The Chair would like to express much gratitude to the faculty and staff that supported the work accomplished by FDEC this year.

1. **Name of Committee Chairperson:** Eileen O’Shea (SON)

2. **Committee Membership:** Gwen Alphonso, Carol Ann Davis, Deborah Edelman (Fall 2014; on medical leave SP15), Cinthia Gannett, Ying Zhang, Amalia Ruso, Christine Siegel, (ex-officio).

   Invited Members for the entire year: Tracy Immerso (IDEA), Suzanna Klaf (CAE)

   Invited Guests for specific meetings: Bob Hanafin – April 1, 2015

3. **Number of Meetings Attended by each Committee Member:**
   - Gwen Alphonso (4 meetings)
   - Carol Ann Davis (4 meetings)
   - Deborah Edelman (2 meetings)
   - Cinthia Gannett (6 meetings)
   - Eileen O’Shea (6 meetings)
   - Christine Siegel (4 meetings)
   - Amalia Ruso (5 meetings)
   - Ying Zhang (6 meetings)

4. **Dates of Meetings:**
   - September 17, 2014, October 22, 2014, November 19, 2014,
   - February 4, 2015, March 4, 2015, April 1, 2015.
   - December 9, 2014 – Faculty Development Day on Online IDEA Evaluations;
   - May 1, 2015 – Faculty Development Day on Meeting the Needs of the 21st Century Learner and Use of Technology.

5. **List of Principal Topics Considered by the Committee:**

   A. **Recommendations for Online IDEA Survey Rollout**

   AC approved to move to an online IDEA evaluation process on May 13th, 2014. Thus, the FDEC was charged to develop recommendations to facilitate the online implementation. The goal was to provide a reliable method to deliver online IDEA surveys in a manner that achieves high response rates, in-class distribution, and faculty control over the date of the survey.
• Working closely with Tracy Immerso, the committee developed a proposal with recommendations. Chair O’Shea and Tracy Immerso presented the recommendations to the AC on November 3, 2014.
• AC approved proposal; however, much discussion ensued concerning the qualitative evaluation questions (i.e. yellow narrative forms), and whether or not to incorporate the narrative questions into the online format. This aspect of the proposal was tabled and sent back to FDEC members for continued discussion.
• Paper narrative yellow forms were offered to faculty for spring 2015.

B. Develop IDEA Best Practice Document
• The committee focused on the development of a “Best Practice” document utilizing research to foster positive student response rates, and to inform and support faculty in a successful transition to IDEA online.
• The committee disseminated the document via: FDEC fall workshop; departmental meetings; Office of CAE Website; faculty announcements; hard copies distributed to faculty mailboxes; and direct email to faculty from Tracy Immerso’s office.

C. Faculty Development Educational Workshops:
• The committee developed two educational workshops: one in the fall and one in the spring. The fall workshop was developed and implemented to specifically inform faculty of the rationales for moving to the online evaluation format and to disseminate Online IDEA Best Practices.
• To promote excellence in classroom teaching, the annual spring FDEC workshop, was developed in collaboration with the CAE (S. Klaf), Academic Affairs, Academic computing, and university faculty members (Chair E. O’Shea; K. Nantz; R. Hanafin; J. Rozgonyi). Using the data from the HERI survey, the purpose of the spring program was to engage faculty in a conversation on choices surrounding course design and meeting the needs of the 21st Century Learner.
• The committee agreed that offering two educational workshops, one per each semester, was an effective model to be continued going forward. Ideally, the fall workshop would focus on evaluation topics and the spring on topics of teaching and learning pedagogy enrichment.
• The committee considered submitting a proposal to AC to set aside dedicated faculty development time each semester – to formalize this structure.

D. FUSA Survey Questions:
• FUSA students made a presentation to the committee seeking support to change FUSA survey questions. The aim is to become better informed about teaching styles.
• The committee informed the FUSA students that any change would require full university (AC) approval. The students were willing to work together with FDEC.
• The committee expressed concern regarding access to data and redundancy of questions (increasing student burden).
• The committee appointed a taskforce (Chair E. O’Shea, C. Gannett, C. Siegel, Y. Williams) to determine feasibility of revising the existing FUSA questions, or exploring several of the present IDEA questions to see if the questions would satisfy their needs. This will be an ongoing initiative.

E. CAE’s Role in Supporting FDEC

• The committee discussed the vital role that CAE brings to the FDEC committee and the value of such a unique and collaborative partnership to faculty development.

6. List of Decisions Taken by the Committee:

• Developed recommendations to provide a reliable method for faculty to deliver the online IDEA surveys.
• Submitted proposal to AC recommending the process for ONLINE IDEA evaluation.
• Developed “ONLINE IDEA BEST PRACTICES” document utilizing research from the literature.
• Disseminated the Recommendations for ONLINE IDEA evaluation, and BEST PRACTICES to fulltime and part time faculty throughout university.
• Committed to implementing 2 annual workshops: one to focus on evaluation and the other to focus on teaching and learning pedagogy.
• Provided two FDEC workshops in collaboration with CAE, and using results from the HERI survey.
• Committed to working with FUSA students to review and possibly redesign FUSA survey questions, with the aim of enhancing student’s understanding of faculty teaching and learning styles.

7. Anticipated Effects of Committee’s Decisions:
• Improved completion rates of IDEA evaluations by using the online process.
  o Eliminate delays in response rate so that faculty can evaluate reports prior to the next term.
  o Departments will have access to aggregate data.
  o Cost savings for the university ~$19,000 per semester.
  o Response rates will be equal to paper format, when best practices are followed.
• Data (HERI survey) will guide faculty development educational efforts, rather than the perceived needs put forth by the FDEC membership.
• FUSA questions will be more informed by best practices in survey construction. FUSA questions should more closely match the goals FUSA has for the questions.

8. Unfinished Business:

• Analyze the effectiveness of ONLINE IDEA evaluation surveys, from SP ‘15.
• Finalize recommendation regarding development and evaluation of part time faculty.
• Consider format of qualitative narrative evaluation data: paper vs online.
• Finalize a recommendation to AC regarding dedicated faculty development time to ensure all faculty have availability to attend educational enrichment programs.

9. Future Agenda Items:
• Assess the new online IDEA format and the use of yellow paper qualitative forms.
• Consider how to best utilize IDEA data in aggregate.
• Discuss CAE’s invaluable role in supporting this committee with its charge to promote faculty excellence in classroom teaching and assessment. Discuss the need for CAE to have a more permanent role versus continued invited guest.
• Strategize how best to evaluate small enrollment courses (e.g., independent studies).
• Develop a recommendation concerning dedicated faculty development days.
• Update on FUSA survey questions from taskforce.

Respectfully Submitted,