Present: Kathy Albertson (Chair), Christine Draper, Teresa Flateby, Laura Frost, Hemchand Gossai, Stacey Kluge, John O’Malley, Daniel Rivera, Chris Thompson, Lisa Vance, Raleigh Way, Mark Yanochik, and Candace Griffith (Recorder)

Outline of White Paper
It was agreed to set a May 21st deadline for submission of the white paper.

Moving forward, Kathy asked members to focus on the recommendations for the white paper. What are we recommending and why? Include a rationale with your recommendations.

Subcommittee Reports
Stacy reported on the faculty teaching awards subcommittee. Awards for excellence in teaching appear to be treated equally as those for the scholarship of teaching and learning, but the highest award amounts are provided for awards which connect the two activities. It is recommended that more awards be given at higher amounts. [Do we need to define the 'type' of award recommended, i.e., teaching excellence and/or SoTL? Do we have any evidence on how teaching awards stack up against those provided for research and service?]

John reported on the workload subcommittee. It was noted that the CATS’ mission statement appeared to be quite broad and unfocused. Some of the activities performed by that group fit well with the mission, while others less so. Seventy to 80% of CATS activities are non-instructional. The findings generated the following question. Should one of the recommendations be that CATS re-visit its mission? How strongly should this recommendation be phrased? It was suggested that the recommendation define the level of support needed and then invite CATS to discuss the possibility of serving in this role. Another possibility is recommending positions be moved from CATS to the newly formed combined center. If CATS is not amendable, we would need to fold these positions into our request for support as new positions needed.

Based upon the workload report, the question was raised whether SoTL is a good fit for the combined center, especially running the conference. How does that administrative function support faculty? It was argued that this function supports best practices in teaching.

In additional discussion, it was recommended that the mission of the other two centers be re-visited as well—especially if we merge functionalities into a combined center. The mission must reflect the desired outcomes.

Announcements
CTLS is exploring offering a Provost-sponsored semiannual or annual teaching lecture series which would bring a renowned teaching expert to campus. Another possible activity is developing an internal teaching and learning conference to promote sharing of best practices within our academic community.

Kathy reported on Complete College Georgia, and how, under this initiative, it will be imperative to preserve the quality of teaching and learning. Members were asked to think about how this initiative (RPG) related to our recommendations. Kathy also added that centers should stay more in tune with the politics of higher education to better serve the institution; for instance, being familiar with Complete College Georgia will help centers design workshops and discussions as well as make plans to aid faculty and programs that address the immediate needs/missions of the university as a whole. This currency of
information will lend credibility and value to the centers; chairs will be more willing to use the centers when they see direct relationships to enhancement of their departments.

Hybrid courses were discussed and the possibility of utilizing a “train the trainer” model. Similarly, it was asked how the COL student call center relates to the COL mission. Originally, when COL was established, it was anticipated that there would be a high volume of interest in fully online degree programs. COL was designated as ‘the unit’ to handle all things related to fully online degree programs, including answering questions from prospective students and following-up with them. Kathy also explained that Complete College Georgia was looking at how instruction can be delivered in innovative ways to reach a variety of populations who need degrees and certifications.

It was noted that the white paper needs to include recommendations related to international faculty, particularly in developing support structures to help international faculty improve their teaching and communication skills. One possibility might be hosting a “welcome fair” where departments play a heavy role in explaining their “culture.”

Candace will email members the High Impact Matrix. Kathy asked members to work on the matrix over the next two weeks, providing the requested information.

In conclusion, members discussed the need to define the University’s teaching legacy. We need to be able to define it for the white paper as well as indicate how we will measure it. Otherwise, we will never know if we are successful in “preserving” our legacy. Part of the recommendation may be recommending the type of institution we should be—one that values teaching. How will that fit with the President’s research mission? Can we define our teaching legacy from alumni surveys? Kathy will investigate whether the alumni surveys address this issue. Members should continue to discuss via Google Docs over the next two weeks.

Adjourned: 3:40 p.m.

Next meeting: in two weeks, TBA