

Approved Minutes of CETL Advisory Committee Meeting

Date: April 19, 2010 12:00 – 12:50 PM
McCaskill 110-E Conference Room

Members present:

Faculty members: Drs. Karl Bahm, Hilary Fezzey, Shaun Lynch and Brent Notbohm

Academic Staff members: Heather Kahler

CETL Staff: Suzanne Griffith (CETL Coordinator of First Year Seminars)

Recorder: Emily Levings, CETL University Services Associate

Members absent: Drs. Pamela Bustos, Maria Cuzzo, Lisa Larson, Ms. Kimberly Kelly, Mr. Travis Erickson, Student Representative

Suzanne Griffith opened the meeting by addressing the **Minutes of the April 5, 2010**, meeting that had been submitted for review. Karl Bahm motioned approval of the minutes and Brent Notbohm seconded the motion. Suzanne Griffith and Emily Levings suggested revisions to correct the minutes, which the committee unanimously approved.

An attachment to the April 5 minutes provided a news release of UW System's Growth Agenda for Wisconsin (also known as the Educational Attainment Initiative) that had been mentioned at the end of the April 5 meeting. In line with this initiative, Suzanne reported that the CIPT (Continuous Improvement Planning Team) is discussing retention and graduation issues for UW-Superior and will have a meeting with the Provost this coming Wednesday. They are working to increase the number of Associate Degrees as well as 4-year graduate degrees.

The remainder of the meeting focused on **Peer Consultation**. To start the discussion, the CETL subcommittee (Suzanne Griffith, Hilary Fezzey and Heather Kahler) provided a handout and reviewed the issues and suggestions they had related to starting a Peer Consultation program at UW-Superior. All three indicated willingness to continue with development of the program. Heather noted that participation should be open to all teaching staff: faculty, academic instructional staff, and teaching "non-instructional" staff. Suzanne then requested comments and reactions for the CETL members.

In answer to a question about what the long term goal would be for this program, Suzanne clarified her understanding that the goal was to improve teaching and student learning, and that participation in the program was not to be required, but rather voluntary, and confidential.

Another member suggested that participation in the program, and particularly a pilot program, be limited to full-time faculty or instructional staff because of the financial, time and training commitments that would be required to complete the process.

It was also suggested that a follow-up should be included at one or perhaps two years to review the process, outcomes and gather suggestions for improvement. Reflection sheets could be utilized as part of the follow-up.

Members felt that it would be beneficial to have a pool of 6 to 8 consultants from which faculty could choose for this program, rather than "assigning" participants to a particular consultant.

The importance of language used to describe this program was highlighted ...

- Use the words "Peer Consultation" rather than "mentoring" to describe the process in order to alleviate any sense of intrusion on departmental domain for faculty training

- Use the words “Consultant or Facilitator” to signify the person who receives Peer Consultation training, while the participants should be identified as “faculty, staff or program participants” rather than “trainees or consultees.” This will help to alleviate the sense that faculty or staff are beneath the consultant.
- To provide a professional selection process in describing the consultants to potential participants, perhaps have them identify specialties or skills they hope to promote so that the choices made by participants are not based just on personality or familiarity.

Discussion of the process brought forth the recognition that there were two models that the Peer Consultation process could utilize: 1) an Expert consultation model and 2) a Peer consultation model. Most members agreed that both models would have merit and should be included, but may need to be designed somewhat differently to be effective. This would entail flexibility, as recommended in the proposal provided by the subcommittee. One advantage of detailing both approaches is that it would provide clarity for both participants.

Another point brought out was the Peer Consultation provides advantages not only to newer faculty, but also to veterans of the system. For instance, based on age, newer faculty may have perceptions and connections closer to the “millennial” students, which in turn could provide a valuable learning experiences for the veteran.

It was also pointed out that the voluntary aspect of the program be clarified so that faculty would be aware that their experiences in the Peer Consultation process could be utilized in their portfolios for retention/renewal purposes, or could remain entirely confidential, at their discretion.

Suzanne requested that members of the committee suggest “next steps” in the process of developing the program. The ensuing discussion identified the following:

- Creating a pool of consultants was identified as a first step
- Training would only be provided if a consultant was “chosen” by a peer.
- Ensure that there is a variety of staff based on rank and discipline from which to choose.
- Recruitment and training of consultants should start in fall 2010 with the program proceeding in spring 2011.
- Some funding may be available from monies allocated for “Learning Communities.”

The above discussion then progressed to the question “How do we recruit?” consultants and interested faculty and staff. Options included the Staff Digest, discussion with Department Chairs to get them “on board,” and finally, develop a fall 2010 Enhancement Day workshop focusing on Peer Consultation. Everyone agreed that a workshop would be a great way to introduce the program to the campus faculty and staff.

The subcommittee will meet on Monday, April 26, to update and clarify their proposal for the Peer Consultation Program and include suggestions made at today’s meeting. They will also prepare drafts of some of the materials that need to be developed, as outlined in item 7 of the handout (using Oshkosh program as a model for some of these).

The meeting was adjourned at 12:55 PM.

Respectfully submitted by Emily Levings.

On November 22, 2010, Hilary Fezzey motioned approval of the April 19, 2010 minutes, as submitted. Karl Bahm seconded the motion. The Minutes of the April 19, 2010, meeting were unanimously approved as submitted.

The next and final CETL meeting for the spring semester is scheduled for Monday May 3rd, at 12:00 noon until 12:50 pm in McCaskill 110E.