Committee on Teaching
Minutes
March 2, 2011

Members present: Subhash Bhatnagar, David Buckholdt, Jay Caulfield, Evelyn Donate-Bartfield, Dennis Garrett (Chair), Sarah Hodges, Gary Meyer, Kira-Lynn Reeves, Susan Schneider, Heidi Schweizer, Leona Vandevusse

Members excused: Heather Hathaway, Michael Havice

Call to order: The chair called the meeting to order at 3:34 pm.

Reflection: Dennis Garrett read the reflection for the meeting that was sent to him by Michel Havice.

Minutes: The minutes of the February 9, 2011, meeting were approved.

Announcements:

1. US Professor of the Year update – The candidate selected by the committee for this year’s application has accepted. Dr. Meyer is working with the candidate to revise the application materials. Dr. Meyer has also solicited letters of recommendation from current and former students, colleagues, and others from the professional and university community to support the application. Former applicants from Marquette are also going to review and offer suggestions to the candidate on the application materials.

2. Teaching Excellence Awards update – Dossiers for the teaching excellence awards are due on 3/9 and will be distributed to the committee members shortly after that date. Members are asked to review the dossiers and select and rank their top four choices. Dr. Meyer will distribute a form by which the members can send their rankings to him by March 21, 2011.

Business:

1. Student access to MOCES information -The committee discussed the pros and cons of granting students access to MOCES information. A summary of the pros/cons/other list developed during discussion is shown on the attached page.

A concern that was expressed is that releasing the MOCES composite score may violate faculty rights, particularly since these MOCES data are also used in “personnel” applications such as promotion and tenure, salary recommendations and annual performance reviews. It was felt that data used in personnel decisions should remain private.

After continued discussion on this agenda item, Dr. Garrett suggested that there appears to be two linked questions that we are attempting to answer: (1) Should Marquette
University have a process to support information flow to students regarding courses and/or instructors, and (2) what information would be best suited to help the students make informed choices? More information is needed.

The reasons for the student request for access to MOCES data (composite scores, or the Q1-Q4 scores) are still unclear to the CoT members. In particular, the members would like to know how students will use the data to enhance their learning experience and/or course selection. Dr. Garrett will ask that a representative from MUSG meet with the committee at our next meeting to provide insight on how it is anticipated that students would use the MOCES data.

Drs. Garrett and Buckholdt have volunteered to work with Alex Riley at Institutional Research to contact the provost office (or other chief academic office) of several other schools that do provide teacher evaluation data to their students. They will develop a short list of questions to ask, including, for example, why did they decide to release this information, how do they provide the information to the students, what other information do they provide to students regarding instructors and/or classes and what was the faculty response to providing the evaluation data to the students. They will report their findings at the next CoT meeting.

Next meeting: April 13, 2011

The meeting concluded at 5:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan Schneider
Recorder
Committee on Teaching  
3/2/2011 meeting  
Summary of discussion on releasing MOCES data to students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pros of releasing MOCES data to students</th>
<th>Cons</th>
<th>Student satisfaction versus student learning experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May increase MOCES response rate (if students can see the results of their ratings)</td>
<td>MOCES questions/score does not capture critical thinking</td>
<td>Possible sources of information on course and/or instructor include</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOCES provides more reliable evaluation data than that available on public ranking sites (RateMyProfessor.com, etc.)</td>
<td>Single composite score from MOCES provides limited information</td>
<td>(1) course syllabus – even “old syllabi” to provide a sense of the class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide students with additional information to be used when selecting classes/instructors</td>
<td>Many faculty do not want these data released to students</td>
<td>(2) applicability of course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other schools already do this</td>
<td>The score should be evaluated with respect to class size, class level, required vs. elective, lecture vs. lab</td>
<td>(3) faculty reflection on their role as a teacher (teaching philosophy statement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students may develop “skewed expectations” from the scores</td>
<td>(4) Prior student views (comments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(5) Student ratings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>