

**MnSCU Center for Teaching and Learning  
Steering Committee Meeting  
November 9, 2001**

**Minutes**

**PRESENT:** Gretchen Dorn, Jane Miller, Kathryn Kelley, Brenda Lyseng, Jerry Noland, Jim Berg, Lynda Milne, Gayle Plank, James Kaplan, Karen Thoms, Deena Allen, Chuck Lyons, James Pehler, and Kathy Nelson

**ABSENT:** Diane Pearson, Debra Japp, Larry Oveson, Jeanette Rydberg, Edward Schones, Colleen Thompson, Jeanette Daines, Russell Lee, Jack Miller, and John O'Brien

**MINUTES:** Nicole Larson

**Minutes from previous meeting / review of agenda**

Please remove the following sentence from the September 20, 2001 minutes (error in minutes): There may be some reorganizing in the "system office" and faculty development may move out of Academic Affairs. Please add to your agenda, small grants/discipline workshops and ITeach call for proposals.

**Steering Committee business**

Review the MnSCU CTL Mission and Bylaws handout (draft). Since there will be 6 faculty from MSCF, should there be 6 from IFO? Do we want to require attendance for the faculty on the committee?

? It was moved and seconded to increase membership of IFO faculty on the committee to 6 (to have a total of 12 faculty on the committee). Would having 12 faculty, in addition to other voting members, be too large of a committee for effective and efficient discussion and decision making? But we need to make sure that the majority of the committee is faculty. Should we have 4 faculty from each union (IFO and MSCF) to go along with the 6 non-faculty voting members? Currently we have 3 MnSCU system representatives attending the meetings, maybe John O'Brien and Lynda Milne could rotate attending. Should the union representatives be on the committee versus being "guests"?

? It was moved and seconded to amend the motion – There will be 4 IFO and 4 MSCF members on the CTL Steering Committee. But then, we are decreasing the current amount of faculty on the committee (from 9 down to 8). Should we decrease the number of non-faculty members on the committee? Or should we have 5 IFO and 5 MSCF faculty members? Could that 5<sup>th</sup> member of each be the union president? President or representative? No, it should be the president. Do we want half of the MSCF faculty members on the committee to be from a Technical College, and the other half to be from a Community College?

? It was moved and seconded to amend the motion – Faculty representation will be 5 IFO and 5 MSCF members and union presidents. **Motion carried.**

Kathy says that it would be beneficial if the presidential seats on the CTL Steering Committee are held by presidents on the leadership council (specifically the presidential co-chair and past co-chair). Kathy will talk to the chancellor to see if we are able to do this.

? It was moved and seconded that the presidential co-chair and past co-chair of the leadership council hold the 2 presidential seats on the CTL Steering Committee. **Motion carried.** (Again, Kathy to talk to the chancellor about this.)

**Who on the committee has voting rights? Chuck mentioned that the committee structure list was created with the intention that everyone on the CTL Steering Committee (all categories on the list) has voting rights, except for the CTL staff.**

We should add a “representation” category to the CTL Steering Committee member list.

We also need to find out which representation category Debra Japp fits into – IFO faculty, or union representative.

As far as the 2 MnSCU system representatives – do we want to designate that those members be from a specific department (ie: someone from OIT and someone from Global Ed), or should we leave it open? It was suggested that we leave it open. We can always invite non-voting “guests” to the meetings to serve as resources.

? It was moved and seconded that the committee accepts the “Committee Structure” (MnSCU CTL Mission & Bylaws document dated November 7, 2001) based on the amendments already noted in the minutes –

Therefore, the CTL Steering Committee will consist of:

5 IFO and 5 MSCF faculty members

All MnSCU faculty association presidents as ex-officio and voting

2 presidents (which will be the co-chair and past co-chair of the leadership council)

2 chief academic officers or deans

2 MnSCU system representatives

CTL staff and/or other guests as non-voting resources

**Motion carried**

## **MnSCU workplan and Office of the Chancellor**

We need to make sure that the chancellor understands what CTL is. It has been said that some presidents want the money on their own campuses, with them deciding what to do with it. The biggest issue/question: Why should CTL exist at a system level, instead of just giving the money to the presidents on their campuses?

Apparently, the chancellor is getting some negative feedback on the perceived dominance of the system office over campuses. It has been said that some of the presidents do not understand the purpose or see the value of CTL at the system level, although it is very important to faculty. What can we do about this?

Kathy is interested in talking to the chancellor about CTL. She also feels that we need a “CTL team” to visit presidents/campuses. And faculty need to vocally support CTL at their campuses when the chancellor is conducting his campus visits this fall/winter. We need CTL supporters at these campus visits!!! At these visits, faculty, rather than CTL staff, should be talking about CTL and providing data to the chancellor. We should try to get a one-page CTL briefing document into the briefing packet that the chancellor receives for each campus visit. Should we send a briefing sheet to CTL Leaders?

CTL leaders need to highlight the need for regional and state-wide activities – showing that this is a way to improve working together as a unit. Do we need to explain the importance of the centralized role, or are we just not doing it well? The importance is to help bond the institutions, but campuses may not be seeing that. How can we communicate that CTL is effective – what works and what does not? Should we talk about strategies for visibility at the Spring 2002 CTL Campus Leaders’ workshop?

During the second half of the meeting, should we discuss co-chair election/leadership and committee appointments, or discuss the CTL Update items on the agenda? – Update items on the agenda.

## **Staffing**

Resumes were given to the review committee. After Jane gathers recommendations, interviews will be set up for December 2001. Received a better response than the last round.

## **New Faculty Tool Kits**

In November 2001, we sent approximately 435 “New Faculty Tool Kits” to all new full-time tenure-track faculty at MnSCU institutions. The “tool kit” included:

- The MnSCU CTL video, Many Streams, One River: An Introduction to Faculty Development in MnSCU
  - Three books: Menges’ Faculty in New Jobs, McKeachie’s Teaching Tips and Davis’ Tools for Teaching
  - A CTL welcome packet including CTL related information
  - Materials from the Office of Instructional Technology, CTL’s co-sponsor for the annual ITeach conference
- Jane has received some positive e-mails from new faculty that received the “kits” (see handout).

This “tool kit” will be followed up by a meeting for new faculty in late winter / early spring.

Each campus CTL leader also received a “tool kit” to keep as a resource for the campus. Is there anything we can do for adjunct faculty?

## **Bush Learning by Doing program**

The Learning by Doing Advisory Committee met on November 8, 2001. The committee discussed the LBD student and faculty (LBD grantees) survey reports, dissemination plans, evaluation needs and sustainability. They talked about strategic concerns (campus to community), technology issues and the need to continue to support individual faculty grants.

The Bush Foundation is pleased with the work that MnSCU has done. But after 30 years of funding, foundations are moving away from funding faculty development/higher education. Bush is still committed to higher education, but they are re-evaluating their funding strategies.

The next proposal for funding deadline is March 1<sup>st</sup>, 2002. Bush will make funding decisions in July, 2002.

As far as Bush funding, they want to donate to MnSCU as a whole, not to individual campuses.

Jane has been working on trying to get a package deal for memberships with Campus Compact and the Collaboration. Apparently, memberships are on an individual basis.

At the fall 2001 CTL leaders’ workshop, Jim had the leaders fill out a LBD program survey (see handout). 27 leaders asked that a CTL staff person contact him/her to discuss individual campus faculty development needs (ie: having a LBD staff visit, or a LBD workshop on campus). Faculty development coordinators are contacting these leaders to see what the needs are.

## **Spring Regional Conference in Mankato**

Conference will be February 1-2, 2002 in Mankato (see handouts). Someone mentioned that there might be some concern about the topic of this conference. The topic was chosen by faculty, but maybe we need to adjust the content of our communications on this conference. We should show that this is a conference to help address: faculty burn-out, time management, student absenteeism, etc.

Someone mentioned the need for a CTL conference to address transfer.

? It was moved and seconded that at the next CTL Steering Committee meeting we discuss transfer and CTL, inviting a member of the transfer team to the meeting. **Motion carried.**

It was requested that before the next meeting, Jane send the Steering Committee members some information on transfer. It was said that transfer is a top priority of this system right now.

## **ITeach Conference**

ITeach: Best Practices in Teaching with Technology Conference will be held at Minneapolis Community and Technical College, April 18-20, 2002.

Call for proposals postcard is being mailed to MnSCU faculty. Deadline for proposals is January 14, 2002.

For more information or to submit a proposal online, go to: <http://www.oit.mnscu.edu/iteach>

## **Keeping our Faculties: Addressing the Recruitment and Retention of Faculty of Color Conference**

Conference will be held at the Radisson Hotel Metrodome in Minneapolis, April 21-23, 2002.

MnSCU is co-sponsoring this conference with the University of Minnesota and Committee on Institutional Cooperation Institutions.

For more information, go to: <http://www.oma.umn.edu/kof>

## **Future meetings**

Thursday, January 17<sup>th</sup>, 2002 – 10am-2pm – Conference room 321 – ETC bldg

Monday, March 4<sup>th</sup>, 2002 – 10am-2pm – Conference room 304 – ETC bldg

Friday, May 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2002 – 10am-2pm – Conference room 321 – ETC bldg

At the September 20<sup>th</sup> meeting someone asked if we always have to hold our meetings at the ETC building in St. Paul? Could we hold our meetings at a campus or at some other location?

Do members want to have the meeting at a different location? A couple of members recommended that we just keep the location as is – no one expressed a desire to change locations.