Minutes

Present: M. Bridges (Chair), L. Delale-O'Connor, S. Dickerson, Y. Ding, B. Falcione, R. Jones, H. Lee, D. Och

Absent: B. Barnhart, C. Bonneau, A. Dakroub, G. Glover, S. Goodkind, C. Perfetti

Welcome and Introductions

Mike Bridges called the meeting to order at 2:05 p.m. and welcomed members.

Approval of Minutes

Bridges asked for a motion to approve the minutes from the ACIE meeting held on February 10, 2023 – distributed beforehand. The motion was offered by Ray Jones, seconded by Dana Och, and approved by the Council. The minutes are posted on the ACIE [website](#).

Innovation in Education Awards

The 2023 Innovation in Education Awards concluded awarding seven proposals. Bridges solicited feedback on the review process. The group decided that an executive summary of all proposals will be helpful for all reviewers. All agreed that the return to an in-person meeting to review and discuss all proposals was a good experience. Other suggestions included: (1) A reviewer will recuse themselves when they have a personal/professional connection to the proposal or when the applicant is in the same department as the reviewer, at the very least. (2) The review becomes partial when a reviewer can provide further clarity on one which puts other proposals at a disadvantage. (3) Revisit partial awards when applicants request for summer support. Bridges said that he will add this to the list of talking points with the upcoming interim provost to clarify the parameters for summer support, provide background information, and if asking tenure versus non-tenure status is an appropriate question. Finally, the group provided positive feedback on *InfoReview* as the platform for accepting and reviewing proposals. All agreed it was easy to use, accessible, and the reminders helped tremendously.

Bridges moved on to get feedback on existing criteria for the awards – is it sufficient to enable proper and adequate review? Lori Delale O'Connor noted that adding a criterion focused on equity and justice as it came up several times during the proposal review meeting. Ray Jones remarked that the criteria helped in establishing variability in rating for which he directed his attention, more than the evaluation. Dana Och suggested to create an independent clause on equity, diversity, and inclusion within criteria #4: *Potential impact on the University's teaching mission*. For example, require applicants to include a teaching statement. Mike responded by proposing to draft potential language for the council to review. Other suggestions included (1) ask chairs or directors to address how the department will support the effort/proposal, (2) draft appropriate language to add a question asking if the proposed effort has been previously submitted or funded, (3) replace overall evaluation with recommendation for consideration: definitely yes, probably yes, probably no, definitely no. This allows pre-screen and eliminate proposals

not worth considering thus making review time more efficient. Finally, Bonnie Falcione suggested – because of reading proposals that were not presented well – to add language to criteria #1 *Clear and sound statement of the goals and rationale* to be able to comment on broad general value, coherence, and quality of writing.

Provost Charge: Master Teaching Certification

The next step for this charge is to draft initial proposal ideas by end of June. Joy Hart will send out an email asking who are interested in joining the subcommittee and set the meetings for June and July. Bridges went through a short slide presentation on the core competencies and mentioned the annual meeting of The Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education (POD) which will be held in November in Pittsburgh. Some comments from the group included: syllabus is controversial, make it operational as they are currently framed abstractly, broad and global and can be applied in clinical setting, designed for accessibility. Bonnie Falcione brought up tracks – clinical, STEM, Humanities, etc. Impetus to train on assessment; under purview of council to make recommendations and recognize tracks. Additionally, clarify scholarship of teaching and learning. All content will be based on evidence-based practice and set guiding principles. Sam Dickerson added that customization to a school or department is impractical. Tracks are better so they can apply the certification to their specific area. Finally, a portfolio element applicable to all tracks to showcase what they have learned.

Next Meeting

The next meeting is on Tuesday, June 6, 2-3 p.m. This is a virtual meeting.

Adjournment

Having no further business to discuss, the meeting was adjourned at 2:56 p.m.