Minutes from March 5, 2014, Meeting

Members Present: Alan Burkard (Chair), Gary Meyer, Jake Carpenter, Jay Caulfield, Maura Moyle, Terrance Ow, Katie Hazlett, Evelyn Donate-Bartfield, James Pokrywczynski, Kristina Ropella, Kristin Haglund

Members Absent: Shaun Longstreet, John Moyer,

1. **February meeting minutes**: The minutes from the February meeting were reviewed. James Pokrywczynski moved to approve the minutes. Jake Carpenter seconded the motion. All approved.

2. **Teaching Excellence Award**: Gary Meyer reported on the results of the vote. The committee discussed the results. Jay Caulfield moved to accept the vote as is and award the Teaching Excellence Award to the professors receiving the four highest vote totals. James Pokrywczynski seconded the motion. All approved.

Following the vote, the committee discussed whether the application process is effective: in particular, whether the form of the dossiers is appropriate. The committee agreed that the process was effective (using Sharepoint, the timeframe for voting, etc.). But, committee members raised several concerns. First, committee members questioned if the number of syllabi and rubrics included in the dossiers is necessary. Second, members questioned the consistency of the MOCES scores reported. For example, in some dossiers it was not clear how many students were in particular classes, how many students responded, and whether all courses were included. Third, some members noted that peer faculty evaluations are not supposed to be included in the dossiers, per committee discussions last year—student letters should be included, but peer faculty evaluations should not be. Fourth, the committee noted that it may need to look at the rubric and reconsider it because it was intended to be a guide, not a formal rubric, and it was never actually completed. The committee noted that, when revisiting the rubric, it should consider adding how research informs teaching, how the teacher works with students on research, and if teaching has some impact beyond the Marquette campus. The committee agreed to discuss this topic in more depth as an agenda item for a future meeting.

3. **Revision of the Way Klinger Teaching Enhancement Award Application**: The committee reviewed the revised application document prepared by Jake Carpenter. Overall, the committee preferred providing potential applicants with a more structured application similar to the one presented. The intent is for applicants to fill in each section of the application separately, so that it will be easier for the committee to apply its criteria when evaluating and comparing applications. This revision was suggested at the prior meeting because some past applicants’ proposals were not clearly organized,
which made it difficult for committee members to find specific information they were looking for when trying to assess whether the applications satisfied the committee’s criteria. The various approaches applicants took in organizing their proposals made it difficult to evaluate and compare some proposals. Gary Meyer suggested moving the requirement that applicants provide a hard copy (only email attachments are necessary now). Any committee members who would like to suggest revisions or edits should email those to Jake Carpenter so that he can revise the proposed application form accordingly and present it again for final approval at the April meeting.

4. **Committee on Teaching Project on Faculty Evaluations**: Alan Burkard passed out Shaun Longstreet’s PowerPoint slides to help prepare the committee for a larger discussion at the upcoming April meeting. Prior to the April meeting, the committee members are supposed to review the summary document that Alan’s Graduate Assistant drafted, which compiled the responses Alan received about evaluation processes across campus. Committee members are supposed to look for good, positive practices that the committee could include in a peer evaluation model it may create.

The committee also had a general discussion about what the committee’s focus will be. The committee discussed at what level it may intervene in the evaluation process at the various colleges and departments across campus. More specifically, the committee discussed the following:

- The committee discussed whether it would attempt to intervene at a low level (by providing guidance and recommendations that colleges and departments may choose adopt) or at a high level (by designing the peer evaluation process and attempting to require the formal process be implemented University-wide).

- Committee members noted that the committee’s charge is to improve teaching, not to address tenure and promotion. Thus, it was suggested that if the Tenure & Promotion Committee wanted to pick up the CoT’s work on this and use it as part of the tenure and promotion process, that would be fine, but that would be for the Tenure and Promotion committee to decide.

- Committee members suggested that it may be good to have best practices in place, so that if the University mandates that all faculty be evaluated, the CoT will already have a peer review model outlined (based on best practices) that any department could simply adopt.

- Committee members discussed that actually rewarding good teaching (as part of the evaluation process) is likely beyond the CoT’s purview.

- Committee members suggested that in order to improve teaching, the peer evaluation model the CoT attempts to create should be a formative process for professors, rather than a summative process. In other words, the peer evaluation process the CoT may create would not be something used for tenure and promotion purposes, but instead it could be
independent of the tenure and promotion process and would be used simply to help improve teaching (again, a formative focus instead of a summative focus).

- While this was just a general discussion, by the end of the discussion the committee seemed to agree that the committee would work to develop peer evaluation guidelines we could recommend across the University rather than a model that would be required across the University.

5. **Current Way Klinger Teaching Enhancement Project:** Professors Eugenia Afinoguenova and Pamela Nettleton attended the last 20 minutes of the meeting and explained to the committee a problem that has developed with the scheduling of the current project. The problem stems from another grant that Professor Afinoguenova has received, which will prohibit her from being able to fully participate in the project. Three potential solutions were discussed. Following several questions from the committee members to the professors, the committee discussed how to proceed with the project. The committee decided that the best solution is to continue the project as is, with no changes, other than to ask Professors Afinoguenova and Nettleton to find a qualified person to substitute in for Prof. Afinoguenova when she is unable to participate fully. For example, the committee felt that Prof. Afinoguenova may be able to find another faculty member in her department, or a retired faculty member, or a Graduate Assistant or graduate student, or possibly a professional in the community, who could teach the course in Prof. Afinoguenova’s place. The committee will ask Professors Afinoguenova and Nettleton to attempt to find a suitable person to fill in for Prof. Afinoguenova and to let the committee know by the May 5 meeting if they have found a suitable person willing and able to fill in for Prof. Afinoguenova. If the committee decides that a suitable replacement has not been lined up by the May 5 meeting, then the committee will discuss whether to revoke the award and possibly award it to the team that had the runner-up project instead.

Respectfully submitted,

Jacob Carpenter