Committee on Teaching  
Minutes for September 13th, 2017  
Zilber Hall 474, 3:30 to 5:00 pm

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

Members Excused: Rose Rains

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

Call to Order  
The meeting was called to order at 3:35 p.m.

Reflection  
Cynthia Ellwood

I. Committee Welcome and Introductions

II. Minutes  
Approval of draft minutes from May 4th, 2017; minutes were approved without correction.

III. Announcement and Information  
The chair reviewed the committee’s charge (as is customary when new members join the committee at the start of the year); this charge comes from the University Academic Senate statutes and is attached to the end of these minutes.

IV. Way Klingler Teaching Enhancement Award  
One of the committee’s annual tasks is to pick the winner of the Way Klingler Teaching Enhancement Award. (Last year’s winning proposal was authored by Jaime Cheatham, Kim Jensen-Bohat, Khadijah Makky, Judy Maloney, and Amber Young-Brice.) The committee approved the following proposed schedule for reviewing applications for the Way Klingler award this year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps in the Process</th>
<th>2016-17 Deadlines</th>
<th>Proposed for 2017-18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Announcement to campus community</td>
<td>Late September</td>
<td>Week of Sept. 5, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application deadline</td>
<td>December 9, 2016</td>
<td>Fri., December 8, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packets to the Committee (emailed)</td>
<td>December 12, 2017</td>
<td>Tues, December 12th, 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee on Teaching rankings due</td>
<td>January 12, 2018</td>
<td>Monday, January 15th, 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee on Teaching discussion</td>
<td>January 18, 2018</td>
<td>January 24th, 2018 meeting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This year’s schedule announces applications for the award to the Marquette community a little earlier than it has in the past, which may allow faculty a little more time to work on their proposals before submitting.

V. **Teaching Excellence Awards**
The committee briefly reviewed and approved the following proposed timeline for the committee’s second major annual task, recommending candidates for the Teaching Excellence Awards. (Last year’s winners were Monica Adya, Leah Flack, Tim McMahon, and Martin St. Maurice.)

II. **Teaching Excellence Award Timeline 2017-18**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 31</td>
<td>Electronic memo sent to deans, directors and full-time faculty members and select student organization presidents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 7</td>
<td>News Brief reminder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 12</td>
<td>News Brief reminder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 14</td>
<td>News Brief reminder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 15</td>
<td>Nomination deadline; e-mail reminder memo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 22</td>
<td>Notify COT electronically of voting and confirm number of nominees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2</td>
<td>Semi-finalist notification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 3</td>
<td>Semi-finalist dossiers due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 5</td>
<td>Dossiers distributed to COT electronically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 3</td>
<td>COT rankings (top four) due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 17</td>
<td>Recommendations to Provost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 24</td>
<td>Winners notified of award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 24</td>
<td>Memo to deans regarding teaching excellence winners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 25</td>
<td>Memo to faculty not selected for award</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The committee approved this time line and had a brief discussion about whether the award winner’s names should be shared with the committee before their announcement at the Pere Marquette dinner. There was some disagreement about this practice and the committee decided to discuss this issue further at a future meeting.

VI. **Continuing Business**

A. **Potential replacement of the MOCES (Marquette Online Course Evaluation System) with IDEA (Campus Labs)**

1. **History and Goals**
The committee resumed discussion of the Committee’s search for a possible replacement for Marquette’s current student evaluation form (MOCES). A detailed discussion of the history of the committee’s deliberations on this issue can be found in the draft titled “Replacing MOCES with IDEA: A Briefing Paper by the University Committee on Teaching” in Appendix A.
In summary, the committee was charged two years ago with evaluating Marquette’s current student evaluation system and determining 1) if the current student evaluation system is adequate for our current needs 2) what other (either commercial or non-profit) teaching evaluation systems are available for Marquette’s use and 3) deciding if any of these alternate teaching evaluation instruments would better fit Marquette’s current assessment needs. In past committee discussions, committee members indicated that they wanted an instrument that would help improve teaching by providing better feedback for instructors. Committee members also raised concern that the four core items on the current instrument (which are often used as a summary measure of teaching effectiveness) do not seem to adequately assess an instructor’s performance, and that the current system does not provide detailed or customizable feedback for different types of teaching skills or courses.

Last year, with the help of the Office of Institutional Research, the committee reviewed information on nine of the most popular student evaluation systems. After reviewing this material, the Committee identified the system produced by IDEA (and implemented by Campus Lab), as the system that would best meet Marquette’s current needs. At the last committee meeting held last year, after a telephone conference call with IDEA to address the committee’s questions, the committee voted on recommending replacing MOCES with the IDEA instrument. The initial vote was seven members in favor of the recommendation, two against, and one undecided vote. After the meeting, subsequent discussion of the issue by email indicated that given the positive committee vote, committee leadership would move forward and begin researching the next steps in this process; this included drafting a statement to share the committee’s research with the University Senate, asking Dr. Su to pursue possible funding options and talking with concerned parties on campus to get feedback on this possible change. The draft of this initial statement can be found in Appendix A.

B. Review of the Instrument

To start discussion of the merits of the IDEA instrument, the chair asked the committee to write down qualities of a course evaluation system that were important to them. She also asked them to review a summary of the evaluation criteria that the committee created last year when considering their responses. This evaluation criteria, which can be found in Appendix B, includes the characteristics of a good instructor, overall considerations for evaluating an instrument, examining underlying research evidence for the instrument, evaluation of good teaching and learning, format considerations, support available to instructors, and issues related to cost and logistics.

The committee then examined the features of the IDEA instrument considering these criteria. The committee’s participation in this exercise pointed out that the IDEA instrument measures effectiveness through instructor-selected learning objectives, reports results with domain-specific feedback to instructors, and provides links to resources for improving teaching performance in these domains.
The committee also considered comments from students about the MOCES and discussed these comments briefly. Issues raised during the discussion of student comments included the importance of having students reflect on their own learning, the importance of asking questions in context, and the effects of student characteristics like the student’s major, interest level, and grade expected on student evaluation results.

C. Discussion of the Pros and Cons of IDEA
The committee revisited their discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of the IDEA instrument. The subsequent discussion included issues related to the use of IDEA in the promotion and tenure process (i.e., what part of this instrument would replace the core items, how would student evaluation test scores be ranked), whether the use of three to five learning objectives would be adequate for assessing teaching in some settings, whether the evaluation form was customizable, and how the form could be administrated to facilitate student participation (i.e., could the form be administered in class electronically or is a paper version required.) It was anticipated that committee members might have some questions about the psychometric properties of the instrument, and the committee chair reported that she has invited Dr. Debra Oswald from the psychology department to the next committee meeting to assist with this discussion.

D. Recommendation and Rationale to The University Senate
The committee then revisited the decision to go forward to the University Senate with the motion to replace the MOCES. Most members spoke in favor of moving forward, although several members of the committee voiced concern that there needed to be more faculty “buy-in” to the idea and more communication with the individual colleges and department units before making a definitive recommendation to replace the current instrument. There was a suggestion that the committee needed to gather more information from the faculty before going forward (i.e., a survey), but the majority sentiment was that the committee process was past the point of assessing the need for change and was ready to make a recommendation based on the work the committee has done thus far. A vote on the motion to go forward with the recommendation to replace the MOCES with the IDEA student evaluation form was taken and passed with a majority vote; six members voted in favor, none were opposed, and there were two abstentions.

E. Decisions about the University Wide Process and Timetable
The committee discussed the next steps in the implementation of the Committee on Teaching’s recommendation. It was suggested that the recommendation be vetted by the Committee on Assessment, since this committee has expertise in the area and is also concerned about teaching outcomes at the University level. Several members felt that more conversations were needed with both faculty and administrators at the college and department level to make them aware of the upcoming change. Dr. Ellwood suggested two possible timetables that would address these issues, including presenting to the University Senate at the next meeting, a pilot period before implementation, and presentations to the colleges, Deans, Promotion and Tenure Committee, and Student government leaders (MUSG), with full implementation of the new system in Fall of 2018. Here are two suggested timetables:
**Possible Timetable**

- Presentation to University Academic Senate  
  October 19th, 2017
- Discussion with Promotion and Tenure Committee  
  October 11th, 2017
- Presentations to Deans  
  November 2017 meeting
- Presentation to MUSG (Student Government Leaders)  
  November 2017 meeting
- Presentation to Colleges and others  
  November 2017
- Motion to Academic Senate  
  November 2017
- Limited pilot of IDEA  
  Spring, 2018
- University wide implementation  
  Fall, 2018

**Longer Timetable:**

- Presentation to University Academic Senate  
  October 19th, 2017
- Discussion with Promotion and Tenure Committee  
  October 11th, 2017
- Presentations to Deans  
  November 2017 meeting
- Presentation to MUSG (Student Government Leaders)  
  November 2017 meeting
- Presentations to Colleges and others  
  November 2017/January 2018
- Motion to Academic Senate  
  November 2017
- Limited pilot of IDEA  
  Spring, 2018
- University wide implementation  
  Fall, 2018

**F. Next Steps for Implementation**

Dr. Ellwood asked the committee if there was other information they would need about the process going forward and asked the committee to provide feedback on the draft summarizing the committee’s work (Appendix A). Dr. Ellwood and Dr. Klockow agreed to present the committee’s recommendation to the University Senate at the October meeting. She reported that Dr. Debra Oswald, Ms. Alix Riley and Ms. Crystal Lendved would attend the next meeting to contribute to the discussion. Dr. Ellwood also asked the committee to consider the requests that the Diversity Committee made at a prior meeting regarding the importance of assessing issues of climate and diversity in the classroom. She would like us to consider these issues at the next meeting.

**B. Follow-up from 2017-2018: Potential changes to the call for nominations and selection criteria of the Way Klinger Teaching Enhancement Award**

There was not enough time to have an extended discussion of this issue; this topic will be discussed at later meeting.

**V. Adjournment**

The Meeting was adjourned at 5:05.

**Recorder**

Evelyn Donate-Bartfield
Attachments to the September 2017 Agenda

I. **Charge of the Committee on Teaching**

**2.05 Committee on Teaching** (amended by UAS on September 21, 2015)

The Committee on Teaching (COT) reports to the UAS and the Provost. The Committee addresses and advances the practice and scholarship of teaching and learning at Marquette University.

Responsibilities:
1. Promotes quality teaching and learning through the development of recommendations to the UAS regarding policies and practices related to teaching.
2. Identifies and implements methods to recognize and promote the scholarship of teaching.
3. Manages the selection process for faculty teaching awards and grants including the Faculty Awards for Teaching Excellence and the Way Klinger Interdisciplinary Teaching Award.
4. Collaborates with the Center for Teaching and Learning to provide seminars and resources for faculty development.
5. Reviews and recommends policies to provide a supportive academic teaching and learning environment including educational technology.
6. Provides an annual report to the UAS.

Membership: One faculty member, preferably tenured with a demonstrated commitment to teaching, from each College or School that desires representation. Each member shall be selected according to the rules of each unit and appointed by the Provost. The Marquette University Student Government will select one undergraduate student and the Graduate Student Organization will select one graduate student to serve on the Committee. Faculty members will serve a three-year term and student members a one-year term. The Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and the Director for the Center for Teaching and Learning shall serve as non-voting members. The Chair of the Committee will be a faculty member elected by and from the voting members of the Committee.

*From the Statutes of the University Academic Senate (UAS), Marquette University*