

Minutes of the University Council on Teaching  
March 19, 2003  
Bourneuf House

Present were Chris Hepburn, Sue Barrett, Theresa Hammond, Mary Joe Hughes, Larry Ludlow, Bill Petri, Ellen Winner, Fred Yen.

The meeting began by approving the minutes of the last meeting. Bill Petri observed that the classroom survey did not address the need for a large lecture hall or halls, and wishes it noted that the absence of this data from the survey does not mean that BC has no need for such classroom space or spaces.

The first major item of business was Draft 2 of the Advising Proposal drawn up on the basis of our recommendations by Chris Hepburn. We discussed the stated goal of accommodating 80% of the freshmen in advising cornerstone/ or faculty seminars. Some preferred that these courses be available to any freshmen interested, and some preferred that they be mandatory, but it was noted that a specific goal is practical for planning. We agreed to revise the draft to state the eventual goal of accommodating a substantial majority of the freshman class, such as 80%, in these seminars, reserving the possibility of eventually making them mandatory.

The simultaneous need for an AAC was again defended, on the ground that it would be able to supply advice to students needing it immediately, that it could coordinate advising seminars, and that it could bridge gaps in advising. It was agreed to incorporate into the document the need for both personal mentoring relationships between faculty and students and technical advising information that can be supplied by a center.

We also agreed to recommend that Adjunct faculty of long standing, whether full or part-time, might staff the freshman seminars.

During the course of our discussion on advising we also noted that both professors and students should be given more information at Orientation about advising seminars such as Cornerstone,. It was also recommended that when students choose a major, they should be assigned an advisor in that department immediately, and not the following semester.

We also discussed the desirability of three-credit faculty research seminars for freshmen, and hoped to consider that at a later time.

The UCT authorized Chris Hepburn to incorporate these revisions and pass along the document to Jack Neuhauser.

The second major item of business was a report from the subcommittee on Teaching, Advising, and Mentoring (TAM) grants by Larry Ludlow. He handed out a survey of the committee's findings, which noted many problems including vague wording about the purpose or requirements of the grants and many past submissions that seemed lightweight or deviant from the real intentions of the grants. The following were

the suggestions and comments to be considered in revising these grant applications and their rationale:

The need for a follow-up mechanism, since many applications involved projects that would require further resources to maintain.

The desirability of web-based applications, with models of strong grant applications online.

The need to state what the grant is NOT for: generally ordinary course preparation, unless it is to incorporate new techniques or technology.

The need to consider whether a TAM grant might be awarded to someone also receiving a research grant.

Could these grants also fund term-time faculty development for teaching?

The desirability of funding collaborations across schools.

We agreed that some of the money for the TAMs should fund smaller grants of about \$2000 for workshops or short courses designed to enhance teaching (similar to the research expense grants).

There was no report from the classroom space sub-committee. It was however noted that members of the UCT did not find the professional consultant's reasons for her stated goals and standards to be satisfactory or persuasive.

The third major item of business was a report from Sue Barrett about the Academic Development Center, its name soon to be changed to the Center for Teaching and Learning.

Specifically, she provided information about resources for instructional support for faculty at the center, and asked for our suggestions about proposed Faculty Learning Communities.

The basic idea was affirmed by various members of the committee, some suggesting once a month as a practical interval for meetings. Besides the ideas for such groups Sue outlined, members of the committee suggested faculty presenting their work, or interdisciplinary seminars based not just on topics related to teaching techniques but on cross-disciplinary subject matter. We also discussed the idea of faculty compensation for these communities, most in agreement that such compensation was desirable.

We set the next meeting for April 16 at 3 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Mary Joe Hughes