Approved Minutes of CETL Advisory Committee Meeting  

Date: May 11, 2011  12:00 – 12:50 PM  
McCaskill 110-E Conference Room

PRESENT:  Faculty members, Drs. Karl Bahm, Brent Notbohm, and Hilary Fezzey  
Academic Staff Members:  Heather Kahler and Scott Smith  
CETL Staff:  Drs. Maria Cuzzo (Director), Lisa Larson (Coordinator of Instructional Development), Suzanne Griffith (Coordinator of First Year Seminars)  
Recorder:  Emily Levings  
Member absent:  Drs. Bob Beam and Vicki Fingalson Madison, and Student Representative

The Minutes of April 25, 2011, were reviewed and discussed. Suzanne Griffith and Lisa Larson noted corrections needed. Scott Smith made a motion to approve the minutes with those corrections, and Karl Bahm seconded the motion. Maria Cuzzo moved to approve them as revised, and the members present unanimously approved the minutes, as revised.

With this being the final meeting of the academic year, Maria Cuzzo began the meeting with a round of thanks and appreciation for the participation of the CETL Advisory Committee members. She invited them to apply for reassignment on the committee and asked if anyone had suggestions or questions regarding the upcoming committee assignments. During the ensuing discussion, it was clarified that the Advisory Council position is currently a one-year assignment, but it was also suggested that the term be staggered for individual members and lengthened to two or three years in order to ensure a degree of continuity among membership. This change will be considered by CETL staff over the summer and will require approval by Faculty Senate for implementation.

Members were informed that the minutes of this meeting would be forwarded to them via email to review and revise/approve so that the full cadre of minutes for the 2010-2011 year will be available for review on the CETL website.

Members were also asked to provide anonymous feedback of both positive and negative aspects of their experiences serving on the CETL Advisory Committee. They were provided with cards and several minutes to complete this task. The responses are provided below and grouped by similarity:

**Strengths:**

- Meetings well organized and run  
- Well organized  
- Meetings are VERY organized  
- Expectations/meeting dates/times, meeting agendas are very clear  
- Focused and pertinent  
- The planning process was well done and was actually very constructive and productive—more so than I would have expected from such a bureaucratic mandate  
- Strong ambassador work by committee  
- Great communication between CETL staff and the committee  
- Great, knowledgeable, informed feedback from committee  
- Considering the service load of UW-S - I appreciate the structure of the group and the low demands made of members outside meetings  
- I feel that my feedback is appreciated and valued  
- Safe space where all members opinions are asked for and respected  
- I enjoyed and appreciated the open discussion and sense of collegiality within the committee  
- Productive years of assessment of CETL through discussion/WEAVE, etc.  
- Helped clarify WEAVE process and plan and helped with mission decisions  
- Feel CETL is an important part of UW-S
Areas Needing Improvement:

- Get agendas out earlier
- Solicit as much feedback from committee members as possible on key decisions; sometimes decisions came up so fast that there wasn’t time to really talk it through
- Could perhaps have more time to work through things more fully
- Ensure committee members are attending and if they are not, ask for them to be replaced
- I’d like a brief job description of what is expected of me. It would be great if I knew this because sometimes I feel that I’m not contributing much by just coming to meetings and talking about my thoughts every once in a while
- I’m very pleased with how the year went. I don’t have any suggestions for improvement. Sometimes I feel guilty that the CETL staff does most of the work so I want them to know I appreciate that and would be willing to do more.
- I think we could do better at communicating with the rest of the campus about what CETL does. I know I need to do that better.
- I think maybe we could integrate adjuncts to Distance Ed into the “learning/teaching community” more
- I’m a bit leery of the technology focus. I love technology and use it in my teaching. But I’m unwilling to accept the idea that we MUST use technology or one is not teaching well.
- Would like to see fewer programs based on administration initiatives (assessment in particular) and more focused on teaching/learning in and out of classroom

Maria then moved on to an update on the Budget. In general, there has been no news forthcoming since our last meeting. She has provided to the Provost the job descriptions of the three 25% FTE coordinator positions proposed for CETL (New Faculty Orientation Coordinator; SoTL Coordinator; and Peer Consultation Coordinator), and received the expected response that the required funding for those positions is highly unlikely for FY12. She indicated that budget discussions will be ongoing throughout the summer. She has instructed that FY12 budgets will remain flat (same as FY11), which Maria considers a possibility, and that there will be no increases forthcoming.

Maria listed the many programs that CETL has provided throughout the academic year. The future of those programs will be affected by the final budget, so priorities will be discussed throughout the summer in planning for next year. She requested that members provide feedback on their priorities for CETL programming, at this meeting and via email over the summer.

Scott Smith indicated that there is still an assumption by many Academic Staff that they are not included in the planning of programming by CETL, and that he continues to work to alter this perception when it is stated by colleagues. Maria said that the change in the “target audience” as reflected in CETL’s mission revision this spring, was in large part due to data that a substantial number of Academic Staff have been engaged in CETL activities. She concurred that the Academic Staff audience should be emphasized through “targeted” invitations and announcements, though it is important that it be understood that “student learning” is the focus of all CETL activities.

This conversation moved onto the issue of mission creep. With the limited resources (funding and personnel) available to CETL, it is important that the focus remain on teaching and student learning. Though other university issues are important and related, specifically – assessment, and orientation for instructional academic staff as well as other staff classifications (academic staff and classified staff), they should not consume a major portion of CETL’s resources.

The New Faculty Orientation series was one program that was highlighted as successful and that should remain high on CETL’s list of programming priorities. Maria discussed the difficulty during the past year of keeping the sessions relevant for the large group and for the varied experiences of fledgling vs. “seasoned” faculty new to UW-Superior, and the subsequent resistance to engaging in activities that were not contractually mandatory. A former graduate of the NFO program as well as several committee members who were new faculty prior to implementation of the program at UW-Superior, expressed their
admiration for the NFO program and the benefits it provides to new faculty. The committee discussed ways to encourage engagement and enthusiasm of new faculty for the program. One suggestion was to hold a social during the Fall 2011 Opening Week for invitation to all new faculty, as well as previous graduates of the NFO program and other faculty and staff, to share their experiences with the upcoming cohort.

Again, Maria encouraged the outgoing CETL Advisory Committee members to stay in contact via email with any additional thoughts or concerns regarding the Committee or CETL’s programs.

Meeting adjourned at 12:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Emily Levings

These minutes were distributed via email on Thursday, May 12, 2011. Each member of the committee at the meeting approved them as submitted via return email by Tuesday, May 17, 2011.