

Evaluation of Teaching Committee

Friday, September 25, 2015

11:30 a.m.-1:00 p.m.

Office of Faculty Development Conference Room, 4th floor
Clark Hall

Members Present:

Beth Fath (Chair); Kimberly Ange-van Heugten, Paul Umbach, Jason Delborn, Hernan Marchant, Chris Becker

Members Not Present:

Katherine Annett-Hitchcock, Valerie Wust, Marta Klesath, Alina Duca, James Mickle, Korinn Saker, Lisa Thomson, Desiree Unselt

Ex-Officio Members Present:

Diane Chapman, Doug James, Barbara Kirby, Grae Desmond

Ex-Officio Members Not Present:

Mike Carter, Katharine Stewart

Call To Order – Beth Fath, *Chair*

The Chair called the meeting to order at 11:31 a.m. and members present offered introductions since this was the second meeting of the 2015-16 academic year.

AGENDA ITEMS:

1. Poll results for ranking of topics to address this year were shared:
 - #1 Question 12
 - #2 Random comment generator
 - #3 NTT Peer review process
 - #4 TA review process
2. The Chair asked members to complete a brief poll of Spring date/time availability (mainly Fridays). Results will be shared as soon as possible to plan Spring meeting dates.
3. **Question 12 from ClassEval “Overall, this course was excellent.”**

The Chair consulted with the prior Chair, Dr. Jeff Joines, to review the history and prior concerns behind this Question. The item has been discussed for two years, and an overall majority (especially of students) suggest to “keep it as is.” Some options on Q12:

 - a) Keep it as is
 - b) Change the scale
 - c) Change the wording

- d) Drop it all together
- e) After discussion weighing historical input and current perspectives, the committee decided to leave question 12 as it is currently worded. The committee felt there should be some future discussion regarding better education for students, faculty, and Department Heads regarding the interpretation and usage of this information.
 - The Chair will review the timeline to confirm when the questionnaire must be reviewed again in entirety (per policy, every 3 years).
 - Several members shared evidence that showed increase in response rates using various methods.

4. FAQ sheet discussion, concern #5

The Chair is gathering information to clarify this concern. She proposed to delay a full discussion of this until our next meeting.

Members briefly identified major concerns with the 10% sampling error, and one noted that we must separate non-response from sampling errors.

5. Random sampling of comments from student evals for dossiers

- a. Will hold for next meeting

6. New Business

- a. None

Adjourn

Minutes submitted by:

Doug James, Ph.D., Asst. Director, Office of Faculty Development (10/9/2015)