

Discovery Committee Minutes, November 17, 2010

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

Next meeting: Wednesday, December 1, 2010

The committee took the following action:

Motion: David Richman moved, David Hiley seconded, to approve the minutes of the meeting of November 3, 2010. **Vote:** 7 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain. Motion passed.

Motion: David Richman moved, David Hiley seconded, for student voting pilot project – to allow the student rep to the Discovery Committee to vote as of the passage of this motion, November 17, 2010 - 6 yes, 0 no, 1 abstain.

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

COLSA

ANSC 510 – *Integration of Culture and Agriculture in Ireland: Past, Present, and Future* – WC, WI

CEPS

MATH 445 – *Mathematics and Applications with MATLAB* – ETS

HHS

RMP 444 – *Building a Culture of Peace* – SS - **Motion:** David Richman moved, Christina Caiazza seconded, to table review of this course pending additional information. **Vote:** 8 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain. Motion passed.

Community College Transfer course from NHTI

SC 110 - *Alternative Energy Fundamentals* – ETS – **Motion:** David Hiley moved, Stephen Pugh seconded, to table review of this course pending additional information. **Vote:** 8 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain. Motion passed.

The Committee discussed the following:

--Student rep to Discovery Committee voting: Discussion of how the idea of having a student representative to the Discovery Committee came to be. The Student Senate came to DC through Lisa MacFarlane and Barb White. Pre-requisites for student membership on the committee include continuity, confidentiality, and reliability in attendance at meetings. This is an opportunity to foster a developing maturity, leadership, etc., We, the DC, should take the opportunity to do this whenever and wherever we can. Students should not be the “outliers” where their own experience and education are concerned. Giving the student representative voting privileges here may in turn give them the incentive to be committed to the program. The University has students on search committees for Deans, and on other high level search committees with voting privileges. Barb will carry the message back to agenda committee.

--Honors Director voting privileges: Concern that there is the potential for the influence of the VPAA office on the person in the position because of the direct reporting of the director to the VPAA. On the Gen Ed Committee there was not someone from Honors and it was remarked then that there should be. It makes sense for this person to be a voting member. There is not concern that COLA will be over-represented if the Honors Director votes. When the Senate made the motion to create this iteration of the DC, the idea behind it was that there would be a committee that would have elected representation from every unit, every college, plus UNHM, plus the Library. In an ex-officio roles would be, the Faculty Director of the Discovery Program,

Director of Honors, Registrar, and a senior member of AA. The only members who would have votes would be those who were elected by faculty.

A slightly different recollection of the DC structure was recalled in that places where the committee did not explicitly reference the voting privileges, that decision was left to the DC to determine. Just as every college oversees curriculum, Honors oversees curriculum university-wide.

If those who vote must be elected, then perhaps the solution is for the UHC to elect someone from Honors to the committee, rather than appoint the ex-officio director.

As the DC does its work, we recommend that regardless of how it came about, we think it makes good sense for the Honors Director to vote. Many courses that come through Discovery will also be vetted for honors and it is good for honors to have their eyes on them at the time of review.

--RFP discussion: For the committee to think about for the next meeting: The VPAA can be seeding and sending faculty to talk with DC people re the DC related proposals – DC is interested in VPAA moving forward INQ pedagogy and Capstone proposals in particular. DC would get “preview” of proposals in order to provide feedback and advisory comments/guidance. This should be publicized so all are aware that they have the opportunity to have DC give feedback. Consult with appropriate experts.

- 1) Representatives from Discovery Committee to review panel. Bill Ross is currently on the panel. Who else would like to be?
- 2) Is the DC interested in/willing to provide feedback on proposals that relate to Discovery?
- 3) Any areas we can a priori designate as ones in which we are highly interested?
- 4) Other thoughts?

Adjourned at 1:40pm.