

Idaho State University  
**Council for Teaching and Learning**  
Minutes

Tuesday, November 10, 2009  
4:00 PM  
Faculty Senate Conference Room REND 301

In Attendance: Groome (Chair), Diedrich, Hill, Gee, Albright, Leung, Neill, Rhoads, Pearce,  
Wong  
Excused: Hertz, Enos, Turley-Ames  
Absent: Schou, Eley, Rudd  
Non-voting: Wallace (Recording Secretary)

1. Approval of Minutes from April 14, 2009, September 8, 2009 and October 13, 2009.

**ACTION:** Moved by Neill and seconded by Hill **to approve the minutes of** April 14, 2009, September 8, 2009 and October 13, 2009. No discussion. The motion **carried with unanimous approval and one abstention.**

2. Report from Sub-Committees and Discussion

a. **Recognition and Merit for Faculty Advising Activities -- Cindy Hill**

Cindy Hill reported on the group's meeting held October 21. The group discussed the following:

1. The differences between undergraduate and graduate student advising
2. The location of advising activities in official workload policy, noting that Tenure and Promotion documentation on the ISU campus currently lists these advising under Teaching Activities
3. The need for a general statement regarding the value of advising in the introduction to the University Workload Policy. To that end, Dr. Hill offered a statement to such as "Student advising will be recognized as a vital component of quality teaching."

Discussion:

Mark Neill noted that the ISU Provost has indicated that the administration feels it proper for each department on campus to develop and implement its own workload policy. This strategy might be in recognition of the diversity of types of activities and focus for the different departments on campus. For example, as Neill noted, the Education Department's clientele is strictly graduate students; their system for recognition of student advising is to assign points toward credit hours. Groome noted that a similar system was used in Biology except that all teaching activities, including advising, were on a point system such that credit hours were put into a rubric with sections taught, number of students, etc. Similarly graduate student mentoring and graduating were in a rubric. All teaching activities are summed into a point system.

Solomon Leung noted that the Engineering Department in the past did not recognize graduate student advising in terms of workload, and advising graduate students is much different than advising undergraduates. He felt that it was important to get information from other departments with respect to their methodology of merit recognition for both undergraduate and graduate student advising.

Hill said that her committee was charged with developing a broad, general University-wide statement that advising is considered a valuable part of teaching activity and faculty participation in advising is expected.

Neill said that advising graduate students can sometimes be considered as an actual class for theses and dissertations, or as mentoring. Groome said the Biology Department has course listings as THESIS which are obligatory. Neill opined that advising should not just be recognized but also rewarded.

Hill replied that the reward for advising is built into the system of evaluations and promotions we undertake at ISU: yearly evaluations, tenure, and promotion.

Neill asked whether faculty in different departments at ISU are contributing equally to advising and whether discrepancies of quantity are addressed (or is it just YES a faculty member is advising or NO). Groome said that in Biology, with advising at a table in the departmental foyer, staffing of the advising table is generally done by no more than 25% of the department in any given semester.

Hill noted that there exist major discrepancies in the fact that in most departments only a few faculty members are doing the bulk of the advising. JoAnne Pearce noted that in her department, with limited faculty, each was given an equal number (33% of 75) of students to advise.

General discussion followed on whether or not ALL faculty should be expected to contribute equally to advising at ISU, with no general consensus at this time for the CTL. Some points noted here:

- Diedrich opined that distribution of a labor should be valued such that faculty members doing research and with active grants might not be expected to spend as much time advising as others.
- Groome noted that in response to the Provost's directive, the biology department was contemplating the downgrading of the minimum number of points in the area of service. This point was offered in response to the question of whether advising is considered a Teaching or a Service Activity. If Service is to be downgraded in the Workload Policy this point becomes even more important with respect to the statement suggested by the Advising Merit and Recognition sub-committee that Advising activity should be considered a valuable element of faculty work.

Hill asked what task her sub-committee should be engaged in next with the completion of this statement for Workload Policy. Groome replied that the work of this committee to come up with a statement was a good accomplishment, and that this sub-committee should take today's discussion of issues as information useful in the continuing development of their product.

**b. Advising Strategies – Sub-committee leader Mark Neill**

Neill reported that their subcommittee had met twice and has examined regional information from other institutions regarding advising mechanisms, etc. and also utilized the information from the work of an intern at ISU several years ago comparing advising mechanisms nationally. The goal was to extract useful information from institutions of similar size, demographics, rural status and the like to Idaho State University.

In the first meeting the subcommittee members focused on improving the ISU website by having each member come up with one or more “cool things” they observed on websites from other universities, and discussed some common features for potential utilization here.

In the second meeting the members discussed possible templates on which to base institution level information, resources for faculty, special opportunities for Native Americans, veterans, and other groups.

**c. Phase III Activities –Sub-committee leader Jim Groome**

Groome reported that the Phase III task force under the direction of the Curriculum Council had not yet been formed but that the Charge to that end had just been delivered to that Council, to the Council for Teaching and Learning and to the Academic Standards council. Groome read the essential elements of this charge to the committee members and it is reiterated in its entirety below:

“The Faculty Senate also charges the Chairs of the Curriculum Council, Academic Standards Council, and Council for Teaching and Learning to form a General Education Review Task Force to address Phase III of the 11/10/08 charge by undertaking four tasks: 1) re-draft and implement a survey to faculty regarding how the objectives map into the general education needs of the specific academic unit; 2) collect and analyze the data from the survey, seeking especially the manner in which the objectives (in the view of the academic units/stakeholders) are met with the existing 12 general education goals; 3) develop recommendations based on the analysis; and 4) project a timeline for the project to be completed, with an end target date of March 15, 2010. Dr. Ken Trimmer, chair of the Curriculum Council, and Dr. Kandi Turley-Ames from the Office of Academic Affairs shall co-chair the General Education Review Task Force. Members shall consist of two faculty members from each Council plus one or two other faculty members who possess the necessary expertise to assist in developing the survey.”

**5. Adjournment: 5:03 p.m.**

The next Council meeting was tentatively scheduled for 4:00 PM, **Tuesday, December 8, 2009.**

Respectfully submitted,

Jim Groome, Chair  
Council for Teaching and Learning

Catherine Wallace  
Administrative Assistant  
Faculty Senate

Approved by Council for Teaching & Learning: December 8, 2009  
Accepted by Faculty Senate: December 14, 2009