Minutes of the University Council on Teaching  
April 16 2003  
Bourneuf House

Present: Chris Hepburn, Fred Yen, Larry Ludlow, Sue Barrett, Theresa Hammond, Judith Vessey, Ellen Winner

The meeting began by approving the minutes of the last meeting and thanking Mary Joe Hughes for acting as Secretary for the March meeting.

The meeting was taken up by discussion of the Teaching, Advising, and Mentoring Grant program. The UCT is going to be in charge of this program starting in the fall. We reviewed the draft statement on these grants, and the application forms, both prepared by the TAM subcommittee. A number of wording changes were made. The forms and draft statement have been revised according to these suggestions and the revised statement and forms are attached along with these minutes.

We all agreed that it was a good idea to establish a new, small grants program in addition to the previously established larger TAM grants. The new program would likely have a large component of faculty development. We also agreed that the funds should be divided the first year with $120,000 allocated for the large grants, and $30,000 available for the small grants program. We could always move money from one pot to the other if the need arose.

We decided to the name the new small grants “TAME” grants for Teaching, Advising, and Mentoring Expense Grants, analogous to the Research Expense Grants.

The application for the larger TAM grants will be due to Chairs and the Deans in the Law School and GSSW on February 6, and to the committee by February 27, a date that we all agreed made sense. This way applicants will be notified in March. Applications for the TAME grants will be accepted once each semester, with suggested deadlines of September 26 and January 30.

We discussed whether for the smaller grants we could leave out the necessity of having deans involved in the recommendation process (except in the Law School and GSSW) and simply have the chairs sign off on and rank the grants. There was some discussion about whether the dean at the LSOE would want to not be involved. It was decided that Chris would simply ask Pat DeLeeuw her view about whether the deans need to be involved.

We discussed the fact that the TAM grants were not to be used just to support faculty development of new courses because this is considered to be what we are ordinarily expected to do as faculty members.
We agreed that $2,000 was the appropriate maximum amount to offer for the small grants and that the TAM grants would remain as they are at the current time with a maximum of up to $15,000.

We decided to include on the application for the TAME grants: “If requesting travel funds to a conference, please attach the conference brochure.”

In a year it is our hope to get the applications submitted on line.

We will post each year’s recipients on a website. Fred Yen was appointed to get a website set up for the UCT. This website will be under the AVP. Fred will try to get all of the old and no longer relevant application information on the TAM grants and the old forms off of the web. The membership of the committee and the fact that we are an advisory board to the AVP on faculty and teaching issues should be posted on the website. Sue Barrett will find out if we should also put information about the UCT and what we do in the faculty handbook.

We are going to need to keep or expand the TAM subcommittee since the UCT is taking over administration of the TAM grants program in the fall. We need someone to step in and take Chris’s position on the subcommittee and also to chair the UCT next fall since Chris will be on sabbatical in the fall of 2003. No one has yet stepped forward for either position.

This was our last meeting for the academic year 2002-3. Over the summer, Jack Neuhauser may email us the report on classroom space being prepared by Persus Rickies, and we should reply to him by email with our reactions. It is possible that he might try to convene a small meeting on this with whoever is around in the summer from our committee.

Next year we will be working on new initiatives for faculty development related to teaching; course evaluations; classroom space and technology.

Respectively submitted
Ellen Winner