Teaching Committee
Academic Senate, Los Angeles Division

Minutes of Meeting
March 13, 2003

Present: S. McClary, Chair; C. Lewis; J. Garnett; A. Hutter; R. Liggett; P. Narins; A. Subrahmanyam; J. Weinreb; J. Smith (graduate student representative)

Absence: E. Rodriguez-Cepeda;

Staff: M. Avila; D. Dang

Guests: S. Kass

Meeting: The meeting was called to order at 12:35 p.m.

1. MINUTES

The Minutes of the 2-13-03 meeting were approved with minor corrections.

2. DISTINGUISHED FACULTY TEACHING AWARDS

Statistical analyses of preliminary ballot ratings were used as a basis for discussion of eleven excellent candidates and selection of five recipients that will be presented the Distinguished Teaching Award. The five recipients chosen for this award were:

   Joseph Di Stefano, Biomedical Engineering
   Robin Garrell, Chemistry & Biochemistry
   A. P. Gonzalez, Film, Television and Digital Media
   Mitchell Morris, Musicology
   Kirk Stark, School of Law

Professor DiStefano was designated to receive the Eby Award for the Art of Teaching and Professor Stark was selected to receive the Distinction in Teaching at the Graduate Level.

3. MS. HOLLAND’S TA APPLICATION

Ms. Mary Holland, Distinguished TA Award nominee wrote to the Committee requesting feedback on her application. In her letter of February 27, 2003, she indicated that it would be helpful to her to get specific feedback from the Committee on ways she can improve her teaching portfolio. She suggested that incorporating this final step of providing central criticisms on an applicant’s dossier that exhibits weaknesses in the eyes of the committee would be a valuable part of the applicants’ professionalization here at UCLA. A final suggestion that the rejection letters be sent to the applicant’s home addresses was also made.

The Committee discussed the response that Chair McClary sent on behalf of the Committee. There was unanimous agreement that Ms. Holland’s dossier was terrific but, all the applicants were
superb and only five could receive awards. The committee recognizes that the nomination itself is a great distinction. Thus, it was decided that no criticisms would be offered now or in the future on any applicant’s dossier.

3. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 2:05 p.m.