Committee on Excellence in Teaching Meeting  
September 12, 2014  
Von der Ahe 236  

Present: Wendy Binder (Chair), Chris Finlay, Laurel Franzen, Dorothea Herreiner, Olga Moraga, Beth Serlin, Brad Stone  

Meeting commenced at 1:45pm  
Meeting adjourned at 3:00pm  

1. Roundtable introductions.  
2. CET reviewed the minutes from the previous CET meeting, which occurred on April 28, 2014. If Wendy and/or Dorothea would like to make any changes to the minutes, they will notify Bianca.  
   a. It was suggested to hold an electronic vote to approve minutes from the last CET meeting of each academic year shortly after the meeting.  
3. CET discussed the Adjunct Faculty Award.  
   a. The Provost approved funds to enhance part-time faculty teaching effectiveness. The Provost designated Dorothea the task of creating a process for awarding these funds beginning in spring 2015. It is not clear whether the Adjunct Faculty Award is part of this. It is also not clear what the available budget is.  
   b. To advance the award proposal further, a senator for the Faculty Senate suggested for the CET to draft a formal process for the award that includes more specific guidelines.  
      i. It was suggested to keep the guidelines simple in order to encourage applications.  
   c. CET members offered suggestions for adjunct faculty development:  
      i. Professional development;  
      ii. Videotaped peer reviews;  
      iii. Syllabi development;  
         1. Part-time faculty members are introduced to syllabi development during the Part-Time Faculty Orientation (attendees receive honorariums).  
         2. It was suggested to hold a Course Design Workshop for adjunct faculty before the start of classes. Dorothea would need assistance in moderating the workshops. Additionally, part-time faculty members would need to receive stipends since they will not be in Payroll’s system at the time.  
      iv. Mentorship with seasoned faculty in respective departments;  
         1. Deena Gonzalez currently offers stipends for mentorship of new tenure-line faculty. Dorothea will gather more information from Deena  
   d. Dorothea will draft a version of the Adjunct Faculty Award form and guidelines for the next meeting based on the proposal  
   e. The discussion regarding the Adjunct Faculty Award is tabled for the next meeting.  
4. CET discussed the status of the Burns Committee.  
   a. The Burns Committee is now a part of the Faculty Awards Committee. The Faculty Awards Committee will also award the Rains Research and Service awards.
b. It is unclear whether the Faculty Awards Committee or the CET would administer any possible Adjunct Faculty Award.

c. Wendy will email Jennifer Pate, the President of the Faculty Senate, to inform her that she is happy to meet with her to discuss the Burns award selection process and how to encourage applications.

5. CET discussed the report from the Academic Honesty Code Task Force.
   a. The Academic Honesty Code Task Force delivered a short report at the end of the spring semester indicating that they hope to have completed their work by the end of the fall semester. It is the CET’s understanding that the CET will provide feedback on the final report. Wendy is going to email Jennifer Pate for details.

6. CET discussed the draft proposal to create a CTE advisory board.
   a. The committee should discuss the pros and cons of having a CTE advisory board. Specifically, the CET should distinguish the dividing lines between the committee and the advisory board.
   b. A CTE advisory board does have the potential to benefit the long-term structure of the CTE by being a forceful advocate and support of CTE interests.
   c. Since the CET spends a lot of time reviewing CTE grants and has less time for general teaching policy matters, it could hand over that duty to the CTE advisory board.
   d. CET assumes that a future teaching committee will concentrate on broader issues related to teaching. Currently, there is no general faculty input on teaching policies and conditions at LMU (i.e., technology, Echo 360, lighting in classrooms). With the creation of a CTE advisory board, the CET would have the opportunity to focus on policies and conditions.
   e. It was suggested for the CET to formulate a position for the tasks assigned to the CET, tasks assigned to the CTE advisory board, and points of overlap.
      i. Brad will make a suggestion for CTE advisory board’s duties and roles based on his experience with the Honors Program Board and best practices for advisory boards in that area and coordinate with Dorothea for a draft for the next meeting.
      ii. Wendy will create a draft of the CET’s duties and roles for the next meeting. Wendy will send her draft to Laurel and Beth for feedback.

   a. TELIG is focusing on creating a more systematic process for online courses and programs, such as a course approval process for online classes, workshops for faculty support, and standards for program review. Policy suggestions will be shared with the larger community in the near future for feedback.
   b. The issue of intellectual property is a major and challenging concern that the committee will discuss further in the near future. TELIG is trying to promote awareness of this issue among the faculty.

8. CET discussed CTE announcements and issues.
   a. The 2014-2015 Master Teachers have been announced.
   b. The CTE is hosting an event on 9/26, titled “Learning – Games – Fun – Drinks.” The event will focus on games in the classroom.
   c. The deadline for the Teaching Innovation Grant is October 17th. There is an upcoming Travel Grant deadline on October 31st.
   d. There was a suggestion for the creation of more teaching awards.

9. Next meeting: Friday, October 17th from 1:30pm to 3:30pm in VDA 236.