Committee on Teaching  
December 1, 2010  
3:30-5:00 PM, Raynor A


Members Excused:

Reflection by E. Donate-Bartfield  
Approval of Minutes:  
Minutes approved from Nov. 10th, 2010 as written.

Announcements and Information

1. Follow up with discussion of idea of creating video from last year excellence letter writers. To get the students to talk about what was illustrative of the 2009 Teaching Award Winners. Dr. Meyer reviewed former student/faculty letters. Discussion about whether to do video presentations this year or next year. Do we get letters from the best people or do we solicit commentary from current students from the award winners? Asked Kira-Lynn Reeves and Dr. Hathaway to get a list of about 10 students who might speak on their behalf. [discussion] How to solicit student input (or maybe get the award winners to speak). It would be nice to have the videos ready by late January but that isn’t feasible. Idea is that the videos will help people nominate candidates for Teaching Excellence, but it seems this will have to serve this purpose next year. How to get the student comment completed. Should we have student comments presented during Pere’ Marquette dinner. When we come back we will try to get videos from students who have been in classes. And videos from winners from last year.

Suggest going to U.S. Prof. of year site and check out how their winners talk about themselves.

2. No other announcements or information items.

Continuing Business

1. Discuss all three awards.....
2. What is the process? What happens now? Who does what and by what time?  
3. U.S. Prof. of Year: Discussion

  Spreadsheet passed out nominations...  
  Should Nominees have won an award previously..  
  Confirm the people who have won some teaching award.
Invite those who have won an award to submit completed materials. As a form of nomination, have 9 submit a statement, log minus letters of support. “What we need from applicants” to make a selection for the person we want to advance for consideration.
We need to take a look at their teaching logs to consider who might best meet needs for a competitive submission.

Nomination materials will be due at the end of January. In Feb. meeting of COT we break into groups and decide upon who we want to advance. COT members rank order nominees and then During March meeting, the COT breaks into groups and makes suggestions for improving submission material (break-out sessions).
What is the vetting process? What role will Deans and Chairs play in the vetting process?
Role of vitae in the vetting process.
Do applicants have the opportunity to not submit?
COT will narrow to three nominees in Feb. or March. And then select one to put forward.

Draft for nominations distributed for approval.

   Faculty list distributed.
   Do we accept 12:18 application...? Discussion. No disagreement. Submission approved by group. Leeway given for one applicant submission of Dean’s letter.
   Gary distributed list of applicants and the Rubric. (7 applications)
   Discussion. What is the process for evaluation?
   COT members who submitted are excluded from reading or ranking of proposals.
   Question of who reviews. (Concerning reviews for “stand in” committee members) Consensus is that the “stand in’s” read and rank.
   Rubric included for guidance.
   Each COT member rank orders top three and submits their decision to Dr. Meyer. By Jan 12. Ties are brought to the reading committee for discussion and breaking the tie.
   Recommended that we do not split awards. (Impacts awardees’ ability to complete their proposal goals.)

Suggested that COT invite award winners to give a report to COT (informal) regarding the outcomes and trials of the project.


Need clarification as to whether number of nominations (votes) matters.
Do we want the nominators to realize that number of votes count more than a nomination? Is there parity among nominators, e.g. dean and chair and faculty votes vs. student votes.

One nomination pr. person. One nomination from groups. A Nominating petition was suggested.
Question of limiting nomination from 3 to one.

Nominations not votes... Change “weighted votes” to nominations.

Eliminate block nominations. Just individual nominations.
Number of nominations matter.

New Business
1. None.

Adjourned. 5:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael Havice