery, Syed Moiz, Mesut Muslu, George Smith, Adam Stanley, Keith Thompson, Joanne Wilson

Other attendees: Keith Becker, Martha Hudon, Cory McCullough, Shane Steward

Since the chair could not come to the meeting, Keith Thompson chaired today’s meeting.

The meeting was called to order at 4:04 p.m.

Muslu volunteered to be the minute-taker for the meeting.

Approval of the agenda: Agenda is approved as distributed.

Approval of the minutes: Adam Stanley moved to approve the minutes from April 20th; seconded by George Smith. Motion passed.

Announcements:
- Provost Ford introduced George Smith and Bill McBeth as the two co-directors of the TEC.
- Keith Thompson indicated that GEN-ED Task Force proposal for new general education requirements are out. Task force is asking comments from the faculty & staff.

New Business:
a) Report on TEC Activities of the past year: Tom Lo Guidice shared a 3-page document summarizing the TEC activities for each month. Activities included writing and other workshops, brown bag discussions, international fair, and universal web design, among other things. He thanked everyone who helped him and the center in the past 20 years. It was noted that this year marks the 20th anniversary of the TEC. Past directors of the TEC include: Ed Neurfer (who started the TEC), David Zierath, Sherri Nicoli, and Tom Lo Guidice.

b) Distinguished Lecture Report: Val Wetzel explained the process of selecting potential list of candidates for next year’s Distinguished Lecture Series. She shared a document showing the names of 16 potential candidates who received highest votes and asked comments from the members. Discussion followed on the issue of whether or not ILC should recommend any changes in the order of the list. Colleen McCabe explained what Bart Starr could be talking about. After some discussion, George Smith moved to give Val Wetzel the authority to start negotiations in the order presented from 1 to 7. The motion died due to the lack of a second.

Joanne Wilson moved, seconded by Tom Lo Guidice, that ILC should give the authority to Val to start negotiating with the top 7 candidates in the following priority order: 1) Leigh
Anne Tuohy, 2) Betty DeGeneres, 3) Sally Ride, 4) Bart Starr, 5) Al Franken, 6) Mitch Albom, and 7) Aron Ralston. Motion passed.

Tom Lo Guidice moved, seconded by Joanne Wilson that in its deliberation with regard to the Distinguished Lecturer selection the ILC consider the academic priorities of UWP and also review the process. Motion passed.

There was a general discussion about the day of the week for the lecture series. There were no recommendations.

c) CIF/SOTL Guidelines: Keith Thompson distributed the modified CIF guidelines that he put together. Adam Stanley was concerned that $3,000 maximum is OK for proposals with single author, but with multiple authors it is not sufficient. After some discussion, Adam Stanley moved to revise the salary restrictions as follows:
- Maximum award for CD proposals by a single applicant is $3,000.
- Maximum award for CD proposals with multiple applicants is $6,000, and
- Maximum summer salary that an applicant can receive is $3,000.

After some discussion motion is adopted.

After some discussion on the “purpose” and “criteria” sections of the document, it is agreed that:
- “single courses”, and “entire program” in the purpose statement needs to be interchanged,
- In the “purpose” section, CD (5) needs to be renumbered as CD (1).
- In the “criteria” section, the phrase “additional credit” needs to be replaced by the phrase “additional consideration”, and
- The 5th bullet under “criteria” section needs to be the first bullet.

Tom Lo Guidice moved, seconded by Adam Stanley, to charge Keith Thompson to make the above changes in the CIF Guidelines including the revisions in the award section. The motion passed.

Keith Thompson asked if ILC should review the guidelines for Teaching Excellence Award Guidelines. Discussion followed. It is decided that it will be on the agenda next academic year.

Next Meeting: The next ILC meeting will be next academic year.

Meeting adjourned at 4:52 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Mesut Muslu
## CURRICULAR IMPROVEMENT FUND – CIF TIMELINE
### 2011-2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>TIME/DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIF Applications available to faculty/staff</td>
<td>December 7, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applications submitted to Deans</td>
<td>February 9, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review by college curriculum committees</td>
<td>February 10 – 26, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deans forward recommendations to OSP</td>
<td>March 12, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OSP forwards to ILC</td>
<td>March 23, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILC review and send recommendations to OSP</td>
<td>April 7, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations forwarded to Vice Chancellor</td>
<td>April 13, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty/Staff notified</td>
<td>May 4, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final reports due</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Curricular Development (performed in summer)</td>
<td>No later than 9/1/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Curricular Development (performed in fall or spring using release time)</td>
<td>No later than 6/1/2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Scholarship of Teaching &amp; Learning</td>
<td>No later than 9/1/2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CURRICULAR IMPROVEMENT FUND – CIF
DEADLINE: FEBRUARY 9, 2011

Purpose
The purpose of the Curricular Improvement Fund – CIF is two fold: 1) Curricular Development – CD – proposals will focus on content development and teaching methods for entire programs or single courses; and 2) the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning – SoTL – proposals will focus on a systematic study of teaching and learning.

CD – proposals may include: 1) developing programs for university curriculum requirements; 2) developing changes in major or minor program requirements; 3) developing courses outside of your normal duties and responsibilities associated with curricular modifications; 4) developing a new course or revamping a course that hasn’t been taught for a number of years; and 5) developing a totally different approach or incorporating a new teaching method(s).

SoTL – proposals involve research and development of new pedagogical techniques and/or models and the scholarship of assessing these new methods. Past scholarly work has involved experiences with other programs such as the Office of Professional and Instructional Development’s (OPID), WI Teaching Fellows, WI Teaching Scholars, and Faculty College. Other projects have involved training provided by the UWP Teaching Excellence Center. Summer work may be devoted to SoTL planning or writing the case studies.

SoTL – proposals may include: 1) researching a project or procedure in a course intended to improve pedagogy; 2) implementing a change in teaching or learning and assessing the results of the change.

Criteria
All proposals related to curriculum reform are welcomed. Proposals will be rated by the clarity of the objectives, the realism of the scope, and the completeness of the plan of work and budget. Additional consideration will be given to projects that satisfy one or more of the following:

- Project affects broad numbers of students such as major program or university level curriculum development including but not limited to development of entry-level and capstone classes; modification of highly enrolled general education courses; program reform; and program development.
- Project promotes writing across the curriculum
- Project exposes students to ethnic and racial diversity
- Project promotes an international perspective; or
- Project is interdisciplinary.

Eligibility
Faculty and instructional academic staff who normally teach one-half time or more for the entire academic year and are returning to the university the following academic year are eligible to apply. Preference will be given to applicants who have not received a CIF grant in the past two years.
Time Period

Payment cannot be made until the final report is submitted. Final reports must be written in Microsoft Word and submitted to the Office of Sponsored Programs via email attachment to osp@uwplatt.edu no later than September 1, 2011 for CD performed in the summer; June 1, 2012 for CD performed in the fall or spring; September 1, 2012 for SoTL. Payment will be made when the final report is received. However, an intermediate payment may be given based on the timeline provided. In order to be paid on the first of the month, the report must be submitted by the 15th of the previous month.

Faculty members who fail to submit a final written report and share their results with university colleagues will be ineligible to receive additional grants in the future including, but not limited to, CIF, SAIF, AAF and sabbaticals.

Restrictions -

1. Maximum total awards are listed below:
   - For CD proposals submitted by a single applicant: $3,000.
   - For CD proposals submitted by multiple applicants: $6,000.
   - For SoTL proposals: $1,000.
2. The maximum allowance for a single individual’s summer salary is $3,000.
3. The maximum allowance for release time during the fall or spring semesters is $4,000 (Note: Requests for release time funds must be accompanied by a letter of support from the chair/director (or chairs/directors) of the affected department (or departments)).
4. The academic department will provide any supplies necessary for the project.
5. Funds may not be used for attendance at conferences, workshops or conventions.
6. Funds may not be used to support graduate study leading toward a terminal degree.
7. All UWP research projects which involve human participants must have approval from the Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects (IRB) prior to the onset of data collection. Research projects involving animal subjects must have approval from the Animal Care and Use Committee (ACUC) prior to the onset of data collection. The approval letter must be included with the final report on your project. Failure to provide this documentation will result in nonpayment of salaries associated with your grant.

AMOUNT AVAILABLE: $22,000 UNIVERSITY WIDE

Award for CD grants may vary from $1,000 - $6,000.
Awards for SoTL grants will be $1,000.
CURRICULAR IMPROVEMENT FUND - CIF
2011 – 2012

The application should include:

1. The project title
2. Statement summarizing the proposed project
3. A description of the proposed project
4. How and when the results of the project will be shared with university colleagues, in
   the form of a workshop, seminar, or similar presentation
5. A timeline for completing the project
6. A plan for evaluating the completed project
7. Budget and budget narrative/justification.
8. Potential for future extra-mural support (identify).

Total CIF request

Support from department/other sources

TOTAL project cost
CURRICULAR DEVELOPMENT/SCHOLARSHIP OF TEACHING & LEARNING
EVALUATION FORM 2011 – 2012

Proposal title ____________________________________________________________ Proposal number ______

Value/worthiness (weight 2) 5  4  3  2  1
Does this grant promote curriculum improvement?
Does this grant propose to solve a current curriculum problem?
Are the needs for this proposal immediate?
Is the purpose of this proposal in line with the goals of the university and college?
Does the applicant demonstrate credibility in topic area?
Does this project have significant possible impact on student learning outcomes?
Does the applicant express the willingness to serve as a mentor to fellow faculty? (SOTL only)
Is the budget complete and justified?

Writing quality 5  4  3  2  1
Are ideas presented in an understandable fashion?
Are projects objectives clear?
Was the proposal written to a “lay” audience?

Methodology (weight 1) 5  4  3  2  1
Is the proposal work clearly explained?
Is the proposals timeline logical and reasonable?
Is the budget complete?

Criteria Preference Items (+ or -)
Project has broad campus impact + -
Project promotes writing across the curriculum + -
Project exposes students to ethnic and racial diversity + -
Project promotes an international perspective + -
Project is interdisciplinary + -

Additional factors
Has the PI received previous CIF/SOTL grants within the last 2 years?
What was the result of these grants?

Overall evaluation FUND 5  4  3  2  1 DO NOT FUND
The final report should include:

1. The project title
2. Statement summarizing the funded project
3. A description of the funded project
4. Potential for future extra-mural support (identify).
5. How and when the results of the project will be shared with university colleagues and the community
6. The following attachments: syllabi or any other applicable pieces of information