

**Minnesota State Colleges and Universities
Center for Teaching and Learning
Steering Committee Meeting**

January 24, 2007

Office of the Chancellor, Conference Room 3304 (west side atrium) 3rd Floor,
30 7th St. E., St. Paul

Minutes

PRESENT: Deena Allen, Cheryl Avenel-Navara, Jim Berg (ITV), Nancy Black, Josephine Books, Deb Buerkley, Julia Curtiss, Elizabeth Dunn (ITV for Kathryn Kelley) Zala Fashant, Kathi Hiyane-Brown, Louise Hoxworth, Tim Kroeger, Karen LaPlant (ITV), Raymond Lou, Doug Thompson, Larry Litecky, Lynda Milne, Sharon Oliver, Stewart Ross, Martin Springborg, Cathy Summa, Yvonne Shafer, Stacy Wells, Thomas Wortman

ABSENT WITH NOTICE: Kathryn Kelley, Larry Oveson, Mary Rothchild

MINUTES: Lynne Goldetsky and Lynda Milne (▶ denotes action item)

9:08 Meeting Called to Order Lynda Milne called the meeting to order; members introduced themselves.

Minutes and Review of Agenda

Minutes from the November 16 meeting were reviewed. Nancy Black requested the ▶additional recording of an item of agreement from the September 15 meeting, under the IPESL section on page 2, paragraph 2. Specifically, she reminded us that CTL had agreed that it could and would fill in the reporting template for each IPESL prospectus with the basic data provided in the original prospectus (project name, contacts, abstract, budget, etc.). This can facilitate completion of the interim and final reports for IPESL project managers. Nancy also requested that the text of the legislative statute describing “competitive compensation,” referred to on page 2, paragraph 3, be added to the minutes of this meeting. Cathy Summa requested future meeting minutes reflect more details on discussions. The committee voted to accept the minutes so amended.

The minutes from the September 15 meeting were reviewed. Cathy requested a change ▶on the Summary Narrative bullet to correct “NSF Fastprint” to NSF Fastlane”, and Lynda Milne pointed out that the date on the minutes was incorrect and that a correction be made on the minutes. The committee accepted the minutes as amended.

Agenda was revised as follows: the addition of#5f. CTL subscription Web seminars-February 16 about online assessment.

Member Business

Welcome New CTL Staff

Three new CTL staff members were welcomed:

- **Julia Curtiss**, Faculty Project Specialist; Core Outcomes Study
- **Yvonne Shafer**, Faculty Coordinator for Technical Colleges
- **Martin Springborg**, Faculty Coordinator for Community Colleges

Lynda informed the committee that Stewart Ross', Cheryl Avenel-Navara's, and Sharon Oliver's three year committee terms are concluding this May. Letters have been sent to the union presidents requesting reappointments. Presidents Larry Litecky and Raymond Lou's terms are also ending. Stewart informed the committee he will not seek reappointment to the committee following his five years of participation.

Bylaws

Cathy began a discussion about the clarity and purpose of the Steering Committee and indicated some confusion in regard to the role of the Steering Committee. She suggested it would be helpful for committee members to know the previous work of the committee to better understand the committee framework and to keep faculty well informed. Lynda referred to the Committee Bylaws giving the purpose of the CTL Steering Committee as advisory to the Office of the Chancellor on systemwide faculty development issues. She and Deena Allen explained that while the process of discussing, developing, initiating, and recommending, begins with the Steering Committee the decision-making is done by the Office of the Chancellor.

Cathy and Lynda discussed how a misunderstanding about the role of the Steering Committee and the responsibility of its members became obvious at a recent IFO Meet and Confer meeting. University faculty members discussed a feeling that there is a disconnect between opinions and advice voiced about CTL projects as discussed in the CTL Steering Committee meetings, and discussion at statewide Meet and Confer sessions. Lynda asked the committee how to best bring forth the committee consensus and suggested a formal motion approach. Discussion included: Nancy indicated something missing from time of initial discussion and the implementation of the CTL project. Tim Kroeger commented on communication and the structure of the system as the problems and suggested CTL begin a Web-based status update communication and a committee solution approach to working on issues as a unified minority. Nancy Black stated some issues are for all state system institutions while some are more germane to two-year colleges only and some to four-year colleges only. Josephine Books remarked that the purpose of the committee is to be working and deciding together and when that does not occur she feels disrespected as a two-year college faculty member, as if the college faculty are "second class citizens." Both Nancy Black and Cathy Summa apologized to her and said that was not their intent. Sharon Oliver suggested when the system is as large as this one is, the entire committee will not always agree and to bear in mind:

- first institution benefits; and
- then statewide benefits.

The committee should look broadly at the issues for all campuses and have the individual unions decide how best to deal with the issue on the campus. Nancy Black told the Steering Committee members they need to bring initiative award information back to their campuses early so when the formal announcements are issued faculty

members are not caught off guard. Jim Berg suggested the entire committee should have input on CTL projects and we should not use break-out group caucus time to address the two-year/four-year college differences. Elizabeth Dunn disagreed and emphasized the need to have the caucuses on a routine basis. Raymond Lou suggested frank conversations at the meetings with communication going back to the campuses. Nancy Black pointed out when and how to address new issues such as doctoral education, and how to really support faculty, is crucial for discussion at these meetings. The committee agreed that the need to better apportion time for project discussion was important.

Cathy Summa recommended that, rather than creating a formal decision-making process, the committee continue its longstanding tradition of seeking consensus. She also recommended that the committee make a conscious effort to be clearer about recommendations made at the meeting and to have committee members communicate back to their campuses. ► Tim Kroeger recommended:

- Steering Committee meeting minutes be distributed within one week of the meeting; and
- CTL establish a project-in-development status report for the web. Lynda asked for time to consider how current communications, including the extensive CTL Web sites and Weekly Updates, fulfill this purpose and whether they need augmenting.

► Raymond Lou recommended a planning retreat to discuss

- CTL direction and support of the system strategic plan;
- committee communication;
- feedback to constituents.

The committee agreed to hold a retreat. Dates were discussed and no date was agreed upon. Lynda will contact committee members to determine a date for a retreat and will communicate that date to the committee.

Initiatives & Activities Update

College Faculty Awards for Excellence (CFAE)

A brief explanation of the status report and updated project list was given. Deb Buerkley explained that CTL requests the updated information from the campus and the campus self reports back to CTL to compile the new data. The status reporting is not in an online format. Jim Berg stated that for a campus to be included on the list they had to report online which is stated in the guidelines.

► Cathy requested the CTL staff name and appropriate contact information and/or a Web address be included on handouts, and asked to include in the minutes any uncommitted funds for the awards. Deena Allen responded that if there are any uncommitted funds--and when that information is known--the committee will be promptly informed.

Initiative to Promote Excellence in Student Learning (IPESL)

Deb Buerkley gave a brief summary of changes to the IPESL Status Report. There were a few modifications and subsequent approvals, and a few late prospectus arrivals since the information was provided to the Steering Committee in November.

BOT Award for Teaching Excellence

Deb Buerkley informed the committee that administrators and Office of the Chancellor representatives will be named once all the award committee appointments are made. Three review teams will be established from the committee. Committee members will have input into the committee processes, deadlines, review criteria, etc. Jim Berg, who has participated in previous reviews, was asked to explain the process. He stated the review process is refined as it progresses.

Deena Allen informed the committee that the ASA newsletter announced the BOT Award for April 17, 2007 at Minneapolis Community and Technical College

- 5:00 p.m. reception
 - 6:15 p.m. ceremony
- ASA Awards by Linda Baer
BOT Awards

Invitations will go to all nominees, finalists, campus administrators, CTL Steering Committee, and the Board of Trustees. The hope is to have 300-400 attendees. Discussion centered on the four universities, Bemidji State, MSU, Mankato, Winona State, and MSU Moorhead, whose faculty associations have voted not to participate in the Board of Trustees Award program. Merit pay and the onerous application processes were a few reasons given as to why the colleges are not participating. Lynda addressed some misunderstandings that she had encountered in recent emails about timing and process. For example, the perception that all nominees must prepare and submit a portfolio (and have it reviewed by campus committees): she pointed out that only nominees advanced for the systemwide award are required to prepare and submit a portfolio. In another example, she addressed the point that there is not one award for university, one for community college, and one for technical college faculty. Instead, the Design Task Force had decided not to so allocate the awards, leaving it to the committee to decide on the overall three best finalists. She also reminded committee members that this award had first been suggested in a formal recommendation from the Steering Committee to Sr. Vice Chancellor Baer in early 2004. The award process had not been created by the Office of the Chancellor, but had been adapted from the Chancellor's award program in the State University of New York system by the (4 IFO and 4 MSCF) faculty and 3 students who had served on the Teaching Award Design Task Force in 2004-2005. Lynda suggested it would be helpful for the Executive Committee of the Faculty Association to formally articulate the campus decision in writing to the Senior Vice Chancellor. The question of what to do in the future to improve participation was asked with no suggestions given. Both the IFO and MSCF signed memoranda of understanding. There are no provisional terms for college types.

Lynda and Deena mentioned future plans include a desire by the Board to advance the award recipients for national awards such as the American Association of Community Colleges award.

Core Outcome Study

Lynda revisited how this initiative evolved from a “campus conversations” initiative into a study, collecting data from the campus and compiling a report to share systemwide about how each campus defines and disseminates core outcomes for students. Following the IFO Meet and Confer meeting this Friday (1/26) the letter will go out to campuses requesting the information in four weeks. Concerns regarding the impact on faculty workload and timing were raised, and Lynda said that the letter was addressed to chief academic officers with the expectation that the information requested could be supplied by them or staff members. Ray Lou and Jim Berg said that they expected that the questionnaire would be completed by administrative staff. Louise Hoxworth was asked to give a brief explanation of the inception of the initiative. She explained that the need for better understanding of Core Outcomes came out of the Minnesota Transfer Curriculum and emphasized that any information the study will provide will be useful to the Transfer Curriculum Reviews in process and to others.

► The recommendation to correct “HCL” on all core outcome documents to read “HLC” was made.

► Sharon Oliver suggested the addition to the FAQ: Do you have information readily available or would you like us to help you get the information? Cathy commended the evolution of this initiative.

Grants

Thomas Wortman informed the committee that the grant postcard was mailed to all faculty members and asked the committee who received it in their campus mailbox. President Kathi Hiyane-Brown indicated it is important for presidents to get the information as well.

Tom explained that he redesigned the Designed for Learning grants and is offering a February 2, 2007 Web conference and a March 1 workshop to help faculty members apply. He informed the committee that CTL has joined the Redesign Alliance.

There was some discussion about the grant, centering around four questions articulated by Cathy Summa, speaking on behalf of the IFO:

Cathy asked why we are doing this program again without seeking input from the steering committee. Lynda responded that this program was funded as a Chancellor's Initiative. The idea for the \$225,000 initiative request was first presented to the steering committee in May, 2006. It's been an item on steering committee agenda at that initial May meeting, in September, and again in November.

Cathy asked why we are doing this program a second year when the IFO objects to spending so much money for NCAT membership. Lynda and Tom answered that the

return from our nearly \$50,000 investment in a consulting contract with NCAT last year did not have the returns that we'd hoped for. Consequently, we have not renewed that relationship with NCAT, but have decided instead to join the Redesign Alliance, an NCAT initiative to bring together faculty teams who are doing, or have completed, course redesign projects. We will use project funds to sponsor institutional memberships in the Redesign Initiative for each of the Designed for Learning colleges or universities. This is in response to Designed for Learning grantees, who found the NCAT association useful for its materials and the expertise available from its other clients. It is also in response to IFO and MSCF input at the CTL Steering Committee, advising against spending considerable amounts with a consultant.

Cathy asked why we are doing this program a second year when the first year was a pilot, after which we would evaluate the effectiveness of the program. Tom answered that the initial year of this initiative comprises projects that will be completed, at the earliest, this spring (2007). Consequently, there is not enough data to do a thorough evaluation of the outcomes of the projects. Because there are only four initial projects, there is not enough data for a complete analysis. We are taking this opportunity to expand the program and fund up to eight more course redesign projects to increase our ability to evaluate program outcomes.

Cathy said that the IFO is very concerned that a major tenet of the project is creating cost savings on campuses, and this may translate into loss of full-time faculty jobs. Tom replied that he believes NCAT placed undue emphasis on cost savings. Consequently, our current grant announcement minimizes that emphasis. Although courses redesigned using the NCAT model can result in cost savings, we neither require our projects to do so nor do we exclude proposals that do not include cost savings. At any rate, however, we do emphasize that any cost savings associated with redesign should free up faculty time or resources to pursue other endeavors, not eliminate jobs.

Ray Lou commended CTL on a well-designed structure for the Designed to Learn grant.

Tom remarked that a grant announcement for Instructional Development grants has been distributed, and there is a February 23 deadline for applications from faculty members.

CTL Operations and Programs Report

CTL Staffing

Lynda reported that the position posted since July for a Faculty Coordinator for University Faculty Professional Development is still open and there are no qualified applicants at this time. She encouraged the committee to promote the position to help CTL better serve the needs and interests of university faculty.

RSP / ITeach 2007

Zala Fashant talked about the RSP/ITeach conference to be held on March 1-3 at Minneapolis Community and Technical College. The full program is now on the website. Keynote speakers include Mark Taylor and Betsy Barefoot. There are 100 Friday presentations and over 150 presenters.

Spring Discipline Workshop

Martin Springborg shared the list of eight workshops scheduled from mid-March through May.

Leaders Spring Workshop

The Leaders Spring Workshop is scheduled for April 12-13 at the Office of the Chancellor. The Crowne Plaza Hotel St. Paul--Riverfront Hotel is reserved. A draft agenda was included in the handouts and Lynda invited the committee's input for the agenda.

Campus Visits

- **January 4-** Ridgewater College, Hutchinson: Lynda and Yvonne Shafer presented about active learning.
- **January 5-** Minnesota West Community & Technical College - Granite Falls: Yvonne presented about classroom assessment.
- **January 11-** Lake Superior College: Martin Springborg presented about active learning.
- **January 12-** Hennepin Technical College, Brooklyn Park and Hennepin Technical College, Eden Prairie: Thomas Wortman and Yvonne about grant seeking and proposal writing.
- **January 17 -** Fond du Lac Tribal and Community College: Martin presented about multimedia.

CTL Subscription Web Seminars- February 16 on line assessment.

Some members of the committee believed this program to be a new CTL initiative. Lynda explained hosting web seminars was part of CTL's 2006-2007 work plan. The Office of the Chancellor and specifically MN Online identified the need for faculty to be introduced to new modes of assessment and CTL is evaluating in this seminar how it might subsequently share effective practices with faculty (online tutorial, etc.).

CTL Weekly Update

Discussion on sending the CTL Weekly Update to campus faculty was held. Stewart informed the committee that at MSU, Mankato, sending mass electronic information is problematic and requires special permission. Lynda suggested alternatives be discussed at a future meeting. It was also determined that not all members of the Steering Committee receive the weekly update from CTL Campus Leaders.

►The entire Steering Committee will be added to the listserv to receive the Weekly Update.

Time did not permit discussion of the 206-2007 work plan at this meeting. Lynda thanked the committee for the frank and open discussion and suggested the work plan and value of caucuses can be taken up at the retreat.

1:08 Meeting Adjourned

- Lynne Goldetsky and Lynda Milne