

Meeting Minutes – Advisory Council on Instructional Excellence (ACIE)

Wed, Feb 5 at 2:00 PM - 3:00 PM

<https://pitt.zoom.us/j/97903916729>

Passcode: ACIE2425

Present: M. Bridges (Chair), B. Falcione, L. Delale O'Connor, L. Fennimore, J. Hart, Heffernan, Z. Horvath, T. Klinbubpa-Neff, J. Martinson, M. Norman, A. Tuttle

Not present: C. Bonneau P. Harper, B. Keown, E. Votruba-Drzal

1. Welcome and Meeting Overview

Mike Bridges called the meeting to order at 2 p.m. and welcomed members. He provided an overview of the agenda, which included the approval of the January 8 minutes, the timeline and review process for the Innovation in Education Awards, a continuation of the committee's previous discussion on intellectual property in the context of the awards, and an opportunity to raise additional items.

2. Approval of January Minutes

Mike noted Joy had posted the minutes in the chat. Zsuzsa submitted her edits, which clarified language to refer specifically to Pitt's Health Sciences Library System. Joy confirmed receipt of the edits; the updated version is available in SharePoint. Laura Fennimore made a motion to approve the minutes, which was seconded by Kayla Heffernan and Marie Norman.

3. Proposal Review Timeline and Rubric

Mike reviewed the proposal review timeline. The submission deadline is February 16. The Teaching Center will conduct pedagogical and technological feasibility reviews. ACIE review will follow, concluding with the March 25 review meeting. Reviewers will receive rubrics and supporting documents in advance.

Pedagogical reviews assess feasibility, support needs, and instructional design. Technological reviews focus on technical viability, infrastructure needs, and required support. Reviewers can access these reviews via InfoReady.

Review rubric criteria include: clear project goals, innovation, instructional design, university impact, sustainability, budget and justification, assessment plans, evidence-informed practices, and overall evaluation. Mike emphasized using the general comments section to provide feedback to applicants, noting the importance of offering constructive peer review.

4. Discussion on Innovation and Reviewer Comments

Zsuzsa noted that innovation is context-specific and encouraged reviewers to consider disciplinary perspectives. Mike and others agreed and emphasized the need for contextual evaluation.

Bonnie asked whether general comments should be written for applicants. Mike proposed adding a dedicated field for applicant-directed feedback, while retaining internal comments for reviewer discussion. The group supported adding framing prompts to guide reviewer feedback.

Zsuzsa suggested predefined feedback phrases (like a dropdown) to streamline reviewer input. Mike agreed to explore this.

Laura raised questions about the rubric and asked whether feasibility reviews impact scores. Mike clarified that they are for context only and are not scored.

She also suggested better guidance on what different rubric scores mean to reduce scoring variability. Mike will work with colleagues to draft definitions.

Marie and Zsuzsa recommended refining the language for evidence-based methods and overall evaluation. Mike agreed and will revise.

5. Intellectual Property Update

Mike reported on his discussion with Alex Ducret of the Innovation Institute. The University retains IP for content developed using more than incidental use of resources or directed support, including Innovation in Education funding. However, faculty can retain full licensing rights to use and publish the content elsewhere.

Zsuzsa recommended clarifying this in the proposal materials to prevent applicant hesitation. The group supported adding more explicit IP language in the FAQ and award letters. Mike will follow up with the Innovation Institute and the Counsel's Office.

6. Next Meeting and Reminders

The proposal review meeting will be held on Tuesday, March 25, from 5 to 8 p.m. In-person attendance is encouraged, but virtual options will be available if needed. Dinner will be provided. Reviewers will be assigned two to four proposals to evaluate.