

**Pew Faculty Teaching and Learning Center Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes  
March 26, 2012**

**Present:** David Bair, Vijay Gondhalekar , Lynn Sheehan, Kim Kenward, Hugh McGuire, Christine Rener, Peter Riemersma, , Ellen Shupe, Lindsey Ellis, Darren Walhof and Joy Washburn.

Meeting called to order: 1:00pm

**Approval of Agenda:** The committee voted to approve the agenda. Vijay Gondhalekar moved, Lindsey Ellis seconded . Approved.

**Approval of Meeting Minutes:** The committee voted to approve the minutes of March 12, 2012 with minor modifications (under New Business changing the phrase from "nose to nose" to "face to face"). Hugh McGuire moved, Joy Washburn seconded. Approved.

**Announcements:**

The Grants subcommittee will meet on Monday April 9th. Nominations are needed for next year's FTLC chair and voting will be conducted before our next meeting on the 9th.

**1. Old Business**

**A. Consistent Student Evaluation Tool Update**

**Digital Measures:** No additional information is available as the representative is out of town.

**Class Climate:** Software along with scanner costs \$35,000. Course evaluation forms can be custom designed and the tool includes a test bank of possible questions. Information webinars are offered.

**2. New Business**

**Teaching Award Subcommittee Discussion Topics and Recommendations**

a) We discussed the subcommittee's recommendation to eliminate the submission of current and former student letters along with the Teaching Award application to streamline the process. It was noted that it is often hard to get letters from former students and the can be difficult to get an objective and representative letter. On the other hand, former students provide a different perspective of a teacher's performance. We also talked about how it might be useful to have somebody other than the applicant select and gather student letters.

b) We discussed the subcommittee's recommendation to have *University Outstanding Teaching Award* nominees also be considered for a *Pew Teaching Excellence Award*. After some discussion we recommend that the distinction between the two awards be better clarified.

c) Concerning the application process, the subcommittee urged that applicants scan course evaluation materials properly and that the application guidelines prompt nominees to provide summary tables and summary descriptions of their course evaluation results.

d) We agreed with the subcommittee recommendation that the number of applicant portfolios be divided up amongst the committee members such that each nominee is reviewed by three people. This will ensure a more thorough review process.

Meeting adjourned: 2:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by, Peter Riemersma, Vice Chair