

Idaho State University
Council for Teaching and Learning
Minutes

Tuesday, December 8, 2009
4:00 PM
Faculty Senate Conference Room REND 301

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

1. Approval of Minutes from Nov 10, 2009.

ACTION: Moved by Rhoads and seconded by Neill **to approve the minutes of** November 10, 2009. No discussion. The motion **carried with unanimous approval and two abstentions.**

2. Report from Sub-Committees and Discussion

Advising Strategies, Committee leader Joanne Hertz

Hertz reported that their sub-committee has looked at the ways other institutions comparable to ISU have developed advising strategies. Neill noted that he has engaged a graduate student in developing a project to design and develop a website template for advising, and that the current website is undergoing revisions.

The committee will examine best practices to see what the website should look like, possibly formatted by sections for different types of students (graduate, undergraduate, parents, international) and subsections for specialty interest groups for example military. Neill said that the group will have a brainstorming session to “spreadsheet” these ideas on paper. Finally, it was noted that University Relations will be asked to help with final revisions to insure that the website proposed by the group contains the elements ISU wants and that the format is consistent with other ISU websites.

Recognition and Merit for Faculty Advising Activities, Sub-committee member Solomon Leung

Leung noted that his group has not met in the interim between CTL meetings

Phase III Activities, Sub-committee leader Jim Groome

Groome said that his group has not met in the interim between CTL meetings. He noted that at the last Advisory Council meeting, the timetable for Phase III activities and the task of this group was raised. Groome said that the response from the chair of the Curriculum Council was that the timetable proposed by the Faculty Senate was too soon and that the Phase III task force was not yet ready to engage in this activity.

Therefore, it was said that a productive use of time for the CTL sub-committee in the interim might be to have these members meet to discuss the history of Gen Ed revisions to come up to speed on the questions at hand for Phase III activities.

Turley-Ames noted that the stickler detected by the Curriculum Council (and reported to the Advisory Council at their last meeting) was that there currently is no mention of diversity in the General Goals and Learning Objectives (Phase II). That council felt this aspect to be important and should be included, (Groome) an idea generally supported by those in attendance at that Advisory Council meeting.

Groome asked if the members of the CTL would like the Gen Ed materials distributed, and the response was to let this sub-committee examine them first.

General Discussion

The question of the nature of the task for the Advising Merit and Recognition came up (what outcome is expected?). Responses included:

Groome - this activity of the sub-committee should be viewed as an ongoing process incorporating ideas from discussions of the CTL, with the goal of producing a document addressing the nature of “credit” or “recognition” into the ongoing development of the University Workload Policy.

Hertz – the subcommittee should examine what other institutions have in place with regards to the recognition and merit for advising activities.

Schou – raised the question of the need for recognition for advising. Provided the example of her college’s accreditation requiring all faculty to participate in advising of students.

Leung noted that graduate student advising takes considerably more time and should be recognized as very different from undergraduate student advising.

Groome said that departments at ISU may do a good job of distributing the advising workload among their faculty, at present. However, one thing to consider is the current proposals to remodel the academic infrastructure at ISU with some of these proposals removing department heads completely – what effect will this have on advising recognition? Who is in charge of that? Issues like this should at least be mentioned to the groups making these proposals or implementing them.

Leung said that summer registration is required for students doing research, but advisors (often faculty members on 9-month contracts) get no credit for mentoring students officially enrolled at that time. Groome noted that issues like this point out the need for documentation from the various units / departments at ISU as well as from other universities as to how they view and how they recognize advising activities. The point system of assigning credit for advising activities (one used by Biology but not universally at ISU) was debated.

Pearce mentioned that Provost Olson told the Faculty Senate that each department would have responsibility for developing policies for advising. Her program, Nursing, has many resources available that detail how specific advising activities are worth X amount of credit.

Groome noted that the workload policy may be appropriate but needs CTL’s input.

Turley-Ames stated that the general expectation is that University workload policy in general is to be followed by individual departments.

Hertz raised that point that faculty possess varying degrees of talent in advising. Should all faculty be expected to share in advising workload equally?

The last several points were followed by general discussion regarding inconsistencies (for advising workload and recognition) at the University, College and Department levels.

Some comments from that discussion included:

Pearce – Provost Olson told Faculty Senate that flexibility in Workload Policy should allow active researchers more time for that set of activities.

Leung – it is important that the administration does not micro-manage departmental policy, but that they do make sure that the university recognizes advising.

Neill stated that this Council should make an emphatic statement to the point that advising activities should be both recognized AND rewarded, and that these need to be incorporated into the official policies and practices of the university.

At the conclusion of the discussion Hertz noted an opportunity for faculty training in advising as Dr. Jennifer Bloom of the University of South Carolina has offered to visit ISU and might be able to meet with this Council. She indicated a willingness to waive her usual consulting fee and come if ISU pays her travel expenses.

5. Adjournment: 5:08 p.m.

The next Council meeting was tentatively scheduled for 4:00 PM, **Tuesday, January 12, 2010.**

Respectfully submitted,

Jim Groome, Chair, Council for Teaching and Learning
Catherine Wallace, Administrative Assistant 1, Faculty Senate

Approved by Council for Teaching and Learning: January 12, 2010

Accepted by Faculty Senate: January 25, 2010