

**MINUTES**  
**COMMITTEE ON TEACHING**  
**February 23, 2010**  
**Tuesday, 10 a.m.-11:30 a.m., Kerr Hall Rm 129**

Present: M. Victoria Gonzalez-Pagani (Chair), Kate Edmunds, Dan Scripture, Hongyun Wang, Gordon Wells, Stephanie Casher (ASO)

Guests: Jessica Fiske-Bailey, Jim Phillips, Pablo Reguerin (Executive Director of Retention Services, and Director of Educational Opportunity Programs)

Absent: Clare Max

The minutes of February 11, 2010 were approved.

**Consultation with Pablo Reguerin from Student Affairs**

Pablo Reguerin, Executive Director of Retention Services, and Director of Educational Opportunity Programs, visited the Committee on Teaching to talk about the reorganization at Student Affairs and the implementation of the Retention Services unit. Retention Services is trying to identify where along the pipeline retention issues become relevant, and develop a culture of data-driven decision-making to address the issues. Protecting diversity is a major priority for Retention Services.

Retention Services has identified a large gap between EOP and non-EOP students in terms of academic performance. What factors are contributing to this, and how can we address the problem?

The committee discussed the various factors that could be affecting academic performance in these two groups of students. One committee member remarked that socioeconomic status is linked to previous academic preparation, and that you can't address the achievement gap without a frank discussion of class. Working class schools tend to teach students to follow directions, not to think critically and challenge the status quo. Thus, students from working class communities are educated within a different learning culture, and do not necessarily develop the skills needed to excel within the University culture. How can we nurture students to become "self-directed" learners, and empower them to take responsibility for their own education?

It was suggested that perhaps the best place to address this transformation from students who "receive" information, to scholars who are more proactive in their education is in college core courses during the first year. Another suggestion was to encourage faculty to actively promote and encourage self-directed learning within their classes.

The committee discussed the various ways the Committee on Teaching could assist Retention Services in thinking through these issues. It was pointed out that there are faculty on campus (in fact, an entire Education department) that are highly-trained in precisely these issues, yet the faculty are seldom consulted on best practices. Moving forward, we need to find ways to align

the various groups on campus and pool brain energy to come up with creative solutions to the wide range of problems our campus community is facing.

### **Partnership with Alumni Association regarding Teaching Awards**

The Chair informed the committee about a meeting she had with Senate Chair Kletzer about a request from the Alumni Association to partner with COT on their Teaching Awards program. In the past, the Alumni Association has nominated Distinguished Teaching Award recipients (separate from the COT-adjudicated Excellence in Teaching Awards). Due to cutbacks, the Alumni Association no longer has the staff to support the Distinguished Teaching Award program, and is wondering if there is a possibility to partner with COT and merge the two award programs.

COT discussed the proposal. While initially they felt they *might* be willing to take on the Distinguished Teaching Awards, on the condition that COT be able to use their own nomination/adjudication procedures (COT feels the nomination procedures employed by the Alumni Association are overly cumbersome), after further discussion it was decided that COT is not in the position to assist the Alumni Association in this regard, given that the committee is heavily impacted with its own work.

### **IIG Adjudication Process**

After reviewing another preproposal that came in after the deadline, the committee moved on to discuss the IIG adjudication process, and the criteria for vetting the proposals. Jim Phillips, Director of Learning Technologies, showed the committee a space he has set up on eCommons where COT can enter their proposal feedback online. The committee also discussed the Grant Proposal Evaluation form that was used by last year's COT to evaluate proposals. The Chair, Stephanie, and Jessica will update the criteria on the evaluation form to take into account the changes in this year's call (i.e. the focus on GE reform and eCommons implementation), and Jim will upload the revised questionnaire onto the eCommons adjudication site.

The meeting adjourned at 11:30am.

So attests,

M. Victoria Gonzalez-Pagani, Chair  
Committee on Teaching