Committee on Teaching
Minutes
October 9th, 2013
470 Zilber Hall (3:30 to 5:00 pm)

Recorder: Evelyn Donate-Bartfield

Members Present: Alan Burkard (Chair), Jake Carpenter, Jay Caulfield, Evelyn Donate-Bartfield, Paul Gasser, Kristin Haglund, Katie Hazlett, John (Jack) Moyer, Kristina Ropella, James Pokrywcynski

Members Absent: Shaun Longstreet, Gary Meyer, Sarah McClanahan, Terence Ow

I. Committee member welcome and introductions.
   Meeting was called to order at 3:30. Paul Gasser (representative from the school of Health Sciences) and Ms. Katie Hazlett (Representative from the Graduate Student Organization) were new to the committee, so the Committee Chair gave a brief introduction to the Committee’s purpose, procedures, and current business. Dr. Pokrywcynski gave the reflection.

II. Approval of draft minutes from September 11, 2013.
   The minutes were approved without corrections.

III. Announcements and Information

   A. COT awards timelines:
      i. Way Klinger Teaching Enhancement Award
         1. Announcement to Campus Community: Announcement was sent out Thursday, September 27
         2. Application Deadline: December 2
         3. Packets to Committee: December 4
         4. COT Rankings Due: January 8
         5. COT Discussion: January 15
      ii. Teaching Excellence Award
         1. Announcement to Campus Community: October 31
         2. Nomination Deadline: November 15
         3. Semi-finalist notification: December 2
         4. Semi-finalist dossiers due: February 3
         5. Dossiers distributed to COT: February 5
         6. COT rankings due: March 3
         7. COT recommendations sent to Provost: March 17

   The chair reported that the announcement for the Way Klinger Teaching Award was sent out after several committee members commented on the final draft. Some feedback was received after the announcement was sent, and will be considered for next year’s announcement.
I. New Business

A. The Chair thanked committee members for attending the HLC meeting Monday, September 30.

B. The committee discussed the evaluation rubric for Way-Klingler Teaching Enhancement Award. While there was general satisfaction expressed with the instrument, there was a suggestion that the evaluation form be reviewed so that all of the criteria in the announcement are reflected in the rubric. One committee member noted that the rubric contained an item that assessed the rationale for the budget, but the corresponding requirement was not listed in the announcement that was sent to faculty. Despite this discrepancy, the committee decided to leave the item that evaluated the proposal’s budget in the rubric this year. The chair will change the announcement next year and add this item to the description sent to faculty.

C. Strategic Planning

The committee continued its strategic planning activities. Committee members gathered information from their respective schools and offered feedback and ideas on future committee activities and goals. The number of faculty responding to the request for feedback was small.

i. These ideas were briefly discussed:

1. Develop a Peer Teaching Evaluation Policy and Procedures for untenured and tenured faculty (identified in the HLC Self-Study).
   There was an objection raised that there were not adequate resources to develop a successful program and that the effort needed to do so would not be worth the benefits. Others commented that one-time assessments, which are what current resources would likely allow, would not be that valuable for faculty.

2. Develop a remediation policy and strategies for faculty that are not performing to expected teaching standards (identified in the HLC Self-Study).
   The difficulty with identifying “expected teaching standards” made this goal problematic; there were also questions about who this standard would apply to, how remediation policies would be used, and who would enforce standards.
3. Seek to elevate teaching ranking to the top 25% nationally for undergraduate programs.
   The idea generated some interest among faculty, but they were not sure what the ranking system was, what was evaluated, and what might need to be done to get a top ranking.

4. Develop a MOOC evaluation system.
   There was little interest in this topic.

5. Solicit applicants for the US Professor of the Year and submit an application in Spring 2014.
   There was little interest in this goal.

6. Review MOCES items and consider revising the teaching evaluation.
   There was an interest in reviewing the MOCES items, especially in examining the use of the composite scores as global measures of teaching effectiveness. It was felt that these composite scores did not “tell the whole story.”

7. Review quality of teaching among part-time and full-time faculty, with the intent to reduce the number of part-time faculty.
   While there was interest and concern in the development and activities of adjunct faculty members, it was felt that this topic, although important, was not appropriate for this particular committee.

8. Review the design of classroom space and make suggestions for revisions that allow for best teaching practices.
   The committee felt that this goal is important, but was not appropriate as a main focus for this committee.

The committee then discussed the items that generated the most interest among those giving feedback to the committee:
- Peer evaluation (as a vehicle for better assessment of teaching to guide faculty improvement),
- developing and identifying resources for faculty to improve their teaching skills (i.e., opportunities for faculty development),
- modifying course evaluation instruments so that they would assist in the improvement of teaching (revision of the MOECS instrument) and
• improving student outcomes and promoting excellence.

A suggestion was made that the committee could address what was most important in these issues by focusing on opportunities for faculty development. Specifically, the committee could work on developing policies and procedures that would result in better assessment of teaching, improved opportunities for the development of teaching skills, and promoting other activities that would support the improvement of student learning.

The chair suggested that the first step in this process would be for the committee to learn more about this topic and how other institutions have addressed this issue. He suggested that the committee ask Dr. Longstreet to make a presentation to the committee at a future date to inform committee planning.

The chair will communicate the committee’s interests to the leadership of the University Senate.

The meeting adjourned at 4:55pm.

Next Meeting:
November 13th, 2013

Respectfully submitted,
Evelyn Donate-Bartfield