President Brooks Keel convened the meeting by charging the Teaching Legacy Task Force as follows:

1. review the missions and current organizational structures of the Center for Teaching, Learning and Scholarship (CTLS), the Center for Online Learning (COL), and the Center for Academic Technology Support (CATS) and recommend a new support structure/mission to support and ensure continued teaching excellence as the University evolves; and
2. preserve the institution’s strong teaching ethos by creating a foundation for a long-standing committee to be the representative voice of Georgia Southern’s faculty and their teaching needs.

According to Provost Moore, the role of the Provost’s Office is to support the team. For instance, the team may wish to visit other “stellar” Centers for Excellence in Teaching. The Provost’s Office will fund that travel. Likewise, the team may wish to invite speakers in to address teaching excellence. Again, the Provost’s Office will handle the expense and logistics. (The Provost encouraged the team to coordinate any speaker invitations with the Campus Life Enrichment Committee to benefit the entire academic community.)

In their deliberations, the Provost encouraged the team to think big and not be constrained by budgetary or space issues. In essence, the team needs to identify the type and level of support that all Georgia Southern faculty need to preserve and promote teaching excellence.

Expectations for the team include the following:

1. a mid-year report, summarizing where the study stands and what the team’s current thoughts are; and
2. by the end of the academic year, a white paper that identifies a structure that best supports teaching excellence at Georgia Southern.

The Provost concluded his comments by encouraging the team to take care of a couple of housekeeping items.

1. Does the team wish to have a record of minutes?
2. Should the team elect a chair or coordinator to lead the effort?

Discussion

Question: Where do the Centers see the gaps in their units? What is currently lacking? Where are the overlaps?

The Provost responded by noting that the team’s initial efforts should be spent conducting an in-depth gap analysis. This analysis should involve discussions with the entire academic community (e.g., Faculty Senate) and most likely will take the first half of the fall semester to complete.

1 Recorder’s note: see [http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/gap-analysis.html](http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/gap-analysis.html). According to the Business Dictionary.com, a gap analysis is “a technique for determining the steps to be taken in moving from a current state to a desired future-state. Gap analysis consists of (1) listing of characteristic factors (such as attributes, competencies, performance levels) of the present situation (‘what is’), (2) cross listing factors required to achieve the future objectives (‘what should be’), and then (3) highlighting the gaps that exist and need to be filled.”
COL’s noted gap: “No front door” for faculty. Functionality is broken down into three separate silos. Another comment echoed the difficulty accessing resources by noting the steps needed to find some of the Centers on the institution’s website.

CATS’ noted gap: The Center focuses solely on technology. Technology and pedagogy are intertwined and need to be considered, evaluated, and discussed together. While COL handles both, the Center is only for those faculty teaching online courses.

CTLS’ noted gap: The focus is on pedagogy and not technology, and the amount of time spent on pedagogical support is diffused by the large number of administrative responsibilities the Center handles.

**Question:** Do we need a forward looking approach that anticipates the present and future needs of faculty as the institution continues to evolve? For instance, as more faculty time is spent researching, shouldn’t we invest in our graduate teaching assistants and lecturers pedagogical support?

The University of Central Florida was cited as the best model for online support. This model could serve as a basis for building Georgia Southern’s, making ours much more inclusive to all types of teaching.

**Question:** Under the current setup, how do we encourage research on technology support when it is mostly separated from pedagogy?

**Question:** Should we not also consider answering “what is the University’s teaching ethos?” How is it constituted? How do the Centers contribute to and strengthen the teaching ethos? Isn’t the first step to (1) define the teaching goals of the faculty, and then (2) configure a structure to best meet those goals?

**Question:** Have any surveys been done that capture teaching ethos or level of support needed?

- Faculty Survey of Student Engagement (FSSE)
- COL survey
- CTLS survey
- Doctoral Research University conversations
- Academic program review (http://academics.georgiasouthern.edu/provost/resources/comprehensivereview, see last bullet Completed Program Reviews)
- Colleges’ strategic plans

It was agreed that each Center would upload to the Sharepoint site (https://sharepoint.georgiasouthern.edu/VPAA/ap/tlt/Shared%20Documents/Forms/AllItems.aspx) their mission statements, activities, and related surveys. Candace will upload the DRU conversations as well as the current program review guidelines and rubric.

By October 7th, all team members should have checked-in to the Sharepoint site to review posted documents and contribute any comments under discussion. Kathy will also work toward scheduling another face-to-face meeting.

Adjourned: 5:05 p.m.