Analysis of Student Ratings of Instruction (Laura Frost)
Laura summarized her report, Analysis of Student Ratings of Instruction (SRI) (submitted November 16, 2011). She reported that the current SRI instrument was written by the institution, which is not considered best practice; however, the instrument was validated, which is best practice. As a result of her review, Laura recommended that the current instrument be updated to reflect changes which have occurred in pedagogy since 2000, when the current SRI was developed.

Another suggestion was to base the SRI on the Seven Principles of Good Undergraduate Education.

It was also noted that the SRI should make it clear to students that they play a critical role in their learning and the overall success of the course. It is not entirely the faculty member’s responsibility.

Finally, it was indicated that SRIs do not, in and of themselves, help a faculty member achieve teaching excellence. The results of SRIs require reflection and study, perhaps even discussion with staff members from the CTLS.

Questions and Concerns
The following questions and concerns were noted by team members.

- Are we re-inventing something that has already been done before?
- If we combine the 3 C’s, where will it be housed, and are there resources to make this happen?
- How can we ensure that teaching excellence is maintained when research expectations are increasing—especially when we are relying more heavily on lecturers and TAs?
- What can we articulate about the Task Force’s findings to date, changes that can be made now, and how to avoid duplication?
- How can we get buy-in for the Task Force’s charge from all campus constituencies?
- How can we promote these services once put in place so that all constituencies are aware of them?
- Do we need to regain our focus for the Task Force? Can we have a restatement of the Task Force’s charge at each meeting?
- Similarly, do we need to reach consensus on what the Task Force’s charge means to each team member to ensure that we are all interpreting the charge similarly?
- How can we overcome the most glaring gap which is a total lack of instructional technology support on campus?
- How can we get to the organization and leadership of a consolidated 3 C and ensure that it falls under the Division of Academic Affairs?
- How can we create incentives among tenured and tenure-track faculty to achieve teaching excellence when they are faced with competing demands for their time and are rewarded more heavily for performance in other areas?
- Can we build in recommendations to our report that may go beyond the scope of the Task Force?

Structure of 3 C’s (Organizationally)
The handout, 3C Organization and Restructure, created a visual that summarizes the function of each center, the current gaps, staffing, and common needs. It was agreed that this handout will serve as the
foundation for the mid-year report to the Provost. In the ensuing discussion, several other additional gaps were noted. These are as follows:

- Need more instructional service coordinators in the CTLS area.
- Need greater faculty involvement in the CTLS area.
- Need to expand the CTLS function specifically into online areas.
- Need video production services dedicated to the functional areas of these three units.
- Need an academic voice, advocacy, for instructional technology (e.g., MIT U-Tube videos that market majors and faculty).
- Need to create an environment where these three center functionalities can “rub antennae.”
- Need to create a vehicle for serving staff and student instructional technology needs.
- Need to create a COL functionality for face-to-face instruction.
- Need to provide each college with its own instructional technology specialist (MEd degree).
- Need to develop a policy to mandate communication and collaboration among the 3 C functional areas.
- Need to have a Faculty Senate standing committee on Instructional Technology and technology related issues.

Next Steps
It was agreed that Candace and Kathy would begin to draft the mid-year report using Google Docs so that all team members could contribute toward the mid-year report. This report will use the information covered in today’s meeting to identify the functional needs and corresponding staffing needs to meet those functions as well as propose an organizational structure for housing such a center. Team members should contribute their suggestions to the Google Docs document by the end of this semester. Candace and Kathy will finalize the first week of January and submit to the Provost for his review.

Adjourned: 2:45 p.m.

Next meeting: TBD

Agenda: Recap progress and achievements to date.