Committee on Excellence in Teaching  
September 13, 2013  
Center for Teaching Excellence Classroom, University Hall 3030

Present: Marta Baltodano, Wendy Binder, Laurel Franzen, Anna Harrison, Dorothea Herreiner, Vanessa Newell

Excused: Damon Willick

Meeting commenced at 1:13 p.m.
Meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

1. CET reviewed the minutes from the previous CET meeting. The committee decided not to officially accept the minutes since they are incomprehensible.

2. There was a discussion regarding the CET bylaws.
   a. Two revisions were suggested by the Committee on Committees. The Faculty Senate approved the bylaws with revisions.
      i. The Chair’s three-year term was changed to a one-year term in order to disentangle committee membership as a Chair and as a committee member.
         1. **Motion**: CET approves changing the term of the Chair to one year. Approved – unanimous.
      ii. The term “non-voting” was added to describe ex-officio members. There is currently a trend at LMU for bylaws of all committees to explicitly make ex-officio members non-voting members.
         1. Wendy B. will ask the Chair of the Committee on Committees for a rationale behind making ex-officio members non-voting. Wendy B. will then email the rationale to the committee members and call for an electronic vote.

3. CET discussed the suggestion to have student members on the CET.
   a. **Motion**: Due to the confidentiality of grant and similar discussions at almost all meetings, the CET does not find it practical to have student representatives on the committee. Approved – unanimous.

4. There was a discussion regarding travel grant applications.
   a. Four faculty members submitted travel grant applications for the committee’s review.
   b. The CET Director had sent out an email inviting people to indicate interest in two conferences in the spring/summer 2014 – the Lilly Conference Newport Beach and Reacting to the Past. She has also asked for those interested in attending issotl 13 and POD 2013 to submit travel grant applications by 9/18. The deadline for all other travel grant application for the Academic Year 2013-2014 is November 1st.
   c. Jeffrey Phillips and Jeremy McCallum are requesting travel grants for issotl. Although NSF is providing some of the funds, registration and lodging are not included (total of just over $1,500 for the two grants).
   d. The overall budget for travel grants this year is about $6,000 (although the budget may increase). Separate funds have been set aside for the Reacting to the Past and Lily West conferences, so that regular travel grant applications can be considered independently at the deadlines during the academic year.
i. If CET approves the grant requests submitted by Jeff Phillips and Jeremy McCallum, then the budget for the applications in November will be reduced by up to $1,520; issotl is a conference that CET wants to support.
e. One travel grant application for issotl was a late submission (1/20) and lacked the required signatures regarding other funding opportunities in the department and college/school.
f. **Motion:** CET approves the travel grants submitted by Jeffrey Phillips and Jeremy McCallum. Approved – 5 approvals, 1 abstention.
g. **Motion:** CET will not consider the late and incomplete travel grant application for issotl due to its late submission and lack of required approvals. Approved – unanimous. Faculty member will be told that the travel grant application can be resubmitted for consideration at the regular 11/1 deadline.
h. The last travel grant application is over budget and the conference is after the November 1st deadline (the conference is neither issotl nor POD). CET decided not to make a decision on this application during this meeting but will review the application together with any possible other travel grant applications at a meeting after the 11/1 deadline.

5. CET reviewed the final SoTL grant reports submitted by John David Dionisio and Matthew Siniawski for a joint project, and Zaki Eusufzai.
   a. **Motion:** The final reports are okay as-is and the final funds can be released. Approved – unanimous.

6. CET discussed the accountability/consequences of missing/unsubmitted final reports.
   a. The deadline for a last outstanding SoTL Grant 2011-12 final report is September 15. The faculty member has received 4 reminders during the spring and summer and is unlikely to submit a report and has made no attempt to schedule a presentation or similar event by/before the deadline.
   b. There was a suggestion to require applicants to list CTE grants they have received in the past. In addition, it was suggested to ask something like the following question: “Please indicate whether you did complete any previous grants and submitted the final report on time? If not, please explain what happened.”

7. CET discussed the Burns Committee.
   a. The Burns bylaws need to be adjusted to reflect the new role it plays as subcommittee of the CET.
      i. It was suggested to have the Burns Committee draft new bylaws and present them to the CET for discussion.
   b. The Burns Committee is constituted of CET members with tenure status. Tenured members of the CET are welcome to serve on the Burns Committee, although it is not a requirement. CET members get the first right of refusal. Open positions would need to be filled from the same college/school.
      i. CET discussed reasons why non-tenured faculty do not serve on the Burns Committee.
   c. The bylaws state that the CTE Director is an **ex-officio** member of the Burns Committee supporting distributing the call, collecting and distributing materials, and deadlines for the Burns Committee although the CTE Director is not involved in the selection of the award. However, the division of responsibilities is not clear, if the CTE Director is not fully informed of decisions and not involved in all meetings except for those where the applications are reviewed and selected. To fully support the committee, the CTE Director needs more information and a clearer definition of tasks.
i. It was agreed that the CET would discuss changes to the new bylaws to provide feedback.

d. Wendy B. will review the Burns bylaws and draw up a list of what needs to be done. The Burns Committee discussion is tabled for the next meeting.

8. The rewriting of the Honor Code was discussed
   a. Jennifer Pate, the president of the Faculty Senate, would like a dedicated subcommittee to work on the honor code – CET has the first right of refusal for membership. The subcommittee will meet more often in order to have a document ready by February 2014. CET will then review the document and then pass it on to the Faculty Senate for approval. Jennifer P. mentioned that she would like the subcommittee to be constituted of faculty, several department chairs, and at least two administrators. Specifically, she mentioned that she would like one administrator from BCLA to serve on the subcommittee due to the size of the college and the resulting high number of cheating incidents within that college.

   i. CET would prefer a committee of only faculty to produce the first draft. Once such a document exists, it should be made available for feedback by and discussion with administrators.

   b. Wendy B. will send a copy of the revised LMU Honor Code & Process and request any changes before sending the document to the new subcommittee.