Due to the lack of a quorum, the minutes from the CET meeting on October 25, 2013 could not be approved at this time. Wendy B. will send the minutes to the CET members for approval. If there are no suggestions to modify the minutes/no responses, then the minutes will be considered approved.

CET discussed Fernando Estrada’s Travel Grant application.

a. **Motion:** CET approves Fernando Estrada’s Travel Grant application subject to Dr. Estrada agreeing to present on teaching multiculturalism at the CTE based on his experience at the Western Psychological Association conference – 5 approvals (written approval from Vanessa N. and oral approval from Anna H.)

CET discussed the guidelines for the President’s Fritz B. Burns Distinguished Teaching Award agreeing on the following changes:

a. Number six, second bullet: “Letters of recommendation from the Department Chair and the Dean detailing **discussing** the candidate’s excellence in teaching.”

b. Number six, fourth bullet: “The statement of the candidate’s teaching philosophy is of primary importance, written by the candidate and limited to three pages; the statement **is of primary importance in assessing the application and** should shed light on the candidate’s approach to teaching and how it is applied in the classroom; it may include a description of the development of innovative courses and curricula, and effective teaching methods.”

c. Number six, second paragraph: “The nominee **may is encouraged to** include the following type of materials:”

d. Number six, second paragraph, first bullet point: “An overall summary of data from student evaluations of teaching from the last three six semesters, not including summer school.”

e. Number six, second paragraph, sixth bullet point: “Course material for three to five different courses including a syllabus and up to two additional items for each course (e.g. syllabi, examinations, assignments, and study guides, student work samples, etc.).”

CET discussed the Selection Process for the Burns Teaching Award.

a. Number one, first sentence: “During the **weeks week** prior to the selection meeting, one complete set of dossiers is to be made available to members in a single location, usually the Center for Teaching Excellence.”

b. Number one, fourth sentence: “These ratings are communicated directly to the Chair a two days before the meeting.”

c. Number two, second sentence: “With the **award criteria in mind, the Committee conducts a holistic evaluation that seeks to determine the best candidate by examining how well:**”

d. Number two, first bullet point: “the **teaching philosophy statement articulates what s/he is trying to do** their approach to and practice of teaching”
e. Number three: “Committee members are advised that this is a teaching award, and although there must be evidence of scholarship (command of discipline and continuous growth in their field of study is one of the selection criteria), teaching should dominate any deliberation.

f. CET discussed the tie-breaking guidelines mentioned in number four. One argument was that no tie-breaking rule should be defined since the committee needs to make a decision. Or, if that is not possible, that the Director of the Center for Teaching Excellence should not be involved in the process since the Director was not present for the deliberation. This argument would prefer to have the Provost make the final decision instead of the Director of the Center for Teaching Excellence. Another argument states that a tie-breaking rule is necessary since the committee may end up in a tie and the Director of the Center for Teaching Excellence is the person working on teaching excellence and therefore a good choice for a tie break, i.e. the guidelines should stay as-is.

i. Wendy B. will send the arguments to the CET members.