Teaching and Advising Committee
Minutes
9 October 2017

Phinney 102 Conference Room
Present: Stephan Flores (Chair), Allan Caplan, Erin Chapman, Karen Launchbaugh, Matt Doumit, Carlos Vazquez, and also Joana Espinoza.

Stephan called the meeting to order at 12:32 p.m.

The Minutes of the meeting of September 25 were approved, with abstentions from those who were not able to attend that meeting.

After review and discussion of the proposed changes to the committee’s functions and structure, the committee approved those revisions (Erin/Matt, M/S) unanimously.

Update addition to these minutes on these revisions to TeAC’s functions: following the meeting, Stephan had second thoughts about removing function A-7, and he sent the following request by email to the committee:

[19 October 2017]:
“Dear TeAC members,

I have had second thoughts on deleting Function A-9 and would like to keep it (now renumbered to A-7) and to get your approval of this by reply email, if you agree.

As I have worked through the formal track changes to the revisions/deletions for the committee’s functions and structure that were approved at the last meeting, and as I have worked on filling out the cover sheet rationale for these changes,

I have realized reservations about having deleted Function A-9—the function that has to do with the committee’s role in advising on hardware and software for teaching, advising, and mentoring. I think this is a proper and important role for the committee, and I’m not sure why I so hastily suggested that we delete it!

Therefore, I have retained that function, pending your approval by email vote—please see ASAP the attached cover sheet and the track changes version of the revisions to the committee’s functions and structure, and

I wonder if you agree to retaining this Function A-9 (now A-7)—and agree to a email reply/vote on this issue, so that I can forward the cover sheet and track changes version to Faculty Senate in time for consideration of these changes.”

Allan, Erin, Helen, Karen, and Matt replied to the query, to express approval for retaining function A-7—there were no dissenting votes. Please see attached/appended PDFs of the Cover Rationale and the Track Changes Version of the approved revisions to TeAC’s functions and structure—these were forwarded to Faculty Senate.

It is also important to note that several committee members expressed strong concern over both the need to retain the committee’s review and oversight function on advising and also the prime example of a recent failure of the committee to be consulted on advising, namely the implementation that is underway, about the Starfish system as well as substantial restructuring of advising at the university. In the words of one member: “If that is in effect now [Function A-9/A-7], then someone has been ignoring it, I think. Otherwise we would have been involved in accepting/defending the Starfish software. My concern is that if no one will share decisions with us, then we also shouldn’t accept co-responsibility for failures we couldn’t prevent.”
The committee also reviewed and approved additional revisions to the wording in letters that will be sent to nominees for the Teaching Excellence and the Hoffman Awards, and conferred with Joana about the revisions as well as about any restrictions for who is eligible to apply for these awards.

There are no restrictions on the Teaching Excellence award, so the committee conferred with Joana so that the language on the website makes this clear, as follows: The Excellence in Teaching Award was established in 1990 and is available to full-time, board-appointed teaching faculty and includes one $5,000 award and up to two $2,500 awards. Tenured, Clinical, Research, and Instructor faculty are eligible to be nominated for this award.

Revisions to the wording of the letters sent to nominees were approved unanimously (Matt/Allan, M/S).

As for the Hoffman award, part of our conversation was to consider shifting the criteria for nomination for the Hoffman award from nontenured tenure-track faculty to some kind of broader, inclusive designation of an early career (six years or fewer at UI) award, that would include non-tenure-track clinical faculty and instructors. This would match the breadth of the Teaching Excellence awards, which are not restricted to professorial/tenured faculty but open as well to all teaching faculty (except for nontenured tenure-track faculty). Given the relatively tight time frame for soliciting nominations for the award, as well as some uncertainty about the history of the award that produced its current focus on nontenured tenure-track faculty, Joana would like to do some more research and to defer moves to broaden the award at this time.

The meeting adjourned at 12:31 p.m.

Next meeting:
When: 12:30 p.m. -1:25 p.m. Monday October 30, 2017
Where: Phinney 102
Agenda item: follow up on October 19 and following email exchange and request from Dale Pietrzak about whether TeAC’s perspectives on whether to continue the transition to the intended, concise final form of the revised teaching evaluation form.

Minutes submitted respectfully by Stephan Flores.
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1640.87
TEACHING AND ADVISING COMMITTEE
[Substantially revised in 7-05, 7-06, 10-17]

A. FUNCTION. This committee will serve in an advisory capacity to the Vice Provost of Academic Initiatives. The specific functions of this committee are: [rev. 7-08, ed. 7-09]

A-1. To promote a faculty and administrative culture dedicated to the enhancement of teaching and advising.

A-2. To advise and assist in organizing university-wide forums, seminars, and capacity building programs that introduce new innovations or share proven ways to promote the enhancement of teaching and advising.

A-3. To review and make recommendations concerning policies and procedures, which affect teaching, advising, and the assessment of student learning outcomes.

A-4. To monitor the processes and content of Student Teaching Evaluations and Student Learning Outcomes, and to advise on the design/content of reports to the Vice Provost, Faculty Senate, Deans, Unit Leaders, and Faculty. [ed. 7-09]

A-5. To review and make recommendations concerning the annual orientation activities for new faculty, which sets out among other things the role of, and expectations for, faculty and staff that teach, advise, and mentor students.

A-6. To publicize awards, review proposals, and select recipients for the Teaching and Advising Excellence Awards.

A-7. To work in conjunction with Faculty Senate’s Information Technology Committee to advise the director of CETL and the Director of ITS on electronic hardware and software needs to support teaching, advising, and mentoring. [ed. 7-08, 7-09]

B. STRUCTURE. Six faculty members, some of whom have received university-level teaching and advising awards, an associate dean or college level advisor, a departmental staff advisor, the director of general education, an undergraduate or graduate student, non-voting members from the Office of Instructional Effectiveness and Accreditation, University Advising Services, and the Director of the Center for Excellence in Teaching & Learning, or designee. [rev. 7-08, ed. 7-12]