Committee on Teaching  
Minutes for October 11th, 2017  
Zilber Hall 470, 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), Deb Oswald, Department of Psychology

Call to Order  
The meeting was called to order at 3:31 p.m.

Reflection  
Joyce Wolburg

I. Committee Welcomes Deb Oswald from the Department of Psychology

II. Minutes  
Approval of draft minutes from September 13th, 2017; minutes were approved with correction to spelling of "Way Klingler."

III. Announcement and Information  
The chair brought the committee's attention to the feedback from the 2016-2017 Way Klingler Teaching Enhancement Grant Recipients (Catey Ott, Susan Mountin, Connie Petersen, Lynne Shumow, and Sarah Wadsworth). The chair said that the committee will want to revisit the criteria, and that this conversation remains on the year's agenda. We will revisit it at some point. (The report from the recipients was sent to Committee members with the agenda.)

IV. Continuing Business

A. Reports for the day's meetings with:

1. Fr. Daniel C. McDonald, SJ (Provincial Assistant Higher Education)  
Fr. McDonald visited Marquette on October 11th, 2017 in order to get a sense of how the university is doing on its mission statement. Cynthia Ellwood, Kristen Foster, Laurieann Klockow, and Shaun Longstreet attended this meeting. Fr. McDonald was particularly interested in Ignatian pedagogy and Catholic mission on campus. Shaun Longstreet had prepared a list of the opportunities on campus for engaging with both Ignatian pedagogy and the university's Catholic mission. The Faber Center, the Center for Teaching and Learning, and the Office of Mission and Identity all support the mission statement.
Additionally, Longstreet had a list of further opportunities for faculty engagement. Finally, we agreed that Ignatian pedagogy and social justice in particular are part of the common parlance of the university.

Members of the CoT also met with the P&T Committee and the Committee on Diversity and Equity to begin conversations about teaching evaluations, MOCES and IDEA.

2. P&T Committee
Cynthia Ellwood, Laurieann Klockow, and Shaun Longstreet all attended the P&T committee meeting and reported that P&T members were highly invested in the instrument (MOCES/IDEA). P&T was curious about many of the issues that compelled CoT to attend and listen: length and cost were mentioned; and P&T was curious about the issue of bias in these instruments. They liked that IDEA was faculty centered. And they were very interested in Deb Oswald's findings about bias in student assessments. CoT would like to send Oswald's psychometric evaluation of IDEA to P&T.

P&T is interested in looking beyond averages in individual teaching evaluation scores; but the committee wanted to know if after we get information /feedback on an individual from IDEA, can we track a person's progress in a report. Can we use IDEA to see if an instructor is improving? Alix Riley said that it was possible for MU to extract its own data from IDEA.

P&T Concerns:
* Length
* Consistency of Language with P&T documents. (Some on the CoT felt confident that the CoT could work with P&T to streamline language if IDEA is selected.)

3. Committee on Diversity and Equity
Cynthia Ellwood and Jerrin Cherian attended the CDE meeting to listen to member questions and concerns about faculty assessment instruments. Like the P&T committee, the CDE was highly invested in the instrument, as extracting data and statistics are both important to them. Members voiced concerns about specific courses wherein faculty might hold a particular intellectual position on an issue such as race. What can assessment data tell us about these courses? Another member wondered if it might be useful to have the instrument at the beginning of the semester in order to think about what will be assessed. The CDE also noted that issues of diversity and equity might appear when a student is in a class with a member of any group they have never before encountered. This could factor into a lower overall score for that faculty member.

This led the committee to discuss briefly how departments use data from the instrument, noting that some departments average the two main scores on MOCES (teacher effectiveness rating/course excellence rating), and this exposes a lack of understanding of how to evaluate statistics on the part of faculty. A guide might be helpful for interpreting any instrument.
The committee also noted that some research on assessment tools suggests that scores are not necessarily altered by demographics. The CoT thought that it might need to make sense of the contradictory research.

The CoT then discussed how it might better understand the important assessment issues for under-represented groups. One member thought we might also consider the role age plays in addition to race, gender, and sexuality. Another wondered if the P&T committee looked at the role that race and gender have played (or might play) in dossiers that are questionable. As this is confidential, the CoT thought it best to ask Gary Meyer to answer this more generally.

B. An Analysis of IDEA Relative to Statistical Adjustments and Diversity/Equity
Debra Oswald, Department of Psychology
The chair had asked Deb Oswald to look over the research on IDEA and its use of statistical adjustments particularly as they related to her expertise with psychometrics and diversity/equity.

Oswald's overall assessment:
1. The quality of the research varies
2. Gender matters more in male-dominated fields
3. We need to consider the moderating factors involved
4. Did not find much in the reports about ethnicity and race, and argues it should be considered
5. Research says we must adjust for extraneous factors
6. As far as what is correlated to overall success, she finds that the method is ok, but she is not sure that what we are adjusting for is valid.
7. As far as overall ratings go, Oswald found that looking at overall ratings, only 7 of 20+ questions correlated with the final score.
8. Worries that what factors into student assessment most is how we perceive someone when we score them

Questions Asked of Oswald:
1. Is IDEA an improvement over MOCES? Her answer: It might be, but we need to be sure to make adjustments.

C. Discussion of Issues Related to IDEA/Course Evaluation
With Oswald's input in mind, the committee continued its discussion of IDEA and course evaluations. The question: how do faculty approach teaching evaluations? Can we find out what experiences diverse/underrepresented faculty have with course evaluations? The CoT agreed that it needs to understand what the experiences are. One member suggested that if all the committee does is start the conversation, then it starts a larger conversation about how we make the university comfortable for everyone.

*The Committee decided it would be useful to list questions that it needs to have answered from the IDEA people in order to move forward:
1. Would IDEA or MOCES take experiences of diversity and difference into account? Debra Oswald suggested that the more specific the questions, the less bias tends to show up. She also suggested that ambiguous questions tend to reveal the most bias.

2. Can we assess a faculty member over time with the instrument (say from year 1 to year 6)? This might be helpful to watch for improvement.

3. Impressive amount of data, but do they answer the questions we have about diversity and equity?

*The Committee also suggested we keep the following in mind as we move forward:

1. Along with Debra Oswald, we have reservations about student evaluations being the sole or primary measure of teaching effectiveness.

2. Thus we should stress to P&T that this would be one tool among a larger number of measures of teaching effectiveness.

3. Remember that the instrument informs peer review and letters NOT the other way around.

D. Final Edits to One-page Brief for UAS
The CoT agreed:
*to omit from Strengths: "Ratings are also statistically adjusted to account for factors like class size, course demands, and student motivation."
*to omit the cost from "Drawbacks" (consider that $30,000 is worth it to retain 3 students or one faculty member)
*to list Drawbacks as "Potential Drawbacks"

E. Next Steps
The Committee agreed that language about how to use the instrument would be helpful for the P&T committee. OIRA said that we already have language, and that the P&T committee is expecting a new document. Agreed that we would start with getting new P&T guidelines from Gary Meyer. [Kirstin Haglund will pursue.]

More General Questions from the CoT:
*Committee would like to know what influences the global measures. [Alix will include this on the list of Qs to pose to IDEA]

* Is there a different way to aggregate the data for summative purposes? [Alix poses to IDEA]

*How defensible is the average of the score from the student self-reporting on how much they learned and the objectives that faculty identify? [Alix poses to IDEA]
*How reliable is student self-reporting?

*The Committee would like to look at the formative tools. [Shaun will give us a demo at our next meeting.]

*Are there faculty satisfaction reports for IDEA? How is this impacting the faculty at other universities who are using the tool? Is there evidence that the tools help? [Shaun will investigate.]

*Does IDEA address faculty frustration with MOCES? Can it help faculty? Do MU faculty members feel that this will give individuals more feedback to improve teaching? [Committee to discuss at our next meeting and as we gather input from our individual colleges and other campus committees.]

* What advice do we want to suggest or create for P&T? [For Committee discussion]

Before CoT adjourned, the committee agreed that it is not yet ready to present IDEA to the Deans. And a smaller group of committee members (Cynthia Ellwood, Kristen Foster, Laurieann Klockow, and Shaun Longstreet) agreed to visit the Committee on Diversity and Equity again on November 8th.

V. Adjournment

The Meeting was adjourned at 5:05.

Recorder

Kristen Foster