

University Council on Teaching  
December 12 2003  
3:30-5 pm  
Minutes (recorded by Ellen Winner)

Present: Sue Barrett, Mary Hughes, Larry Ludlow, Alfred Yen, Ellen Winner

Jack Neuhauser's email response to our proposal for pilot freshman seminars was passed around. JN responded very positively and said he would fund faculty overloads for those faculty who teach these seminars Fall 04. He said that we needed to find someone to lead this pilot experiment, and suggested Jim Gips for the one credit course, and also suggested that this could be part of the TAM process. He also suggested that Clare Dunsford might run this under the Cornerstone umbrella.

Our job is to propose these seminars and to invite applications. We agreed that we would like to invite applications ASAP and think it might be practical to make this an addition to the TAM program.

We feel that it is not up to us to run this program, and we would like to find the appropriate organization at BC already concerned with the freshman year experience to run this (such as Father Marchese and Cornerstone). The organization that runs these pilots should perhaps be the one to review the applications.

Action: Fred will speak to Clare about this.

We decided on two kinds of pilot courses:

- 1 credit course for 10 weeks (esp. needed because science majors have no extra space in their schedules to take a 3 credit course); these courses meet for 1 hr 15 min a week and end just before the Thanksgiving break. They have short papers, short readings, and no finals. The major requirement is attendance.
- 3 credit course for entire semester. These are like regular courses.

In both, the faculty would teach on a subject of his/her choosing.

We decided not to argue for these to be core courses because that decision is up to the core program. Our objective is to encourage small freshman seminars on interesting topics, with the 3 credit ones being rigorous courses. Ultimately we hope that there can be 40 new freshman seminars, which would require something like 40 new professors and 80 million dollars. (NOTE: EW is not sure where these numbers came from but they were mentioned at the meeting.)

How would faculty be enticed to teach these? There is an overload cap of about \$5,000. Currently one credit seminars pay about \$3500 as overload pay, with a \$750 budget to take students out to dinner, concerts etc. Currently the replacement cost of a 3 credit

course is about \$4700. We discussed the possibility of JN making an exception and offering more than the overload pay for these courses. One possibility is to fund them as TAM grants. We even thought about the possibility of funding a TAM grant for the full \$15,000 for a faculty to teach a freshman seminar.

Action: Fred will talk to Jack and find out (1) how much is the current overload stipend for a 3 credit course; (2) whether we are restricted to this or can go higher; (3) whether the 1 credit course would pay the same for the faculty as the Cornerstone rate.

We discussed that if the pay goes higher, we will get more applications and can then be more selective.

We also discussed the possibility of using some of our retired teachers, those known to be great teachers.

Faculty could adapt courses they already teach and make them for students with no background.

Larry Ludlow asked what happened to our proposal for an advising center

Action: Fred will ask Clare (or her replacement for next year, Ourida Mostefai) about this.

Larry also asked what happened to the million dollar budget JN promised the UCT.

Action: Fred will ask Jack about this. Poor Fred—should we distribute some of these “actions?”

We next moved to the TAME grants. We funded the O’Leary/Fonti grant. We will not fund the other two because they are to fund RAs and for this faculty must apply to our URA program.

Action: Fred will change the TAME website to make clear this is not for RAships and is for faculty to develop new ideas about teaching.

#### Other issues

Larry would like to review the new classrooms. For ex the new Campion computer classroom should be evaluated. We should find out what our role is in planning new classrooms.

Bill Petri noted that the university is going to build two more lecture halls and Rita Owens is in charge of general campus technology. We should invite her to speak to us and tell her about the plans.

We agreed that we should be sent copies about plans for new classrooms and we would like these sent to us in the draft stage where there is room for our comments. These would come from Rita.

Action: Fred will contact Rita Owens about this.

Larry said that he would like to revive Andover weekends. Bill said this was a good mechanism for bringing faculty from different departments together.

At our next meeting, Sue will talk to us about her program on teaching designed to bring faculty together from across departments.

Reminder:

Tame grant applications are due Jan 26<sup>th</sup>; Tam grants (up to 15K) are due Feb 6)

Finally, Larry would like us to take up the issue of course evaluations. He would like the university to computerize them so faculty can track their own evaluations, access the data base and ask questions of it. The new Institutional Research officer should maintain this data base.

Action: Larry will present to us next time on the evaluations and what could be done with them were they to be computerized.

We agreed to meet more often than once a month next semester. Our goal is to meet every 3 weeks for one hour at noon, over lunch (either brown bag or supplied).

Action: Please email your spring schedule to Fred as soon as possible. Indicate the days on which you could meet from 12-1.