

Teaching, Learning, and Assessment Committee Meeting

Meeting Date: 09/28/18

Meeting Time: 1:00-2:00pm

Location: Humanities Rm 303

Approved October, 2018

Minutes

Members Present: Jennifer Edelman, Dena Kneiss, Kathy Kral, Sally Richter, Kyunghye Moon, Tyler Petty for Sydney Francis, Amy Irby-Shasanmi for Pam Hunt Kirk, Rick Sigman, John Morris

1. Meeting Called to Order at 1pm.

2. Item #1 – Committee History, Minutes Review and Charge- 3 handouts were provided (Committee Charge, Current Membership and Minutes from previous meeting) and the minutes from previous meeting were quickly reviewed. The committee reviewed the charge. John shared his conversations with Jennifer Edelman (previous chair) and Judy Butler, as well as his communication with the Provost's office. John highlighted 2 challenges that were identified in his discussions while preparing for the TLA's first meeting.

1. TLA is a New Committee (2nd year) with a broad charge, which at times has led to cross-over with other committees when trying to take up a specific Agenda Item.
2. Meeting Times is an issue that all committees seem to struggle with as there is not a University wide administration day. After a brief discussion it was agreed the committee are will try and have meetings on Fridays and a doodle poll will be sent out to accomplish the goal of finding a time that works for most people. It was suggested that people could share their Department Faculty Meetings with John to perhaps help with finding the best times.

3. Item #2 – Elect a Chair Elect- Sally Richter was nominated by John Morris to be Chair Elect, Rick Sigman seconded and the vote was unanimous.

4. Item #3 – 3 Possible Charges – John shared 3 possible charges that were suggested to him while preparing for the first meeting and asked that we consider these if the

committee wanted to consider taking them up.

1. Discuss possibility of working with CTL to develop a training course for objectives/assessment development to use with Curriculog. *Please see the discussion items that followed*
 - a. Curriculog is the replacement for CSS. Used to make adjustment to courses and proposing new courses. The system has been viewed positively; it is easier to track the changes through the system so you can the status of each proposal.
 - b. Curriculog requires the new course/program to account for assessment. There have been some issues where the assessments are not included or are not measurable, which led to the course/program being sent back to be revised.
 - c. We could work with CTL to help faculty in writing the proposals so that they include assessment with measurable objectives.

2. Discuss researching and making recommendations on climate issues concerning equity with adjuncts/lecturers etc. regarding governance, representation, etc. *Please see the discussion items that followed*
 - a. This comes directly from Dr. Crafton. The executive committee is looking at this and trying to determine which standing committee might take this on. It was suggested at the Ex Com that it may need to create an ad hoc committee or combine committees because this charge crosses a lot of committees' charges.
 - b. Adjuncts and lecturers may not have as much agency as others (e.g. some departments don't put adjuncts and lecturers on Faculty Senate).
 - i. The question is whether or not they want to take on the added service.
 - ii. Start by reaching out to the community to identify their needs and how their voice is or is not being heard.

3. Discuss examining the issue of paperless course and faculty assessment. *Please see the discussion items that followed*
 - a. Looking back at minutes from 2010 because this was discussed then.
 - b. With the e-Dossiers now required, we may want to go entirely paperless.
 - c. ITS is no longer doing the scantrons for SEIs. How will this information get into the dossiers?
 - d. Faculty Handbook requires the use of paper/pencil SEI for face to face classes
 - i. Faculty Executive Committee will take this language out.
 - ii. Issue of student response rates. Instructor preference, etc.
 - iii. Will need a process for faculty to request paper or electronic SEIs for use in their face to face classes. Fully online classes are remaining with electronic SEIs.

5. Item #4 – Open Discussion of Possible Charges and subsequent issues. All 3 charges were discussed. In reviewing charge number 1 the consensus was that this seems fairly straightforward. The committee could reach out to the CTL and discuss what tools might be developed to aid in course/program development as it relates to successfully navigating Curriculog. As for possible charges 2 and 3 there is some interest

in looking into these topics further as a good bit of open discussion was had pertaining to both topics. Please see the following notes from the discussion.

1. Kathy Kral: regarding online evaluations the process has been piloted twice. She can pull the data from those experiments. In 2016, there was research done on different ways to do course evals electronically. Possible to use Qualtrics? That would save the cost.
 2. Response rates are a concern. Online versions yield lower returns than paper. How do we measure the results? How will this affect tenure and promotion processes?
 3. There is a bigger issue with SEIs because some students don't give any thought. Do we get quality information from the SEIs or not? What if we did it during advisement? Is the issue that the professors are doing these? Advising seems early for some departments to use as an option. Also some larger departments might find it creates a backlog.
 4. The system they looked at in 2016 used a QR code and the students could do it in class. If the students didn't have a device then you would give them a paper/pencil one. Still done in class but the option is to do it online or paper/pencil.
 5. Need to discuss the quality of the data we are getting and the weight that those data get in the tenure and promotion process.
 6. Looking at the questions on the survey. Are we asking the right questions? Do the questions work for online and face to face classes? For example, the question about the professor being available for extra help. Are there knock-out questions to assist in measuring the quality of the data.
 7. The question is not how or when we deliver the surveys. The real question is how do we get actionable data? What can I as a faculty member do to teach my class better?
 8. The student representative: The students feel obligated to do the bubbles but not the qualitative comments on the back.
 9. Do the students know what happens with the course evaluations? In business they do know that the professors read the evaluations.
- 6. Item #4 – Meeting Adjourned and Final Thoughts-** At 2pm John asked for the meeting to adjourned. He asked for everyone to think about the discussion that was had and to consider what the committee would like to work on this year be it none/some/or all of these charges as well as to discuss with their departments what the committee talked about as well as any concerns they might have for the committee to take up. John mentioned he would share our discussion in the Senate Executive meeting and send out the doodle poll for the next meeting. Thanks to everyone who could attend and to Jennifer Edelman for taking notes to be used in the drafting of the minutes.