Committee on Teaching
Minutes for September 14th, 2016
470 Zilber Hall (3:30 to 5:00 pm)

Members Present: Daniel Meissner (Chair), Evelyn Donate-Bartfield, Cynthia Ellwood, Kristin Haglund (By phone), Shaun Longstreet, Don Newmann, Terence Ow, James Pokrywczyński, Jane Sloan Peters, John Su, and Susan Schneider

Recorder:
Evelyn Donate-Bartfield

1. Call to Order
The meeting was called to order by Daniel Meissner at 3:35.

2. Reflection
Dr. James Pokrywczyński provided the reflection.

3. Committee Welcome and Introductions

4. Minutes
The minutes from the May 4th, 2016 meeting were unanimously approved with two small corrections.

5. Reviewed the Charge to the Committee on Teaching
   a. The committee reviewed the committee’s charge; this charge is detailed in the University Senate Statutes at: [http://www.marquette.edu/provost/documents/STATUTESOFTHEUNIVERSITYACADEMICSENATEupdated091616.pdf](http://www.marquette.edu/provost/documents/STATUTESOFTHEUNIVERSITYACADEMICSENATEupdated091616.pdf)

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.

After reviewing the committee’s charge, the committee reviewed tentative dates for the Way Klingler Teaching Enhancement Award and the Teaching Excellence Award. The consensus was that the committee would adopt the same general timelines for completing these tasks this year.

b. Proposed Deadlines for the 2017-2018 Way Klingler Teaching Enhancement award:

   **Way Klingler Teaching Enhancement Award**
   - Announcement to campus community: Late September
   - Application deadline: December 9
   - Packets to Committee: December 12
   - CoT rankings due: January 12
   - CoT discussion and final ranking of candidate: January 18

c. Proposed Deadlines for the 2017-2018 Teaching Excellence Award:

   **Teaching Excellence Award**
   - Announcement to campus community: October, TBA
   - Nomination deadline: November, TBA
   - Semi-finalist notification: December, TBA
   - Semi-finalist dossiers due: February, TBA
   - Dossiers distributed to CoT: February, TBA
   - CoT rankings due: March 6
   - CoT recommendations sent to Provost: March 16

d. Way-Klinger Teaching Enhancement Report

   No presentation has been scheduled for last year’s Teaching Enhancement Award winners to present the results of their project. (Mrs. Cathleen Ott Thompson, Mrs. Connie Petersen, Dr. Sarah Wadsworth, Ms. Lynne Shumow and Dr. Susan Mountin were the award winners last year.)

e. Discussion of Way Klingler Teaching Enhancement Award Process

   The committee briefly discussed last year’s award process and examined some changes that might improve 1) the number of proposals submitted and 2) the assessment process for submitted proposals. These issues included updating the evaluation rubric, discussion of factors that might be affecting the number and diversity of proposals being submitted (such as our call for proposals that appears to value innovation over replication of educational projects), and whether to include a special focus in the call for proposals this year. There was some concern that including a special focus might limit the number of proposals submitted. It was decided that the committee did not have enough time to fully
consider adding a new focus for this year, so the issue should be revisited at a future meeting for implementation next year.

Follow up: Discuss evaluation rubric, Decide on a special focus for the Way-Klinger Enhancement award for next year. Set deadlines for committee activities, Schedule presentation for Way Klinger Teaching Enhancement Award winners to share activities with Marquette Community.

6. New Business

a. Issues the Committee may want to consider in the future
Dr. Su presented several issues that the Committee on Teaching may want to consider discussing in the future. These included:

1. Evaluating effects of upcoming change in grading system: Marquette will adopting to a slightly different grading system (i.e., B- rather than A/B). The committee may want to consider the results of this change and provide feedback to help manage change in this area.
2. Electronic Badges: A digital badge is a way to designate a student’s achievement in a chosen area. It indicates achievement that is different than a major or minor concentration of classes. There needs to be work on what these badges would mean in the Marquette setting and how they would be identified, awarded, and documented.
3. Providing education to faculty on ADA (American with Disabilities Act) compliance for on-line materials. Dr. Su gave examples of online educational materials that are likely inaccessible to students needing learning accommodations (i.e., PDF files cannot be read by most speech recognition programs; closed captioned materials are sometimes needed for compliance). Most committee members agreed that there was a need for training around this issue.

7. Continuing Business

a. MOCES (Marquette Online Course Evaluation System) Revision
Last year, the committee began to work on evaluating and possibly revising or replacing the MOCES instrument. At the last meeting in the spring, the committee compiled a list of requests for materials they felt would be useful in deciding on revisions and/or in replacing the current instrument. In response to this request, the CTL (Center for Teaching and Learning) and Office of Institutional Research have put together a repository of materials for the committee. These materials include educational resources/materials on best practices for conducting course evaluations and eight pre-packaged validated evaluation instruments that could be used in place of our current form. See the Appendix A for a list of materials that this repository would include.
Dr. Longstreet proposed assigning committee members to different areas of the repository and asking them to read and be responsible for representing that information in group discussions about revising the MOCES.

Follow up: The committee needs to decide if it wants to assign individual members to reading/representing each of the content areas in the repository.

b. Promotion and Tenure Committee and Institutional Accreditation Considerations for Revising the MOCES: Dr. Gary Meyer
There were concerns raised that changing the MOCES would negatively impact a) teaching portfolios for candidates being considered for Promotion and Tenure, b) educational outcomes that are part of the institution’s accreditation process. Dr. Meyer reported that changing or altering our current student evaluation system would not adversely affect either of these processes.

5. Adjournment
The meeting was adjourned at 5:00.

Next Meeting: October 12th, 2016

Respectfully submitted,
Evelyn Donate-Bartfield
Appendix A

Contents of Materials to Assist in Evaluation of MOCES Scores

- Course Evaluation Questionnaire
  - Reliability and validity of course evaluations
  - Specific Questions
    - Effective Teaching
    - Items for Promotion and Tenure
  - Sample Sets
  - Pre-packaged Evaluations
    - Ascend II
    - EvalUT
    - IASystem
    - IDEA
    - SEEQ (Student Evaluation of Education Quality)
    - SETE (Student Evaluation of Teaching Effectiveness)
    - SIR II (Student Instructional Form)
    - SQOI (Student Questionnaire on Instruction)
  - Evaluation for Different Class Sizes
  - Diversity and Inclusion Questions

- Evaluation Administration
  - Timing of course evaluations
  - Incentives
  - In-class

- Results
  - Variance in scores for different class types
    - Class size
    - Course level
    - Discipline
    - Workload and course difficulty
  - Variance by instructor types

- Education
  - Department Heads/Dean
  - Faculty
  - Students
  - Promotion and Tenure Committees

- Impact of Switching Instruments
  - Promotion and Tenure Committee
  - OIRA (Office of Institutional Research and Assessment)
  - Cost
  - Value of Evaluations
  - What is the process?