



Minnesota
STATE COLLEGES
& UNIVERSITIES

Center for Teaching and Learning Steering Committee

November 15, 2007

Office of the Chancellor, Board Room B 4th Floor
30 7th St. E., St. Paul

Minutes

PRESENT: Deena Allen, Josephine Books, Zala Fashant, Linda Fuselier, Lutchmiparsad Hazareesingh, Sally Johnstone (ITV), Kathryn Kelly, Tim Kroeger (ITV), Karen LaPlant, Louise Mengelkoch (ITV), Larry Lundblad, Jane McConnell, Lynda Milne, Greg Mulcahy, Yvonne Shafer, JoAnn Simser, Martin Springborg, Cathy Summa, Doug Thompson, Beth Weatherby, Thomas Wortman

ABSENT WITH NOTICE: Nancy Black, Louise Hoxworth, Ann Valentine

MINUTES: DeeGee Frenzel and Lynda Milne

(▶ denotes action item)

9:10am Meeting Called to Order Lynda Milne called the meeting to order.

1. Member Business

Jane McConnell was welcomed to the committee and all members introduced themselves. Member roster was distributed and members were asked to review. There are no open seats on the committee this year.

2. Minutes

No changes made; September minutes were approved. Lynda demonstrated where previous minutes are available on the CTL Steering Committee Web site. The Minutes date all the way back to 1999. Lynda mentioned to the committee that the minutes are posted after they are approved by the committee. No official business took place during the June 2007 meeting so there are no Minutes posted for that month on the Web site.

3. Review of Agenda

No changes made; agenda was approved. HTML style of the agenda was approved as generated. Using Google Groups for posting of agenda is working well for the committee. Some of the committee members were getting the agenda twice but it was discovered that they may have two different email addresses in the system, one being a gmail account. They did not request deletion of one account or the other.

4. CTL 2007 Faculty Development Survey

The third biennial survey of all faculty was conducted in August and September. The survey tells us what respondents' faculty development history is, what their needs and interests are, and what their opinion is of professional development services on campuses and from the Office of the Chancellor CTL. The survey invitation was sent out to all full part time faculty. About 8,000 people received the survey, and there were 2,048 responses: 761 for Universities and 1316 for the Colleges. Deena Allen requested a comparative view of college and university responses side by side in the same report. Lynda explained that we have asked for that from our survey administrators at MSU, Mankato, but it will be a special reporting that would require additional funds. Lynda mentioned that the survey had more demographic questions this, and that they permit us to see that, although the response rate is about 29%, the respondents seem to be representative of the faculty at large on major characteristics (i.e., college/university/sex/race/liberal arts/career and tech). Kathryn suggested that we offer incentives but Lynda noted that we are not able, by state statute, to provide incentives to state employees for such efforts. We did offer incentives for campus faculty development based on response rates last time, and it didn't seem to yield any better results than we got this time. Lynda questioned the committee about continuing to do the survey regularly on a biennial basis (per the Committee's 2003 recommendation).. Greg Mulcahy thinks we should continue to do the survey. Larry Litecky wanted to know how widely this was distributed and did it go to HR directors? It went to CAOs and CTL Campus Leaders, Each institution has access to a copy for their institution that includes 5 questions that Leaders from those institutions wanted to include in the survey. ►CTL will send the survey directly to HR Directors and make sure CAOs have it and also suggest to Leaders that they find a way to make all faculty aware of their own campus responses. We will distribute the survey and ask groups, CAO, CTL Leaders and HR Directors to let us know what uses they are making of the surveys and is there any improvement in the administration of the survey, including timing. The committee discussed having a shorter survey with more of a discipline focus to it. Cathy Summa recommended more open-ended questions to help faculty more clearly indicate and prioritize what they would like. ►Committee came to a conclusion to continue administering the survey every two years. ►Lynda will summarize feedback received from CAOs and deans at the October, 2007 meeting, and what she has heard from the committee, and have it ready before the next meeting.

Zala Fashant reviewed survey highlights with the committee.

➤ Page 4

3. *Interest in Professional Development Topics*

Zala highlighted the strong interest in student motivation and engagement; critical thinking and problem solving; and student learning processes and cognition. He said that we will be using this information for program planning. It's very clear that faculty are concerned with students, and with meeting the

needs of new and differing populations of students. Lynda mentioned that the alignment between college and university faculty was strong in these top three interests, and that critical thinking is the number one teaching topic. Beth Weatherby spoke to the committee about what her campus is doing and how revising the liberal arts work and critical thinking keeps coming up. Greg noted that we have a fundamental cultural problem when the average high school student reads twenty minutes a week and everyone is trying not to address the cultural problem. Greg feels it can not be addressed by support because it's a core cultural problem. Karen LaPlant mentioned that there are some things on the horizon on nation wide help for literacy. Sally Johnstone discussed the culture shift toward media and technology, and how we ourselves need to be using technology tools that are readily and freely available. JoAnn Simser feels that the aggregate survey correlates with commonalities found in the Core Outcomes Study. Haz Lutchimiparsad addressed the committee on his study that was done on attitudes of developmental students. In that discussion they found that most people tend to separate things as retention, engagement and critical thinking they are part of the same thing. Sally noted that we get limited in our knowledge by the questions that are asked. It might be interesting to go back to things that we know are critical issues like the cultural shift. Students coming to our campuses are an entirely different type of consumer of information. She wondered if the committee could look at the questions that were in the item bank that was created and see which ones might begin to relate to those cultural differences. Sally also mentions that something that is fundamental is shifting and it is shifting faster than most of us can even wrap our heads around. She also wanted to know where do we look for more solid information and what can the committee do? Cathy Summa would like for us to think about the different populations of students that we are serving as we talk about it. Doug Thompson talked about the technical side and how he would like to see a breakdown on the results in order to know if we are all experiencing the same problems and challenges. Tim Kroeger feels that CTL analyzing the data by discipline would allow us to better target faculty disciplines like science and math.

➤ Page 9

10. *How strong is the support on your campus for faculty professional development?*

Zala spoke about the fact that campus faculty development was rated as strong by faculty, and noted that CAOs at last month's meeting accredited some of that to CTL's support for leaders and for campus faculty development. Committee discussed the need to better define what is meant by "strong faculty development on campus;" it still varies considerably.

➤ Page 8

7. Please identify the two biggest obstacles to your participating in faculty development activities in your discipline or professional area.

Lynda point out the responses point to two big issues, difficult to separate: How professional development opportunities are scheduled versus high work load. Last time we saw a bigger response to lack of rewards and incentives but in this time lack of rewards and incentives has gone away as an obstacle.

➤ Page 10

12. Do you know who your CTL Campus Leader?

Zala talked about how we have seen improvements in this area. We jumped nearly ten percent over the last time the survey was taken.

➤ Page 10

13. During the last two academic years, in how many on-campus faculty development activities did you participate?

There is another ten percent improvement over the 2005 survey. Lynda mentioned that at our universities we are seeing more and more strong centers being established than there were five years ago and now people know that they have a CTL Leader and they know who the Center for Professional Development Directors are. There simply may be more opportunities available on campus than before.

➤ Page 9

10. How strong is the support on your campus for faculty professional development?

Lynda mentioned how the questions results are also about ten percent up, although we don't probe to find out what accounts for this faculty perception.

➤ Page 11

14. What types of on-campus faculty development activities have you participated in during the past two years?

Zala expressed that one of the most surprising results for this question was that 72% of the faculty attended workshops/seminars on a non-duty day. We can also see that nearly 80% of faculty attended D2L, WIDS, software, or some other technology training, indicating a very high degree of use and interest in teaching with technology.

➤ Page 11

15. How do you rate your overall satisfaction with the faculty development activities offered on your campus?

Lynda mentioned it is very strong and has been going up in the past five years. Haz expressed that what that indicates is that we need to do two things, one is that we need to make some structural changes in what to do and the other one is to do what we do better. So when we plan the next phase of professional development we should focus on that direction rather than keeping on improving on what we are doing right now. Haz reflected about structural

support that needs to be available on campuses. Zala asked what, as a system office, can CTL provide for campuses to help individual people delivering those services? Zala mentioned that CTL is increasingly providing Web base workshop as a way to help deliver services to all campuses.

➤ Page 12

16. *Are you aware of the Office of the Chancellor Center of Teaching and Learning?*

Lynda discussed the blurring of identity for the Office of the Chancellor CTL as more campuses use the "CTL" title for their faculty development centers. Beth said that what SMSU has found since they have been involved with CTL is that they have a lot of expertise on the campus so they have a lot of people that they haven't accessed enough but once they started doing professional development days and started sharing what they know works, they feel like they've got a good local CTL. Beth feels what the Office of the Chancellor CTL can do is more of the "big picture stuff," like doing the research to help campuses with issues and help them plan how to focus on them. She doesn't feel this work is something that campus CTL Leaders have time to do and she feels that having the OOC CTL help with that would be a big help—for example on the issue of critical thinking. Lynda would like the committee to start thinking about the shifts that we are seeing on campus and what it demands re shifts in what CTL delivers.

➤ Page 18

31. *How important are these items as motivators for you to participate in faculty development on your campus, and opinion of CTL*

Lynda spoke about how high the areas of increasing knowledge and improving teaching skills along with improving technical skills. Overall satisfaction with what CTL does is high. Publicity doesn't seem to be a problem and faculty seems to know what is going on.

As for the open-ended comments, Zala and Lynda mentioned a lot less in the way of complaints. ▶ Zala will be categorize the comments and will bring them back to the committee. Lynda questioned the committee on what, having reviewed the survey, do they think we should go forward to the Bush Foundation with? Bush mentioned at the end of this year, beginning of next year they expect to be announcing their new faculty development program.

▶ CTL will ask survey administrators to analyze survey results by discipline/field, and to disaggregate technical field results; we will also obtain side-by-side reporting of college and university faculty responses to each item.

5. 2007 Core Outcomes Study

Lynda made a PowerPoint presentation. ▶ The PowerPoint will be available online on the study Web site right away. This study asked the question: "What is it that our institutions are telling students that they will be able to do and what will they know when they graduate?" Stacy Wells and Julia Curtiss conducted the Core Outcomes

Study for CTL. Twenty-seven out of our thirty two institutions have in some level defined core institutional outcomes, two said that they have them defined for many programs but not at an institutional level, and three said boy this is a good question. Committee discussed how quantitative literacy and science is missing from outcomes institutions all expect of their graduates. Kathryn Kelly spoke to the committee about Normandale and Century and how when you walk on their campus you see their values because student art is displayed. She suggested that stopping a few students on any visit to a campus and asking them questions about their college would be a great way to get answers to campus values. Central Lakes has core outcomes displayed in the classrooms. Lynda asked the committee to recommend what they would like for CTL to take to Senior Vice Chancellor Linda Baer as implications for further action of this study? Deena asked what do we do about this on our campuses, and said that the study at a minimum provides information that is hard to find across the system. Haz suggested that distribution at the campus level will be a good step, so that locally faculty and administrators can compare the information. Beth feels that a lot of this is usable as campuses work on their own definitions and integration of core outcomes, however they don't want to be told what the outcomes should be. Committee agreed there should be a commitment to keep discussion going in follow-up to the study. Beth would like to get the reports back and along with the PowerPoint to distribute and talk about on the campus. Cathy thinks the study is fantastic as a first step but where do we go as a system in thinking about accountability. What gains do our students make by coming to our institutions? Committee agrees the study is preliminary, and is not something for discussion at this point by the Board of Trustees. Karen questioned our rationale in doing this study? Lynda referred the committee to read the first three pages to answer some miscellaneous questions as to what was our rationale in doing the study and more. Tim Koeger mentioned that getting our faculty to buy in helps us to be successful. ►Lynda will put this on the agenda for next committee meeting: What are the implications of this study for faculty development and for CTL? Beth feels that what we have is a useful kind of status report. It gives the system a place to build a network to have conversations and help give you who is available in the system to give you benefit of their experience. ►Lynda will take the question to the Academic and Student Affairs AVCs in the next couple weeks and she will ask them "What can this system level study do to help support coordinated informed efforts on the campuses without dictating outcomes?"

Deena asked the committee if they were familiar with the system accountability dashboard; presidents have seen it at the board meeting. Deena goes on to say that this is the way the board is going to be looking at the high-level accountability measures. ►Lynda will add the Accountability Framework to next meeting's agenda, and invite system director Craig Schoenecker from ASA Research and Planning, depending on whether we are able then to have Student Affairs AVC Mike Lopez or not. Regrettably, Mike Lopez was unable to attend this month steering committee meeting. Cathy expressed that given how important accountability is across the spectrum of higher education and everything we do, what can we do to make certain that there is initiative money directed to this that goes out to the campuses to support our doing it? This is not

going to be something that is cost-free to get done. It is necessary to have support from the central office to help get this accomplished.

6. CTL Operations & Programs Report

6a. RSP/ITeach Proposals, program plans

Martin Springborg spoke about RSP/ITeach, CTL's systemwide annual conference. Last years RSP/ITeach was cancelled because of a snow storm. There is a committee of faculty now reviewing conference proposals. About thirteen hundred or so people are projected to attend this year's conference, February 28-March 1. There are three distinct area of this conference under the overarching theme of First Year Students/Student Experience: Discipline Meetings; Teaching & Learning Best Practices; and Teaching with Technology. Session highlights were reviewed.

6b. Leaders update

Martin talked about the Leaders Fall Workshop and he reviewed the evaluation summary that was taken during the workshop. Leaders were highly satisfied with the workshop. One new thing this year in the Leaders Program is the incorporation of Guides, Leaders who have been with the program for many years serving as mentors to the new Leaders coming into the program. CTL and both new and Guide Leaders felt it was a great idea and extremely helpful for new Leaders coming into the program. Each Leader got a copy of the Faculty Survey for their campuses and CTL advised the Leaders to forward the information to faculty and other on their campuses.

Web Conferencing

Martin informed the committee that next semester CTL is going to try Web conferencing for the Leaders. Web conferences will give the Leaders a more efficient way of holding meetings with each other along with meetings with the CTL staff throughout the year.

6c. Grants for 2008-2009

6d. Awards for Excellence/IPESL

Tom Wortman talked about the instructional development grants for 2008-2009 and how they are going to help to increase learning in STEM courses and require collaboration of faculty between colleges and universities. There will be up to \$150,000 available. Tom reported that other units within Academic and Student Affairs are working together to create a unified way of notifying and communicating grant announcements. The combined announcement will be sent to presidents, CAOs, and faculty leadership. The targeted timeline is to have this sent out as early as possible in January to be in faculty mailboxes when they return to campus from the holidays.

Tom also mentioned that a small group is getting together and discussing the possibilities of doing more training on how to write grant proposals. Saint Paul College will be having a grants workshop on December 4th (date not confirmed yet). Tom, Kathy

Hanon from the OOC budget office and Bill McMahon, from Career OneStop, will be facilitating the workshop.

Tom expressed along with others in the OOC that the grants application process was pretty disjointed and sometimes hard for faculty to figure out. An initiative was started to make things more parallel across grant programs. IT people were consulted and they work with us to create "My Grants" system. This is an electronic Web-based grant application and reporting system. Using campus employee ID numbers for login, this system will be completely accessible off campus.

CAO/CSAO Meeting

Tom and Lynda presented a session at this meeting about the College Faculty Awards for Excellence projects, the awards process, and outcomes from the awards. In summary, comments from CAOs were generally quite positive, and they reported having been able to accomplish more and better projects because of this program.

6e. "Ask CTL" (Right Now)

This is a question and answer type database that will help track our consulting services with faculty and staff by creating a record of frequently asked questions and of consulting services provided. Most campuses are already using RightNow for questions all across their Web sites. CTL will be using it that way, but also to record phone consults and campus visits.

6f. POD Conference

CTL professional staff attended the international Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education Conference held in Pittsburgh, PA on October 18-21, 2007. Zala's handout gave titles & topics for CTL's Staff presentations.

6g. Web workshops (Rubrics; Wikis, Blogs, and Podcasts)

CTL has offered two workshops via the Web this semester, and enrollment has been high (20-25 faculty each) and evaluations enthusiastic. Zala offered the Rubrics workshop and Yvonne Shafer facilitated the workshop on wikis, blogs, podcasts. The Web workshop development and scheduling was in response to positive feedback from the faculty who participated in the RSP/ITeach summer "make-up" Web conference.

7. Sector Discussions

7.a College Faculty: "Philosophy of Community & Technical College Teaching"

College faculty and administrators reviewed the latest draft of the nearly completed online course for the credentialing requirement for new faculty. Feedback was positive. ▶ A letter will need to be sent to potential students explaining the registration process for the course. There is a need for another course that everyone will be able to access, such as Deans, CAOs and HR people.

7.b University Faculty: CTL and faculty development for doctoral education

In response to requests from the Graduate Council, CTL will review how it can best support the faculty development needs related to new doctoral programs. University faculty and administrators discussed what needs they felt these faculty might have. The group decided that the members present just don't know enough—about which doctoral programs are now available, and about which and how many faculty are teaching in them. Louise Mengelkoch suggested that we should take some type of survey to find out from the people who are teaching graduate courses, what kind of support they feel they need. Cathy and Linda F. discussed the 4 developing doctorate in nursing practice programs, and wondered whether centers for graduate students are needed. Linda Fuselier pointed out that other graduate programs have particular needs for support of faculty, e.g., the professional science master's degrees at MSUM. Lynda wondered whether our faculty, having been prepared for research and teaching careers, need some help in learning to prepare students for applied careers as professional practitioners.

►Lynda will arrange to meet with the graduate council and find out more about they have in mind, and will develop a questionnaire for response by graduate faculty about their particular needs and interests. In addition, in response to discussion about CTL's ability to support statewide faculty meetings within disciplines, CTL will promote RSP as a place and time available for university-only faculty to have conversations about teaching in their disciplines. RSP provides great facilities (with no classes taking place), free food, free parking, and collegiality among than 1,000 faculty from across the system.

8. Lunch and General Discussion

Lunchtime discussion allowed all to share what they learned in the sector discussions.

1:04pm Meeting Adjourned

- DeeGee Frenzel and Lynda Milne