The Chair sincerely thanks the faculty members of the FDEC, its ex officio members, and especially its tireless collaborators, the CAE (Kathy Nantz, Roben Torosyan, and Suzanna Klaf), Tracy Immerso (OCC), and Jay Rozgonyi (CNS), and all of the faculty from across the University who were involved with the various Faculty Development Days for all of their dedicated work during this busy academic year.

1. **Name of committee chairperson**
   Angela Kim Harkins (Religious Studies)

2. **Committee membership**
   CAS/SOE: Bill Abbott (History); Jessica Davis (Chemistry); Joel Goldfield (MLL); Angela Harkins (RS)
   
   DSB: Vishnu Vinekar
   
   SON: Meredith Wallace Kazer
   
   GSEAP: Emily Smith
   
   Dean Aaron Perkus (UC)
   
   AVP Mary Frances Malone
   
   Invited Guests for the entire year: Kathy Nantz (CAE); Roben Torosyan (CAE); Tracy Immerso (Academic Affairs)
   
   Invited Guests for Specific Meetings: Laura Nash and Jessica McCullough on 11/10/10; Paul Fitzgerald, SJ (SVPAA) and Jay Rozgonyi (CNS) on 1/19/11; Gisela Gil-Egui on 2/9/11; Cinthia Gannett on 4/13/11

3. **Number of meetings attended by each committee member:**
   
   All 11 Meetings: Angela Kim Harkins (chair); Bill Abbott; Joel Goldfield; Emily Smith; Mary Frances Malone (ex officio)
   
   Attended 10 Meetings: Jessica Davis; Meredith Kazer; Vishnu Vinekar
   
   Attended 8 Meetings: Aaron Perkus (ex officio)

4. **Dates of meetings**
   
   September 8, 2010
   
   October 8, 2010
   
   November 10, 2010
   
   December 1, 2010
   
   Dec. 10, 2010—Faculty Development Day on Student Engagement
   
   January 19, 2011
   
   February 9, 2011
   
   February 23, 2011
   
   March 2, 2011
   
   March 30, 2011
   
   April 13, 2011
   
   May 4, 2011
   
   May 5, 2011—Faculty Development Day on Academic Integrity
5. List of principal topics considered by the committee

A. IDEA AND EVALUATION OF TEACHING; The majority of the work of the FDEC this academic year was dedicated to discussion and evaluation of the procedures for the new IDEA student evaluation form. This work includes the following topics and concerns: Education and Outreach to Faculty, Administrators/Rank & Tenure Committee members, and Students; Procedural matters (Paper and Online Procedures; Error Reporting); Administrator’s IDEA; Local Codes/Discipline Codes

IDEA Education and Outreach

A large portion of the FDEC work this year was dedicated to various initiatives to educate both faculty and students about the new evaluation of teaching form. Throughout the fall and spring semesters, the IDEA committee, along with the FDEC and CAE, collaborated on how to best inform faculty and students about the new IDEA form. One major outcome of this collaboration was the creation of a website with the assistance of Laura Johnson (CNS). This website, (http://www.fairfield.edu/academic/aca_idea.html), is a centralized place for both faculty and students to read about the IDEA form and how to use it. Copies of the Faculty Information Form and student surveys are archived there as pdf files.

Specific Outreach to Faculty: The Chair made general announcements at the GFM in both fall and spring (12/3/10 and 4/1/11) that updated faculty on the IDEA implementation process, reported specific errors and how they were addressed. At the 12/1/10 meeting, the Chair specified that Faculty Announcements would be the primary means of communicating about IDEA and that all faculty and Department Chairs should ensure that they both receive and read these messages.

Training Workshops: According to the Academic Council Minutes from 4/19/10, a unanimous motion was made to ask the CAE to conduct the workshops related to the IDEA form. In those minutes, it specified that faculty who assist in those workshops should be compensated from the Teacher’s Bureau. In the fall 2010, current and past members of the FDEC who had been at the Train the Trainer IDEA conference in Orlando, FL worked in collaboration with the CAE (Kathy Nantz, Roben Torosyan, and Suzanna Klaf) to offer faculty workshops on the basic procedures for the paper and online IDEA forms (Bill Abbott, Shannon Harding, Angela Harkins, Vishnu Vinekar) as well as workshops on how to interpret the reports generated by the IDEA form (Bill Abbott, Meredith Kazer). In the fall of 2010, members of the FDEC took it upon themselves to offer training workshops at regular meetings for each department in the College of Arts and Sciences and every school at the University. Every department in the College participated in this initiative (with the exception of V.P.A. and Physics) and every College/School participated (with the exception of SOE). In the fall 2010, more than 250 faculty members participated in these training workshops led by Bill Abbott, Shannon Harding, Angela Harkins, Vishnu Vinekar, and in the spring 2011, as many as 54 faculty attended CAE workshops on the interpretation of the IDEA Diagnostic Form Reports. The Chair held a private workshop on the DRF for the Religious Studies Department which was attended by 9 people. A total of 63 individuals have participated in an IDEA DRF workshop. Special thanks are extended to the former FDEC
chairperson, Shannon Harding, for assisting with 2 of these fall semester training workshops after her rotation off the FDEC.

**Targeted Outreach to Administrators and R&T Committee:** On behalf of the faculty, the FDEC expressed concerns about how the first IDEA data would be used for summative purposes, especially for Rank and Tenure decision-making and discussed ways to inform and reach out to individuals who are in positions of decision-making.

In the fall semester, the Chair conducted a private workshop on the IDEA form and its procedures for the members of the Rank and Tenure Committee (11/17/10). In accord with the Academic Council minutes from 4/19/10, the Chair also sent a formal letter to the chair of the Rank &Tenure committee which urged them to use caution when interpreting the fall 2010 IDEA data as both students and faculty will not have been familiar with how it works (memo dated 2/23/11). Included with this memo was a document from the IDEA Center on recommendations for using the IDEA data in administrative decision-making which include the specification that the quantitative portion of IDEA should represent 35-50% of the data for summative decision-making. In addition to this, the Chair formally requested that the Academic Affairs office send an ongoing member of the Rank and Tenure committee to the IDEA Train the Trainer meeting held annually in Orlando, FL, so that an IDEA trained expert would reside in the R&T committee. Kathy Nantz (CAE) generously agreed to fund Jean Lange (SON) as this ongoing-member of the Rank and Tenure committee. Jean will be the R&T resident expert on the IDEA form and she will conduct additional training and guidance on IDEA to the future R&T committee members.

In collaboration with the CAE, members of the FDEC (Bill Abbott and Meredith Kazer) have conducted a training workshop for all Deans (5/26/11).

**Targeted Outreach to Students:** In addition to the website, the Chair worked with a student, Niles Muzyk, who authored an article for the *Mirror* which appeared in Dec. 2010. Bill Abbott wrote an open letter to students that was published in the *Mirror* on April 19, 2011. These articles and others that document the implementation of the form and describe the importance of the student evaluation process are archived on the website as well. Since many of the online IDEA forms will be completed in student areas/ in student residences outside the classroom, the Chair also requested the collaboration of student life directors (Karen Donoghue and Kamala Kiem) to ask them to stress the importance of the thoughtful and careful responses by students (email dated 4/13/11). The Chair also met with Suzanne Solensky (FYM) and discussed how to integrate the IDEA form into the First Year Mentoring experience (5/2/11). In the Chair’s announcement at the GFM on Dec. 1, 2010, all faculty members were urged to take the time in class to explain the importance of students responding carefully and thoughtfully to the form.

**IDEA Procedures and Errors**

Current members of the FDEC who had previously attended the Train the Trainer IDEA conference in Orlando, FL (Bill Abbott, Angela Harkins, Vishnu Vinekar, and later Meredith Kazer), became on-going members of the IDEA procedure committee which was run by Tracy Immerso, the On-Campus Coordinator and attended by Mary Frances Malone, Aaron Perkus, and Jay Rozgonyi. This IDEA committee met regularly at least once a month in addition to the usual FDEC meetings. The chair reported updates from these IDEA meetings and raised topics
that required further discussion by the FDEC. The administration of the IDEA form lies under the purview of the OCC; the OCC is in charge of the process and is responsible for executing the process. Faculty members of the FDEC hold an advisory role and evaluate the process. The Journal of Record states the following:

> Every faculty member in every class shall administer the IDEA teaching evaluation form. The On Campus Coordinator for IDEA (OCC) shall be a non-faculty employee appointed by the Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs who reports to the SVPAA. The OCC is responsible for coordinating the administration of the IDEA teaching evaluations, for receiving all data from IDEA, for overseeing the storage of the data and for distribution of Diagnostic Reports to individual faculty members. Teaching evaluation data belong to the individual faculty member. The OCC is the only person authorized to receive data from IDEA. The OCC will have access to the data but may not release it to anyone except the individual faculty member without the faculty member’s written permission. Each fall, the Faculty Development and Evaluation Committee shall appoint one of its elected faculty members to be a liaison to the OCC for that year.

**Procedures:** FDEC members of the IDEA committee reviewed procedures for the paper IDEA form (including the best way of distributing the paper FUSA forms), and the yellow forms. This included the preparation of the script and the instructions that were attached to the outside of the IDEA envelope and the Yellow Form envelope and offering feedback on the website used for the fall online registration site. Much of the content and topics of these meetings are detailed in the below section on Error Reporting.

**Error Reporting:** The IDEA committee and the FDEC discussed a number of errors in the process of administering the IDEA forms from fall 2010 which were avoided in spring 2011. These errors and their resolution are described here.

i. **Errors in IDEA Inserts widely distributed to all faculty:** The original FUSA insert prepared by the OCC office for the fall 2010 FUSA questions did not clearly indicate that students should answer these questions in the “Additional Questions” spaces numbered 48-52 on the IDEA evaluation form. It is also the case that the paper insert of Discipline Codes that was included in the paper IDEA packets included incorrect Discipline Code information for Religious Studies (spr 2011). The insert directs faculty to use the code 3802 which does not exist. These discipline codes should be determined by the faculty person. If the OCC wishes to suggest a discipline code, it should be correctly indicated in the document. *These types of errors ultimately result in more work for the OCC. They can be easily avoided in the future by asking FDEC members of the IDEA committee to review documents for accuracy and clarity prior to distributing them widely to faculty.*

ii. **Preparation of the Envelopes to Return Data to Faculty:** The process of the paper IDEA form is a manual process with much room for human error. Once the student
evaluations and the Faculty Information Form are received back from IDEA along with the Diagnostic Form Reports, the Academic Affairs office must reconcile the different forms together since all of these forms arrive separately from the IDEA processing center. The forms from fall 2010 were reconciled in the Academic Affairs office by the staff people who happened to be available for this additional work during March. Faculty from the Dolan School of Business and from the College of Arts and Sciences (Paul Caster and Rose Rodriguez) received envelopes addressed to them which included several other Diagnostic Form Reports that belonged to other faculty.

According to the Journal of Record, teaching evaluation data belongs to the faculty person and it may not be disclosed without the express intent of the faculty person. Due to the sensitive nature of the data, it is important to avoid this type of error in the future. The FDEC recommends that the Academic Affairs office hire a full-time dedicated staff person to assist Tracy Immerso, the On-Campus Coordinator in the reconciliation and preparation of these sensitive documents. While the administrative staff in 300 CNS are to be commended for their efforts to fill in as needed, it is not appropriate that the burden of this manual labor should fall as additional work on staff who are not dedicated to the process. Teaching is the most important thing that the University does and the Academic Affairs Office should commit funds and resources so that Tracy Immerso is able to have the support that she needs to administer the IDEA form and its results correctly.

iii. Paper/Online IDEA Forms and Registration Page:
   a. Registration Page: The FDEC chair worked with the IDEA committee in the fall to give feedback on the registration web page that records a faculty person’s desire to use either paper or online forms, and also give faculty the ability to opt-out of the FUSA survey. The Chair specifically requested that the course timecodes and dates appear on the registration page to ensure accurate registration. Because the CRN is the key driving mechanism, Banner becomes even more important for the IDEA process. This and other related conversations highlighted the difficulty of using Banner data as it is currently being used. The FDEC recommends the ongoing development of the Banner system so that the IDEA process can be handled in an efficient way that is expeditious for the faculty person. The use of Banner in the IDEA process is a matter that continues to be of importance for the ongoing use of IDEA at Fairfield University. In the future, the IDEA committee plans to further develop this registration page.

   b. Paper/Online Format: Discussion was held about the format for the IDEA evaluations. In both fall and spring, faculty members were asked to register their preferred format and whether or not they wish to be included in the FUSA data. In the fall, approximately fifty courses self-selected the online format. The chair requested that the format remain consistent through the entire academic year (paper default). Due to the high cost of the paper forms and the many opportunities for error, the decision was made by Tracy Immerso (OCC) to change the default for IDEA from paper to online. In the spring approximately 250 courses requested the
paper format for IDEA. It should be stated that the OCC’s decision to change the default to online does not violate the AC motions which specifies that faculty should continue to have the option of requesting the format that they desire during the 4 semesters (2010-2012).

iv. Damaged and Lost IDEA data from fall 2010: Seven boxes of IDEA forms were shipped through the USPS to the IDEA processing center at the end of the fall 2010 semester. One of these boxes containing data from the Dolan School of Business and the School of Nursing was seriously damaged by the USPS. This error lies completely outside of the control of Fairfield University. For the faculty whose data was seriously damaged or unrecoverable, the SVPAA issued a formal letter at the end of March 2011 that excuses that faculty member from reporting that data for summative purposes (merit reporting and tenure and promotion applications). The faculty members who were affected were also identified to their respective deans.

At the request of the Chair, the OCC held a brown-bag workshop for faculty in the DSB who were negatively impacted by the damaged box of forms in spring 2011. This brown-bag was held on April 12, 2011 and was attended by 2 faculty members. One matter that arose was the processing of incomplete data—if a Faculty Information Form was salvaged and processed, but only a handful of the course evaluations were salvaged and processed, this would result in a skewed and inaccurate report. The Chair requested that the OCC also send a letter excusing faculty who were affected in this way. This request was made in person on 4/12/11 and a follow-up email was sent on 4/21/11 and 5/5/11.

v. Error in Class Lists for online IDEA: In week 14 of spring 2011, Angela Biselli (Physics) reported serious discrepancies in the enrollment lists used for her sections. This error was addressed and immediately resolved by Jay Rozgonyi (CNS).

vi. The Yellow Sheets: Related to the discussion of IDEA is the role of the Yellow Sheets. In accord with the Academic Council minutes from 4/19/10, the actual hardcopy Yellow Sheets should be used through spring 2012. It is recommended that in 2011-2012, the FDEC begin review of faculty use of this formative mechanism. The chair wishes to document here that faculty have very strong views about retaining the Yellow Sheet form in its current physical paper format.

B. PEER REVIEW

The IDEA Center recommends that the quantitative data from the IDEA reports should represent approximately 35-50% of the total teaching data when making summative decisions about teaching. Other data that should be considered can come from Peer Review. FDEC discussions about the IDEA form have historically been accompanied by discussions about the need to improve the Peer Review process at the University (e.g., see item 7.b., FDEC annual Report 2008-2009). A Peer Review sub-committee (Bill Abbott, Vishnu Vinekar, Emily Smith, and Roben Torosyan, Kathy Nantz, and Suzanna Klaf) was formed and met throughout the fall and
spring semesters. The Chair extends her gratitude to this sub-committee for their dedication and hard work on this topic throughout the year.

While it is already a common practice to have peer classroom observations for formative purposes, there is no systematic method for evaluating how this kind of teaching data can and should be used in summative decision-making.

Through the work of this sub-committee, a funded program was designed that invites interested faculty members or departments to apply for funding to develop a peer review system for their program (4/15/11). Fourteen faculty members from GSEAP, SON, CAS applied and were awarded funding for their participation in the Peer Review initiative. During the ay 2011-2012, these faculty members would be expected to report on what their progress on Peer Review over the course of the year at the Faculty Development Days for 2011-2012, both of which would be dedicated to Peer Review.

C. STUDENT ENGAGEMENT (Faculty Development Day for fall 2010)

The topic of the fall 2010 Faculty Development Day was “Student Engagement.” This was a topic that had strong support during the 2009-2010 discussions of possible FDD topics, but had not been chosen. The FDEC wishes to thank Dean Beth Boquet who gave the plenary address on student engagement, and to those who presented in their areas of expertise Jessica McCullough (student assignments), Laura Nash (advising), Betsy Bowen (graduate writing). Special thanks are extended to the Office of Academic Affairs for funding the lunch and refreshments on that day. Meredith reported that the evaluations from the FDD were largely positive with good feedback on the topics and presenters.

D. ACADEMIC INTEGRITY (Rebecca Howard, Faculty Development Day for spring 2011)

The Chair received an invitation from Cinthia Gannett in December 2010 to collaborate with a number of groups across the University to host Dr. Rebecca Moore Howard (English, Syracuse University) as the Faculty Development Day speaker. This opportunity fit well with previous suggestions to host a FDD topic on the topic of Academic Integrity that were expressed in conversations from 2008-2009. The Chair is grateful to Cinthia Gannett for this opportunity to collaborate across the university to bring such an important topic to faculty members.

E. OPEN SOURCE RESEARCH

Early in the spring semester, the Chair was approached by Gisela Gil-Egui (Communication) to consider the topic of Open Source Research as a possible Faculty Development Day topic for spring 2011. Unfortunately, a commitment had already been made with Cinthia Gannett in Dec 2010 to collaborate on the spring FDD. The Chair nevertheless invited Gisela Gil-Egui to present this topic in further depth to the FDEC on 2/9/11, since it may be a topic that the FDEC will wish to pursue in the future. There was stimulating discussion of the topic, both in favor and against. It was decided that the FDEC would not be able to pursue this topic at this time but that this topic was underway in other areas of the University and that they might be good collaborators (e.g., Jackie Kramer, Library)
6 and 7: List of the decisions taken by the committee and Anticipated Effects of these Decisions:

- **Peer Review of Teaching:** The FDEC voted unanimously to accept the recommendation of the Peer Review Sub-committee (1) to collaborate with the CAE and to sponsor a Peer Review funding opportunity for interested faculty and departments during 2011-2012; (2) to dedicate both FDD in 2011-2012 to the topic of Peer Review of Teaching (vote: unanimously in favor).
  - The FDEC anticipates that both of these initiatives will stimulate the deepening of faculty interest in the Peer Review process and encourage the design of peer review systems across the University. This will help to avoid a disproportionate weighting of student evaluation data and assist in creating a culture where both formative and summative approaches to teaching are holistic and integrated.

- **IDEA for Administrators Form:** The FDEC formed a sub-committee in fall 2010 to review the Administrator’s IDEA form (Angela Harkins, Mary Frances Malone, Aaron Perkus). It was decided that the IDEA for Administrators form was outside the purview of the FDEC. The FDEC voted, nevertheless, to present a motion to the Academic Council to ask it to consider forming a subcommittee (independent from the FDEC) to consider the adoption of an Administrator’s IDEA form. The FDEC voted on February 23 to present the following motion to the Academic Council (vote: all in favor, one opposed).

  **Motion:** The FDEC requests that the Academic Council appoint a subcommittee to consider the adoption of the Administrators’ IDEA form.

  **Rationale:** The new student evaluation of teaching that Fairfield University formally adopted beginning in fall 2010, known as IDEA, also produces a survey to measure the effectiveness of chairs, deans, and administrators (hereafter IDEA for Administrators). Like the IDEA student rating form which allows the faculty person to choose the specific learning objectives that will be measured, the IDEA form for administrators allows the chair, dean, or administrator to choose in advance the goals by which he or she wishes to be evaluated.
  - It was decided by the FDEC that such a task technically lies outside the purview of the FDEC, whose charge is the ongoing evaluation and development of faculty performance. While department chairs, deans, and many administrators are also faculty members, this IDEA Administrator’s Evaluation system evaluates their performance as administrators.
  - Adopting IDEA for Administrators is consistent with the recent conversations about shared governance on campus.
  - This motion is also consistent with the University’s goal to adopt open and transparent practices of assessment.

  - This motion was presented to the Academic Council on April 4, 2011 and it was approved although with some reservations about the wording since it was not clear that the specific form known as IDEA for Administrators was the best instrument to use for this evaluation process. The FDEC anticipates that this motion will help to create a culture of shared governance at Fairfield University which best represents the goals of the Blue Ribbon Commission.
• **Viewing Data in the Aggregate:** In January 19, 2011, the SVPAA requested that the FDEC make a motion for administrator’s to view data in the Aggregate. The FDEC discussed this motion at the February 23 meeting and formulated the following motion to present to the Academic Council (vote: all in favor, one opposed):

  Motion: The FDEC requests that the Academic Council allow the faculty and administration to view student survey data in the aggregate. Data must only be available in such a way that individual faculty are not identified.

  Rationale: In practice, chairs, deans, and other administrators have had access to the viewing of summative teaching data in the aggregate form for the purpose of meta-analysis of student learning patterns and teaching effectiveness. The viewing of data in the aggregate would formalize a procedure that is already in practice. The restriction that no individual faculty be identified is a change in the procedure that is currently in place in some schools.

  This motion was presented to the Academic Council on April 4, 2011 and it was approved although with some reservations about the wording given that it may be in tension with existing language in the J of R. The FDEC anticipates that this motion will increase transparency across the university. More importantly, it is hoped that this motion will ultimately help faculty to gain access to aggregate teaching evaluation data which can ultimately help faculty who must make a case for teaching excellence.

• **Constitution of the IDEA Committee (led by Tracy Immerso, On-Campus Coordinator):** The Chair proposed a change to the current language found in the J of R, to create a more diverse faculty representation on the IDEA committee.

  Motion: The FDEC requests a change in the Journal of Record which currently specifies only that there should be “one” dedicated member of the FDEC on this committee. This should be revised to specify “two” faculty from the FDEC; the FDEC chair and a faculty member from a different school.

  Rationale: At the present time, only one dedicated FDEC liaison is specified in the Journal of Record; the FDEC moves that the Academic Council revise this detail to specify “two” dedicated FDEC members. Ideally, one of these individuals should be the FDEC chair. Since different programs have different practices and norms for the end-of-course teaching evaluations, it is recommended that the other FDEC member is from a school different from the FDEC chair.

  Given that there are many different norms for courses across the University, broader faculty representation on the IDEA committee is recommended. The FDEC anticipates that this will ensure a stronger sustainable process in the future.
8. Unfinished/On-going business

- **Evaluation Scale for IDEA data:** The University needs to identify what “good” and “excellent” teaching looks like on the IDEA 5 point scale.

- **Ongoing improvement of Banner:** attaching more course attributes to Banner so that the CRN can be utilized more systematically.

- **Loss of Data from the Damaged Box:** DSB faculty whose course evals may be negatively affected if their FIF was processed but only a small percentage of the student evaluations were salvaged and processed.

- **Ongoing education of Faculty about how to interpret IDEA data.** It is clear that a very small percentage of faculty (63) attended workshops on how to interpret IDEA data. It would be important to continue this outreach through summer 2010, for faculty who plan to submit applications for Rank and Tenure in fall 2011. Request/Collaborate with CAE to host additional Diagnostic Form Report workshops for faculty who will need to prepare Rank and Tenure Dossiers with the first year of data from IDEA.

- **Local Codes/Discipline Codes:** a draft proposal for the Local Codes field was circulated and discussed. This needs to be finalized for implementation in fall 2011.

- **Peer Review of Teaching Initiative:** Ongoing development of Faculty and non-student generated teaching data is needed.

9. Future agenda items

- General Evaluation of the IDEA process at the end of the 2 year period and Recommendations for improvement
- Consider situations where IDEA evals may not be required (established professors whose evaluations are more or less stable); if so, the FDEC should remember that the Journal of Record specifies that each faculty should administer the teaching evaluation form. Do a best practices study of peer institutions?
- Status of the Yellow Formative Forms: there is strong support for this form in the paper format, should these questions be added onto the online IDEA comments section?
- Other ways to develop faculty teaching and to develop non-student generated teaching data that can be used for summative purposes (writing teaching philosophy; e-portfolios; etc.)