Committee on Teaching  
Minutes for January 24, 2018  
Zilber Hall 470, 3:30 pm – 5:00 pm

Members Present: Cynthia Ellwood (Chair), Jacob Carpenter, Jerrin Cherian, Evelyn Donate-Bartfield, Kristin Haglund, Laurieann Klockow, Shaun Longstreet, Susan Schneider, John Su, Terence Ow

Members Excused: Joyce Wolburg, Kristen Foster

Invited Participants: Alix Riley, Crystal Lendved from Office of Institutional Research and Assessment (OIRA)

Reflection: Susan Schneider

I. Draft Minutes from December meeting
The minutes from the December 6, 2017 meeting were unanimously approved without changes.

II. Announcements and Information
A. Committee members acknowledged receiving the report from John Su titled, Student perceptions of faculty technology used to enhance learning

III. Continuing Business
A. Way Klingler Teaching Enhancement Award:
John Su distributed tally sheets of committee member rankings of the three proposals under consideration for the 2018-2019 Teaching Enhancement Award. The committee discussed and endorsed the proposal with the highest weighted total score and sent it to the Provost for the award.

B. Reports on IDEA College Feedback:
(1) Kristen Haglund reported back to the Committee about her January 9 IDEA presentation to the faculty of the College of Nursing. The Dean of Nursing has used IDEA at other institutions and liked it. Overall, the feedback was positive with some skepticism regarding the cost of implementing IDEA. Questions were raised regarding the online experience for IDEA and whether data analytics (e.g. frequency of word choice) for the open-ended comments is available. In addition, the suggestion was made to reevaluate MU’s policy of evaluating every course every semester with the idea of lightening the burden on students of having to complete 5-6 evaluations each semester.

(2) Cynthia Ellwood and John Su reported back to the Committee about their December 14th IDEA presentation to the Provost and Academic Dean’s Council. Overall the responses seemed to be that the instrument was probably better than MOCES but the question remained whether we should use it. Concerns were raised about the length of the instrument and whether it could disadvantage STEM faculty. Similar to the Nursing faculty, the council also
inquired about the possibility of digital mining of open ended responses since they felt that the comments are what faculty care most about. To this, a comment was made by a committee member that since scores count towards P&T that faculty also care significantly about student evaluation scores.

C. Next Steps regarding IDEA:
Cynthia Ellwood distributed a FAQ sheet she assembled from previous emails/conversations with Alix Riley and Campus Labs representatives. The FAQ included answers to commonly raised questions and concerns among faculty. The question was raised as to the purpose of such a document. It was stated that this could be a central place to gather feedback, questions raised and thoughts that have been voiced from our conversations and discussions of IDEA. The FAQ included a number of institutions that also used IDEA, several of which are Jesuit institutions (Loyola, Creighton, Fairfield). However, Alix Riley stated that not many of Marquette’s 22 peer aspirational institutions use IDEA. Terrance Ow proposed the idea that there needs to be a process and oversight for choosing appropriate learning objectives. It was also asked what the default option would be for faculty who do not indicate relevant learning objectives.

D. Electronic Conference with IDEA/Campus Labs
Crystal Lendved set up a video conference call with representatives Campus labs and IDEA to answer specific questions from the committee. The representatives on the conference call included Jerry Anderson (Senior Director, Campus Relations, Campus Labs), Shannon Lacount (Asst Vice President of Campus Adoption at Campus Labs), Steve Benton (Senior Research Officer IDEA) and Jake Glover (Senior Education Officer and director of Client Resources at IDEA). Shannon Lacount walked committee members through the faculty view of the IDEA report. Various representatives answers the committee’s questions.

Can the learning objectives be autofilled from year to year for the same course or do faculty have to reenter them every semester? Objectives for the same course can be chosen once and autofilled in remaining semesters.
What is the default if faculty do not choose learning objectives? The default is that all objectives marked as important.
Can instructors gain the system by choosing easier objectives? The conversion compares progress on the learning objectives of that faculty member to everyone else in the IDEA database who chooses that same objective.
Do you offer any ability to mine open ended questions? Not currently but hopefully soon. There is a beta version that can do sentiment analysis and comment analysis of the open ended comments.
What is the experience of using IDEA in online courses versus face-to-face courses? According to IDEA’s research they don’t see differences in response rates between face-to-face vs online courses. This is available in IDEA technical report #15. At Marquette, response rates for online courses are lower than for face-to-face courses.
Does the long length of the survey impact completion rate? According to IDEA’s research, 99% of students who start the survey complete it so length doesn’t seem to be the issue but rather motivating students to initiate the survey. Can we compare faculty results over time? The trends analysis can show you results over terms. Can we customize the list of institutions for the comparative data? No, instructors will be compared to results from all institutions in the IDEA database. The comparisons for discipline also cannot be customized. However, the segment comparison can be customized. That is, the university can choose which units within the university you’re compared to.

Shannon Lacount also demonstrated the formative feedback tool which is available for use by instructors and the data is not available to administrators. The students’ responses in this tool are not anonymous. The committee expressed concerns over the lack of anonymity. There are no plans from Campuslabs to make anonymizing the formative feedback an option.

IV. New Business
A. The committee decided to postpone revisiting next year’s Teaching Enhancement Award criteria to a future meeting although not the March meeting since that is when the Teaching Excellence Award dossiers will be discussed.
B. At the next meeting, the committee will sketch out an outline of our proposed recommendation and rationale of replacing MOCES with IDEA to the Academic Senate, which Shaun Longstreet volunteered to formally write.

V. Adjournment
The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 pm. Next Meeting: February 14, 2018

Recorder
Laurieann Klockow