Present: Kathy Albertson (Chair), Christine Draper, Hemchand Gossai, Stacey Kluge (ex officio), Daniel Rivera (ex officio), Sonya Shepherd, and Raleigh Way (ex officio) [Candace Griffith, Recorder]

Organizing Technology
Team members discussed the best tool to facilitate the committee’s online discussions (i.e., Sharepoint or Google Sites). Daniel volunteered to organize a Google Site for the Task Force and to integrate the documents currently stored on Sharepoint. He will give a short demonstration of Google Sites at the Friday meeting (October 21st). This method will make communication quicker and easier; as information is ready for final draft form, it will be stored on Sharepoint.

Goals for Today’s Meeting
Kathy set two goals for today’s meeting and distributed a framework for discussion (see handout):

1. Establish the due date for the gap analysis; and
2. Establish sub-committees.

In reading through the University’s Mission statement, members agreed that there currently does not exist a focused, concise statement on teaching that accurately reflects its value and importance at the University. It was suggested that the Task Force:

1. Develop a refined statement on teaching;
2. Develop a teaching ethos that would include desirable qualities of our faculty (e.g., civility in discourse); and
3. Define “teaching excellence.” What exactly is meant by teaching excellence and how do we know when we achieve it?

Also noted was the need to develop minimum teaching standards (e.g., the ability to develop appropriate college-level student learning outcomes, assess those outcomes, design instruction appropriately to achieve the outcomes, and reflect upon teaching and learning). How do we foster a culture where faculty will continue to pursue teaching excellence?

While members agreed that they cannot be prescriptive in their statements, they can be descriptive and set the parameters of a discourse on pedagogy at this institution.

Members briefly discussed how good teaching is currently defined/assessed at this institution. We rely heavily upon student ratings of instruction. To a lesser extent, faculty evaluations include peer evaluations, department chair evaluations, and upon request input from the Center for Teaching, Learning, and Scholarship. In defining teaching excellence, members also need to consider librarian faculty whose teaching effectiveness is measured by their daily activities.

Defining Teaching Excellence
To arrive at a potential definition, it was suggested that members first examine criteria used in the Award for Excellence in Contributions to Instruction. How do these criteria align with the University’s mission? Do recipients share common teaching attributes? Christine and Sonya volunteered to serve as a sub-committee to explore this approach.

A question was raised regarding whether we wish to conduct a survey of all faculty concerning their needs. In response, it was noted that someone should first go through the survey data we currently have and extract any information salient to the Task Force’s charge. Such an exercise will help to refine
what we might potentially ask in a survey of all faculty. Kathy noted that she will ask some of the absent committee members if they would like to work on this task.

Another suggestion was to explore how other colleges and universities define teaching excellence and see if there is a common core that we could use. Hemchand and Stacey volunteered to address this task.

Other ideas included what conferences like the Teaching Professor Conference (June 1\textsuperscript{st}-3\textsuperscript{rd}) and sites such as Merlot use as criteria for teaching excellence. Parker J. Palmer’s book, *The Courage to Teach: Exploring the Inner Landscape of a Teacher’s Life*, was suggested as a possible reference.

Daniel and Raleigh volunteered to research the National Educational Technology Standards (NETS) for minimal technology standards that teachers should utilize in their teaching as well as what exceptional technology use might look like.

**Timeline**

Members agreed to complete sub-committee assignments and report back to the full committee at the Friday, November 4\textsuperscript{th}, meeting (AD 2002, 10:30 a.m. – noon). A second meeting was scheduled for Thursday, December 8\textsuperscript{th} (AD 2002, 1 p.m. – 2:30 p.m.). The committee also agreed to complete the gap analysis for the mid-year report to the Provost (due January 1\textsuperscript{st}).

Adjourned: 4:35 p.m.

**Next meeting**

Friday, October 21\textsuperscript{st}, 10 a.m. – noon, AD 2002

Agenda:

1. Brief tutorial on Google Sites
2. Bring members absent from today’s meeting up-to-date
3. Discuss next steps