

MINUTES OF THE UNIVERSITY COUNCIL ON TEACHING
Wednesday, April 28, 2010

Recorder: Colleen M. Griffith

Present: Suzanne Barrett, Pat DeLeeuw, Colleen Griffith, Chris Hepburn (Chair), Jackie Lerner, Paula Mathieu, Bob Murphy, Rita Olivieri, Virginia Reinberg, Akua Sarr, Pete Wilson

The minutes of the March meeting were accepted.

Chair Chris Hepburn asked for some initial responses to the first draft of the document on interdisciplinary teaching. UCT members liked the structure of the draft very much. All were asked to submit specific suggestions regarding it to Chris by email.

I. Update on TAMS and TAMES

There were many good proposals this year. Seventeen TAM and nine TAME proposals were submitted. 80% of what was requested was funded. Requests totaled approximately \$200,000 and \$162,000 of that was awarded. Gratitude was expressed to the 2010 Committee that reviewed the proposals.

II. Peer Review of Teaching

- A. What will enhance faculty review of teaching?
 - 1. Clear objectives with respect to teaching reviews
 - 2. More consistency across schools in this evaluative procedure.
 - 3. Greater empowerment of the Chairs in the process. In order to create a culture that values teaching, faculty ought to be receiving regular feedback on their course evaluations.

- B. How can faculty be mentored in a way that inspires excellence in teaching?
 - 1. Think about peer mentoring as something that spans one's full career. This would involve forms of peer teaching reviews prior to tenure and a system of reciprocal mentoring in the area of teaching following tenure. The latter would be more informal and non evaluative, though there would be departmental expectation that faculty continued to develop their teaching through syllabus swaps, visiting classes, having conversations about pedagogical strategies, etc.

2. Initiate more conversations about teaching in departments and schools. Imagine a Master Teacher Symposium.
 3. Demonstrate the University's commitment to good teaching through monetary teaching awards. While bad teaching carries professional consequences, good teaching is not rewarded sufficiently.
- C. What should teaching evaluation prior to tenure look like?
1. Teaching reviews should be spread out over the six years. When junior faculty are mentored yearly, they begin to understand that becoming a good teacher is a process.
 2. Peer review should amount to more than a pop in to one class. It ought to include conversation about syllabi, exams, expressed goals for the course, consideration of pedagogical strategies, etc.
 3. Junior faculty ought to be encouraged to observe great teachers across the University in order to fine tune their own teaching.
 4. Can videotaping we of help here? Might mentoring committees of three (teaching, research, service) be helpful in one's first six years?
- D. Specific suggestions for ongoing development
1. Include different types of questions regarding teaching in Faculty Updates.
 2. Think more about the kind of incentives that would foster good teaching.

Meeting adjourned at 1:30 p.m. The next UCT meeting will be held from 9:00 -10:30 a.m. on Thursday, May 20th.