

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

**November 12, 2003
Office of the Chancellor, 304 ETC Building, St. Paul
Minutes**

Present: Carol Steimer Bailey, James Berg, Michael Berndt, Mike Connelly, Rex Gaskill, James Kaplan, Larry Litecky, Chuck Lyons, Sue Martinez, Lynda Milne, John O'Brien, Jim Pehler, Lori Schroeder, Keith Stover, Karen Thoms

Absent with Notice: Deena Allen, Judy Harris, Russell Lee, Stewart Ross, Janet Henquinet

Minutes: Carol Steimer Bailey (? denotes action item)

Minutes from September 12, 2003

Minutes from the previous meeting were reviewed. Moved to accept by Chuck Lyons, second by James Kaplan. Passed.

Agenda reviewed:

Noted that item # 9 should actually be #6

Lynda Milne added 2 items: Advisory Committees, Liberal Arts Education

Chuck Lyons moved to accept with amendments, second, Rex Gaskill Passed

Member Business:

Lynda Milne noted that Judy Harris, a staunch CTL advocate, would be retiring in January and leaving the Steering Committee. This leaves an opening to be filled. Jim Kaplan suggested that Carolyn Williams, St Cloud State, for this dean/CAO position. Karen Thoms noted that she is very good and has great ideas, but is an extremely busy person.

Jim Kaplan suggested that it be a minority person and from a University. Perhaps someone from Southwest, the Dean of Professional Studies from Metro, or someone involved with the Urban Teacher program.

Lynda Milne suggested someone from Winona State, since that might encourage them to be more involved with CTL. Another suggestion was: Joe Bessie, Dean of Liberal Arts, Ridgewater; he has volunteered to be of assistance to CTL. Lynda will explore Marshall, Winona and Southwest by email.

Jim Kaplan suggested that the Affirmative Action office might have names. Rex Gaskill suggested we might contact the Associate Vice Chancellor for Equal Opportunity and Diversity [Dolores Fridge].

Chuck Lyons requested that the minutes reflect that our preference is that the person be: a person of color, from an out-state 4-year institution.

Lynda also noted that Gayle Plank and Diane Pearson's positions both expire in January of 2004. We need one person from a technical college and one from a community college. These two positions must be referred to the MSCF Co-Presidents for appointments.

Action Item Update:

Lynda reported that she had contacted the office of the Chancellor regarding representatives from the Health Care and Teacher Education areas. Unfortunately, Pam Wanga from the teacher education area had recently resigned. Deena Allen had recommended Sonya Smeader, a consultant. Mary Rothchild in the Health Area was eager to be part of the group.

Lynda reported on efforts to get people to work on specific projects and as work study students. Jim Berg reported that we had positions for three graduate level students as work study, but noted that we had very low response to our job postings and it was difficult to get interns, since the projects seem to be more work study than graduate level learning.

Jim Kaplan suggested that we explore individuals that have been convicted and assigned to community service, since they are often professionals, such as lawyers and administrative types.
? **Lynda will contact Margaret Johnson to see if it's feasible.**

We will be hiring a new student who will specialize in event coordination.

Bush Update :

As noted at our July 2003 meeting, the Bush Learning That Lasts grant provided enough funding for 18 Active Learning Advocates, but the final number was 14. In response to our 2002-2003 interim report submitted October 1, 2003, we are approved to use the money to provide ALAs with additional release time ("cohort 2" faculty were initially scheduled to receive a lower allotment); professional development funds for a national conference (POD Network); and campus programming funds. Bush funding will also allow Jim Berg to hire a faculty facilitator to keep participant activities going after the Weekend Seminars, working with WebCT or Desire2Learn systems or blogs. Lynda reported that work groups are not yet active.

Janet Henquinet has indicated a willingness to work with CTL on creating a recognizable visual identity. Everything is dependent on the guidelines being developed by public affairs. There will be guidelines for web sites, logos and all publications. Jim Kaplan questioned if a CTL logo could be on one side and the MnSCU Logo on the other. Public relations has said no.

Recognition for good teaching

The chancellor was very positive about the idea.

Larry Litecky reported on some of the information he had gathered. He talked to people in charge of the University of Minnesota Horace T. Morris awards.

They have a set of guidelines:

Each institution sends in names and can opt out if strongly opposed.

They require dossiers and specific information.

Money is usually attached—e.g., a \$3,000 stipend or money over several years that may be as high as \$10,000.

Some of their biggest concerns were regarding the money issues. Those were taken care of when it became part of a foundation.

Karen Thoms suggested that the criteria might be different for different institutions.

Jim Kaplan questioned whether or not it belongs in the CTL or should we be looking at excellence in faculty development activities. Is there time for us to do something like this? Should faculty be involved?

Carol Steimer Bailey noted that UTCE had looked at this in the past and that we might look at the K-12 model since they have done this for many years. Or should we explore being part of their effort since MSCF is part of Education Minnesota? Keith Stover thought we could look at the K-12 model, but should not be part of it.

Lynda questioned that we were talking about process, but should first determine our purpose for doing it. Should we send a letter to push the issue?

The group agreed that we should seek recognition for teaching and it should be a Board or Chancellor award, since the Chancellor thinks it's a terrific idea.

Jim Kaplan felt that since it is usually the monarch that dispenses honor, it should come from the Chancellor. We could send a letter to encourage that it be done. Perhaps companies or foundations could be a part as well. Rex Gaskill felt that a monetary award or endowment is good. Jim Kaplan thought that an award pin would also be important.

Larry Litecky noted that the University recognizes excellence in 5 different areas and an award might cover only one or more than one. Examples are: advising, counseling, leadership. Should we write a letter?

? Lynda said that she would write a letter on behalf of the committee to the Chancellor. We might volunteer to help define criteria. Since there is currently no award, we would recommend that it be established.

It was moved by Larry Litecky, seconded by Rex Gaskill that Lynda send a letter to recommend that a state level award be established to value excellence in teaching and that it include a monetary stipend. Discussion followed:

Jim Pehler suggested that all three types of institutions might make awards, but we need to alert the unions and assure them that it is not merit pay. Larry Litecky felt we shouldn't get into details now since that always sends up red flags for the unions.

Lynda suggested that it be up to 10 faculty members and that the process be firmly grounded in agreed upon criteria. Chuck Lyons questioned whether we desire or are willing to be part of the process? Lynda felt that we would be interested in the process. Jim Kaplan suggested that if we are involved that we should take credit for the idea.

Larry Litecky suggested that we take it to the co-presidents and see where the faculty associations stand. At Century it is part of Shared Governance – the faculty has no role, but administration does and the stipends come from the foundation. Jim Kaplan questioned if \$500 is too moderate an amount? Chuck Lyons felt that money could be

used for staff development and also to attend events, in addition to the recognition. Larry Litecky noted that the University of MN gives larger awards to at least 15 people.

The motion was amended to read: It was moved by Larry Litecky, seconded by Rex Gaskill that Lynda send a letter to recommend that a state level award be established to value excellence in teaching and that it include a monetary stipend and that the CTL desires to take the lead on creating the award. Motion passed.

? Lynda will draft by the first week in December, post it with a week to respond and then send to the Chancellor, it will suggest 10 people.

Survey Update:

Lynda noted that even with extended dates and weekly reminders, only 10 or 11% of the IFO faculty responded. She expressed her disappointment over the small returns.

Respondents were mostly full time, 40% of them new (teaching less than 5 yrs.) Jim Kaplan wondered if we should discuss results at the RSP Conference? Lynda felt that we should just stop with this survey and focus on the new survey for next year.

Jim Pehler noted that the IFO members questioned how the questions were worded and noted that IFO wants to review the questions. Was the data statistically significant? The IFO is very selective as to surveys.

Lynda said the questions were out for review in March 2003 and no IFO committee members responded. Jim Pehler said that they meet only every 2-3 months, so need lead-time and should have the fall survey questions now. Lynda questioned if the survey is not getting to the right people, what process would work? Since it was open for several months, why were there no objections until the end?

John O'Brien asked if the completion rate was any different for this survey than for any other. Is it an average rate of return for most surveys or lower than others? Chuck Lyons noted that it might not be for the general populations, but for specific groups. Lynda noted that the UCLA/CIRP biennial survey of faculty typically has a 40% return, the highest nationally, but that campus surveys are frequently in the 10-15% range. Jim Berg noted that in the Learning by Doing survey they were chosen randomly across the system and the return rate was 45% to 55%. Lynda noted that the LBD faculty surveys used a selective sample. The come-one come-all Web survey is the hardest to get a high response rate, and is less likely to be representative of the population. Karen Thoms noted that at St.Cloud, you don't know who's actually getting the survey, when paper copies are used you know who gets them.

? Lynda will begin work in January on the next survey and will change methods, using a stratified random sample.

Jim Pehler asked if in the respondent group of "new" instructors, do we know how they fall in their positions? He suggested that we select 5 people to look at the survey. They could be appointed and have it ready by a certain day. At the December Meet and Confer he would let them know that the survey is going to be done and that questions can be asked about the questions.

Lynda requested that the committee decide when to do the survey since both faculty groups had requested an annual survey.

Chuck Lyons suggested that it be done annually every fall. Jim Pehler suggested doing the survey between Oct 1 & 15, after faculty had a chance to settle in. Lynda thought that spring would be a better time, so that data could be used for planning the programming the following year. Chuck Lyons questioned that it might be too late for doing programming. Karen Thoms felt it would be helpful to have the feedback to work with over the summer. Jim Kaplan suggested between March 1 & 15, so that it would be ready for fall. Jim Berg suggested February where we would not have to work around breaks. Jim Kaplan favored using randomized. Chuck Lyons felt all faculty should be surveyed.

Lynda suggested we aim for February and March of 2005 for a first annual survey. The committee approved. Karen Thoms questioned whether or not the questions should be the same for all faculty? Lynda said we could set the survey for different institutional types. Opportunity will be provided to the governance of both the IFO and MSCF, through its CTL representatives, to review and comment on the survey, and that the survey will be brought to systemwide meet and confer well in advance of survey administration.

Annual Report:

Lynda presented the draft annual report for discussion and comments. Is it the right content for the intended audience?

Suggestions:

- “Why do we exist” should be put in a more positive light—i.e., “How do we serve?”
- Doesn’t address how the CTL measures accountability and the words “measuring success” should be added.
- Use a larger font.
- Say “what advisory to”
- Under ALA section – mention institutional contributions
- Emphasize how we contribute to “One system”
- Put future page to the front
- Delete definitions of Learning, Learning that Lasts
- Add an index
- Stress more CTL role as a vehicle for grant funding and implementing grants
- Leaders – Strike first of name
- Change from MnSCU to full name where used
- Needs more text information
- Show broad lists of people involved
- Use map with stars to show state locations
- Leave out amounts
- Use grant letters
- Instead of MnSCU maps, use map of activities
- Fill in Metro details
- Highlight that money is being brought in, not just paid out
- It would be good for administrators to compare accomplishments with their rivals
- Change “complicated” and add service learning, diversity and drop apathy part
- Missing the Discipline Workshops
- Explain graphics (workshop page)
- Need uniformity for all data
- Graphics with topic covered
- Leaders “ chosen by campus” should be more specific

New Program Work Groups

Lynda noted that we haven’t put out new initiatives and would like steering committee to help

She showed the Cal Poly Web site as an example – especially their special events for part time faculty. Should we have programs dedicated to leaders and part time faculty? Should we fund a position for this?

Jim Kaplan felt that this would show them that they are valued. Lori noted that they need an orientation before beginning.

Larry Litecky asked what is happening on campuses? Century has an adjunct institute all four semesters and they learn new things every time. They are looking at times, since they would like it earlier. Lynda said we could ask the CAOs, a couple of schools currently have orientations. Karen Thoms says that at St. Cloud they do not separate adjunct and regular faculty in most things. She talked of an instructor that described them self “as only an adjunct”. Books are not always available to part time instructors. Many adjunct instructors have full time jobs so it is difficult to determine when and how activities are best offered. Jim Kaplan suggested an adjunct chat room. Jim Pehler suggested it should be done on campus or in the instruction department. IFO has a concern that adjunct instructors will replace full time instructors. Larry Litecky noted that the two-year contract has different language and improving their functionality will not necessarily add more adjuncts.

Lynda asked if we should have a workgroup to determine a model for best practices to improve teaching?

? John O’Brien volunteered to put out a call for volunteers. Initial activities would be to inventory campus support, possibly seek grants and make recommendations to the group. Moved by Jim Kaplan, second by Chuck Lyons to create a workgroup to inventory campus resources and make recommendations. The group should include at least two faculty. Passed

Mike Connelly suggested a workgroup for new faculty. Karen Thoms noted that this has been done at CTL workshops. She felt that a handbook would be helpful. We need to know what’s happening for any new faculty. Is there mentoring going on, is it discipline specific? We need to assess what are the current programs and resources. What can CTL do? Karen Thoms and Michael Berndt volunteered to work on this group.

Chuck Lyons suggested that there be focus groups at the leader’s workshops and also pick questions from the steering committee. Jim Berg said it should include grant funding.

? Lynda suggests that the groups report back at the January steering committee meeting.

Jim Kaplan felt we needed a workgroup for minority faculty. Could we include minority groups in the RSP conference groups? Rex suggested it might be included on the registration page. Jim Kaplan suggested that we make room for groups and have minority conveners.

Lynda asked if faculty of color met, what questions should be addressed? One possible question might be what CTL could do for them?

John O’Brien suggested that we create a pool of faculty from non-represented groups. They might help to inform faculty of color and perhaps assist with statewide recruitment? Larry Litecky thought they might focus on teaching multiculturalism and diversity. Need to look at focus and what they could bring to bear. Lynda suggested this might happen over lunch. They

could be organized by groups. If people let us know what they need we could provide the organization.

Another possibility might be a roundtable on teaching multiculturalism and diversity. We need to find way to get input and should record discussions. Jim Kaplan suggested that we encourage sessions on different group issues in the classroom. Lori suggested a committee to submit roundtable ideas. Chuck Lyons noted that roundtable discussions might focus on issues facing the African American faculty member. John O'Brien questioned whether discussions would have a narrow or large focus? What do we expect to come out of the groups? Lynda thought they might tell us if there were issues and might provide a communications pipeline.

Operations Report

Carol gave a report on the applications for Discipline Workshops.

Lynda raised the question regarding how long should we keep funding groups? There are several groups that have been funded for up to 10 years. Should we be more selective? Rex Gaskill felt priority should go to groups that had not met before. Michael Berndt noted that it takes time for groups to get established. Larry Litecky felt we should fund those interested and who will do the work. We have lists of hosting from Metro Alliance meetings. Chuck Lyons suggested meeting at a single time and location—perhaps 8 or 10 could meet at once and the groups plan content.

Questions might be: What's needed besides Desire2Learn? Are there volume discounts that the state might get licenses for certain group? Jim Kaplan asked about the overlap between professional organizations and the discipline workshops?

Lynda summarized that the committee had an interest in developing groups and supporting them for a certain number of years with gradually declining support. Jim Kaplan felt that we should continue funding MnSCU issues.

Chuck Lyons attended the Developmental Education Workshop and felt that they were very appreciative of the support they've received. Both Rex and Michael attended the English Composition Workshop and heard good reports. It certainly dealt with best teaching practices.

Jim Berg reported on the Weekend Seminars and Lynda reported on the Active Learning Advocates.

Lori Schroeder reported on the grant-writing workshop at Itasca and showed the web site information for the RSP conference.

Carol Steimer Bailey gave a brief report on plans for the ITeach Conference.

Rex questioned the Jan. meeting attendance since it is during semester break – would people be coming?

? Lynda noted that we had discussed in July meeting and approved these dates, but she will poll the group and see what the response is.

Next meeting – January 8, 2004.

All meeting dates listed at <http://www.ctl.mnscu.edu/about/committee.html>