This year the committee membership was comprised of:

Carol Ann Davis, Chair; Deborah Edelman; Amanda Harper-Leatherman; Amalia Rusu; Ying Zhang; Christine Siegel (ex officio); Eileen O'Shea and Kris Sealey (both of whom were on sabbatical leave, Spring 2016); Linda Roney and Shannon Harding, both of whom served as leave replacements in Spring 2016.

Invited Guests: Tracy Immerso (IDEA), Suzanna Klaf (CAE fall 2015) & Emily Smith (CAE spring 2016)

The FDEC met a total of six times (3 in the fall and 3 in the spring) on the following dates: 9.23.15; 10.21.15; 11.18.15; 2.8.16; 3.16.16; 4.13.16

Much of our time this year continued to be focused on continuing “to provide supervision and guidance in the administration of the evaluation procedure.”

To that end, we:

Considered the results of surveys of faculty taken during the previous academic year’s implementation of an all-online IDEA implementation (with the retention of yellow qualitative forms). We continued to disseminate faculty information related to distributing the surveys electronically and ironing out the glitches that occurred in providing students the link through blackboard and email interfaces.

Given the results of the survey data, we isolated several trends and created a white paper for the rank and tenure committee in order to advise them on how to interpret cases in which response results may have been lower for a semester or two due to the transition to all-online implementation. We delivered this white paper to Rank and Tenure Committee Chair Betsy Bowen.

We completed a review of a revised IDEA instrument and an accompanying online system of results reporting. During our research, members of the committee met in person with IDEA President Ken Ryalls, and followed up with an all-committee conference call to answer specific questions. Satisfied that the move was the right one for Fairfield, we prepared a proposal for Academic Council that both the new survey (slightly shorter) and superior online platform be adopted, and had that proposal approved. Next year’s FDEC will work to disseminate information to faculty about the improved form and results delivery platform, CampusLabs.

In line with our charge to “coordinate activities” “in the promotion of teaching excellence,” we hosted two FDEC Days, both exploring aspects of what it means to be a
21st Century Teacher. In the fall we hosted a day which highlighted the various ways in which teachers are innovative, and invited twenty colleagues to share their work in a fair that took place in Kelley Center Lobby and was follow by a meaningful discussion that further unpacked the term “innovation.” The second FDEC Day explored how the 21st Century Teacher can best engage in the exploration of intercultural knowledge in the classroom. Both were well attended and enthusiastically received events.

Additional items we discussed (and which will remain on next year’s FDEC agenda were):

The role of IDEA surveys in the evaluation of affiliate faculty, since the surveys “belong” to the individual faculty members; at the request of chairs and program directors, FDEC will take up this issue next year.

Concerning IDEA for all faculty, next year’s FDEC will work with CAE to disseminate information about the revised IDEA survey and CampusLabs online platform for retrieving data.

Also, continued discussion of whether the yellow forms should stay as paper forms or be converted to an online implementation; the main impediment to online implementation at this time is the loss of the demographic data students voluntarily provide on the yellow forms.

Finally, the FDEC discussed and will probably continue to discuss the evolution of the role of the CAE, a major partner of the FDEC, on the committee, whose leadership at present attends meetings as a visitor rather than as a full member of the committee; the FDEC may consider revising and resubmitting an unsuccessful proposal that this year’s committee put forward to Academic Council to change the Handbook Language to better reflect the significant role of the CAE on the committee.

Attached please find:

• White Paper Submitted to Chair of Rank and Tenure Committee RE Online IDEA Implementation
• Proposals submitted to the Academic Council
• Minutes from all meetings (reverse chronological)

Respectfully submitted,

Carol Ann Davis, Chair
FDEC Recommendations Regarding the Consideration of IDEA Evaluations During the Ongoing Implementation of All-Online Process

The Faculty Development and Evaluation Committee (FDEC) offers the following document to assist the Rank and Tenure Committee (RTC) in the consideration of teaching materials for candidates for tenure and promotion whose materials include IDEA evaluations in the period of the Spring and Fall semesters of 2015. Because these semesters represent the first two during which the IDEA evaluation process became an all-online process (except for yellow qualitative forms, which remained on paper), the FDEC feels it is necessary to let members of the RTC know the trends in data they may encounter in a review of candidate teaching materials. No guidance has been provided to candidates on the interpretation of specifically online IDEA evaluations beyond that given to all faculty on the use of best practices for online adaptation of IDEA evaluations; however, because an instructor who utilized all recommended best practices may have still run into some of the problems detailed below, the FDEC wanted to make the RTC aware of some complications regarding the interpretation of results in affected semesters.

Of course, IDEA evaluations are merely one form of evidence of effective teaching. The IDEA center itself recommends that the summative faculty evaluations contribute no more than 30% to the overall faculty assessment. Nonetheless, here are some aspects of the transition for the RTC to consider:

• IDEA evaluations converted to all online delivery method in Spring 2015 and ITS continues to refine the implementation process during the Fall 2015 semester
• For the first transitional semester (Spring 2015), there was a marked increase in the number of courses with a 0% response rate and a slight increase in the number of courses with a low (<50%) response rate. See statistics below.

Lower than usual response rates may have been a result of one of the following, each of which would have been out of the control of the instructor even if the instructor followed FDEC best-practice recommendations:

• Faculty members may have had trouble copying the link to Blackboard and/or students may have had trouble accessing the link due to issues with Outlook Web Access, something that they would have had no control over even if they’d made prior preparations (something ITS has remedied for Fall 2015)
• Students using Google Chrome often had trouble accessing the survey links (a known problem of the Google Chrome platform.)

Candidates whose cases include the above explanations of lower than usual response rates during the affected semesters do reflect trends of which the FDEC is aware. However,
response rates may have been a result of one of the following, which remain the responsibility of instructors:

- Faculty members may not have distributed the links to the students.
- Faculty members may not have set aside class time for the evaluations.
- Faculty members attempted to give the evaluation instrument after the survey window closed.

The FDEC anticipates that familiarity with the online distribution, improved communication of instructions, and ITS involvement will substantially improve the response rate for Fall 2015 and beyond.

### Response Rate Comparison

#### Spring IDEA Surveys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resp Rate (%)</th>
<th>Spring 2015* Count of IDEA Evaluated Surveys</th>
<th>Average Response Rate</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Surveys</th>
<th>Count of IDEA Evaluated Surveys**</th>
<th>Average Response Rate</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Surveys</th>
<th>Count of IDEA Evaluated Surveys **</th>
<th>Average Response Rate</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Surveys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>13.45%</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>7.07%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>4.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.01-0.26</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>15.98%</td>
<td>8.91%</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>18.57%</td>
<td>7.36%</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>19.21%</td>
<td>5.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.26-0.51</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>39.29%</td>
<td>18.18%</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>39.08%</td>
<td>20.75%</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>39.43%</td>
<td>27.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.51-0.76</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>64.73%</td>
<td>20.87%</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>65.41%</td>
<td>20.84%</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>63.32%</td>
<td>18.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.76-1.00</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>89.11%</td>
<td>38.59%</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>90.00%</td>
<td>43.98%</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>89.99%</td>
<td>43.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>1078</td>
<td>56.46%</td>
<td>1046</td>
<td>62.68%</td>
<td>974</td>
<td>62.67%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Online Distribution Only
** Includes unreturned paper packets as 0% response rate (52 for Spring 2014, 34 for Spring 2013)

5/11/15 TDI

---

PROPOSED and APPROVED BY ACADEMIC COUNCIL

DATE: March 23, 2016
TO: Academic Council
Amalia Rusu, Executive Secretary
FROM: Faculty Development and Evaluation Committee
Carol Ann Davis, Chair
SUBJECT: Proposal to Adopt Newly Revised IDEA Evaluation & Platform

Proposal to Adopt Newly Revised IDEA Evaluation & Platform

Fairfield University has been administering the IDEA evaluation form since 2010. Fairfield originally adopted this form to replace the internal Fairfield quantitative
evaluation to reap the benefits of a valid and reliable quantitative evaluation focused on student learning, faculty-determined course purposes, as well as on the availability of comparison data and professional development support. In 2015, we adopted a model of all-online administration of IDEA evaluations. This change has not affected the actual evaluation or results format, which remained the same, but sped up the availability and distribution of IDEA results.

IDEA has recently worked to improve their product in response to current knowledge about student learning and constituent feedback, offering a revision of the evaluation instrument and a new web-based platform for viewing the evaluation and results. These changes preserve all of the benefits of the original instrument while adding new ones. The two major improvements are:

1. An improved, more valid and reliable evaluation form based on routine statistical analysis of the current instrument with updated teaching methods and learning outcomes mapped to those of regional accreditors such as the AAC&U
2. A user-friendly web version of the evaluation and diagnostic report with substantial improvements in data presentation and interpretation through a Campus Labs format

Although IDEA has no imminent plans to eliminate the current IDEA evaluation and platform, within the next 3-5 years, the current format will most likely no longer be available. **Because of its many benefits and the eventual planned phase out of the current instrument and platform, the FDEC recommends that Fairfield adopt the revised IDEA evaluation and new platform at this time under a three-year contract to take advantage of significant improvements.** The revised IDEA evaluation and Campus Labs platform will cost only slightly more than the current IDEA online platform; the difference has already been added to the FY'17 Academic Division Budget in anticipation of Academic Council approval.

Below is a more detailed description of the improvements that the newly revised IDEA evaluation and platform include. Minutes, as well as an example of the new web format, follow as appendices.

**Improvements Related to the Evaluation Instrument:**
IDEA has significantly improved their evaluation instrument by completing statistical analysis on the responses to IDEA forms from 2002 to 2011, by consulting a variety of focus groups including IDEA users, expert panelists, item writers, faculty, administrators, and students, and by working to map their learning objectives and teaching methods more closely with those of regional accreditors such as the AAC&U (see example of comparison between AAC&U Value Rubric and IDEA learning objectives in Appendix B).
IDEA’s research led them to revise their teaching methods to include methods related to diversity, self-reflection, and service-learning. In addition, the learning objectives have been revised to include objectives related to diverse perspectives and global awareness, ethical reasoning and decision making, civic engagement, and quantitative literacy. These changes to teaching methods and learning objectives seem to correlate well with Fairfield’s own common teaching methods and objectives.
The changes also resulted in a more streamlined student evaluation form. Some items were dropped, while others were added, but the resulting diagnostic long form is now only 40 questions long compared to 47 questions on the long form Fairfield currently administers. The current IDEA long form is made up of 20 initial questions about the instructor’s teaching methods, then 12 questions on progress made on 12 learning objectives, 3 questions about the course work, 6 questions on student characteristics, a rating of the teacher, a rating of the course, and finally 4 additional questions related to the instructor’s practices. The changes to the current form are summarized below:

- The last 4 questions on instructor’s practices were always experimental items that were not involved in any evaluation scores or suggested actions and so have been deleted.
- The 6 questions on student characteristics have been decreased down to 3 because three were not used to adjust scores.
- There have been changes to the teaching methods and learning objectives, but while the teaching methods have gone down from 20 to 19, the learning objectives have gone up to 13 from 12, making the overall number the same.
  - Some examples of specific changes to learning objectives include:
    - Current Objectives 1 and 2 (related to gaining factual knowledge and learning fundamental principles) have been combined in the newly revised form because of high correlation in terms of faculty selection and student ratings.
    - Objective 10 (related to understanding of and commitment to personal values) in the current form is not emphasized by any higher education organization anymore. IDEA has replaced this with an ethical reasoning objective that is emphasized now.
    - Some learning objectives were rewritten to improve them such as making Objective 9 not just about finding and using resources, but also evaluating resources.

IDEA has published a white paper that summarizes all of the data that contributed to revising the IDEA evaluation instrument. Faculty that want to compare results from the current form to the newly revised form may find it useful to consult the tables on pages 87 through 91 of this paper (see link above). These tables will be helpful for those summarizing their student evaluation data for rank and tenure or for other similar purposes. Many faculty successfully negotiated the tenure and promotion processes during the transition from Fairfield's internal evaluation form to IDEA, and since the change from one IDEA form to another is much less disruptive, the FDEC does not see any problems emerging from this change. Furthermore, it is also the nature of these types of instruments that they evolve over time, and the FDEC sees the new form as an improvement over the current one, since it takes into account current teaching methods. Should the Academic Council adopt these changes, the FDEC will widely distribute materials to faculty highlighting the opportunities inherent in these changes and making faculty aware of them.
Improvements Related to New Web-Based Platform:
IDEA has collaborated with a technology company, Campus Labs, to improve the ease of use of the evaluation and results through a new web-based platform. Below is a list of many of the improvements.

- Evaluation and results are simplified, color-coded, and easier to read (see example screens in Appendix B)
- Results are stored more securely in the cloud and not on Fairfield’s server
- Faculty receive results within 48 hours without any Fairfield-required interface such as my.fairfield
- Faculty can track student responses to the evaluation in real time as the students are completing it
- Pedagogical papers available on how to improve teaching are now imbedded within the results screen that the faculty member sees so that a faculty member can easily click within this screen to find out suggestions to increase student learning outcomes (see Appendix B for example screen)
- Evaluation can be administered on cell phones or computers and renders on any device automatically. (IDEA has been looking into whether student responses would be different on cell phones versus computers and what they have found so far indicates that there is not a big difference in quality of responses; they have not yet prepared a white paper on this issue but have communicated the above to the committee via email and teleconference.
- The new platform provides for four possible surveys available as opposed to the current system, which offers only two. The new platform provides a Diagnostic (equivalent to current long form), Learning Outcomes (equivalent of current short form), Teaching Essentials (additional new short form), Instant Feedback (a faculty-driven quick formative assessment, not related to end-of-course survey and available as a kind of electronic MAT).
- The OCC (on-campus coordinator, IDEA) can more easily load course and enrollment information to the IDEA database through a direct feed from Blackboard

Appendix A: Meeting Minutes

Fairfield University
FDEC Meeting Draft
Wednesday, March 16, 2016
Donnarumma Hall 230
2-3:30 pm
Meeting called to order at 2:00 by the chair.

1. MOVING IDEA EVALUATION TO CAMPUS LABS PLATFORM PROPOSAL

Follow up discussion ensued based on November conference call with Ken Ryalls, President of IDEA, whether to adopt a change to the Campus Labs platform.

Reference to handout distributed on Proposal to Adopt Newly Revised IDEA Platform and Evaluation:

Advantages discussed for adoption that should be emphasized to faculty:
- Much better interface and survey (color coded-ease for students and faculty)
- The revised survey is now available on a new platform based on a collaboration between IDEA and the technology company, Campus Labs
- The Campus Labs platform provides easier input and access to formative information than current version of IDEA provides and even has an option for a mid-semester survey that offers feedback on teaching that can be used before end of semester to drive changes in instruction.
- Faculty results from Campus Labs IDEA platform is in the Cloud and available within 48 hours.

Questions by FDEC members:
- Should we stay with current PDF version of IDEA or a slightly different form that aligns with our mission?
- Have other academic institutions piloted Campus Labs? Yes, Azusa Pacific University is one example of a university successfully using the new platform. Information from Ken Ryalls, IDEA president, indicated no difficulties with the Campus Labs platform based on university experiences.

Cost: Approximate additional cost is 1500.00 per year and Academic Affairs has budgeted for this cost.

Suggested Improvements Related to the Proposal on the Evaluation and Presentation of Instrument to faculty:
- Amalia suggested need for more transparency when proposal to adopt Campus Labs is presented to faculty. Committee agreed that we should add more content/explanation showing the link to instruction and why this revision is beneficial to faculty.
- Reference Changes: Reverse the two major improvements cited in proposal handout to read:

1. An improved, more valid and reliable evaluation form based on statistical analysis with updated teaching methods and learning outcomes mapped to those of regional accreditors such as the AAC & U.
2. A user-friendly web version of the evaluation and diagnostic report with substantial improvements in data presentation and interpretation through the Campus Labs format.

Additional comments to support use of Campus Labs over IDEA Evaluation:

a) Some of the additional information in original IDEA Evaluation was not valid so Campus Lab offers fewer questions getting at the targeted points to be assessed.

b) Tracy will obtain the “old language vs. new language” to demonstrate repetitive questions.

c) Many learning objectives are the same, but some have been revised or combined to fine tune instrument.

d) On campus IDEA coordinator will upload information easier into the new Campus Labs IDEA platform

In sum:
Revisions will be made and distributed to FDEC members by email along with the 90 page PDF which will be attached when submitted / sent to Academic Council by Friday, March 25th for approval.

Motion to approve the proposal to adopt Campus Labs with suggested amendments presented by Shannon and seconded by Amalia. All eight members approved. No abstentions.

Appendix B: Campus Labs example screens: see attached PDF
PROPOSAL REJECTED BY ACADEMIC COUNCIL; INVITED TO REVISE AND RESUBMIT

DATE: March 21, 2016
TO: Academic Council
     Amalia Rusu, Executive Secretary
FROM: Faculty Development and Evaluation Committee
       Carol Ann Davis, Chair
SUBJECT: Proposal to Amend Handbook Language to Reflect Current Practices of the FDEC

Proposal to Amend Handbook Language to Reflect Current Practices of the FDEC

Background: The FDEC is a committee that came into being prior to the inception of the Center for Academic Excellence, and because of that, the committee has invited the director (or his or her designee) to attend meetings throughout the CAE’s history. The CAE plays an integral role in the committee’s efforts to facilitate and support faculty development, such as helping to plan FDEC Days, helping to educate faculty on a number of teaching resources, and assisting faculty with the interpretation of IDEA results. Each of these activities the FDEC does in concert and consultation with the CAE and so we think it more appropriate for a Director of the CAE to be a member of the committee as opposed to an invited guest. As we discussed those changes, we also took the opportunity to update the language in the faculty charge to better reflect the role of the committee in faculty development around teaching and research. In March, the FDEC voted unanimously to make the following changes that better reflect the current practices of the committee. Each change is offered below, with accompanying rationale. Minutes are also attached to reflect the discussion of these items at the FDEC meeting.

1. Changes to Membership description:

   Current language:

   Seven members elected from the faculty for three-year overlapping terms, according to the following electoral divisions: three from the College of Arts & Sciences, one each from the School of Engineering, the School of Nursing, the School of Business, and the Graduate School of Education & Allied Professions. The Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs or the appointed representative of the same shall be an ex officio member with a right to vote.

   Proposed language:

   Seven members elected from the faculty for three-year overlapping terms, according to the following electoral divisions: three from the College of Arts & Sciences, one each from the School of Engineering, the School of Nursing, the School of Business, and the Graduate School of Education & Allied Professions. The Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and a Director from the Center for Academic Excellence, or their appointed representatives, shall be ex officio members with voting rights.
Rationale:
The final sentence was revised to give a CAE director or her/his representative ex officio status with voting rights. This will better reflect the active role the CAE plays on the committee and empower that person to be a full member of the committee.

2. Changes to Specific Duties:

A. Current language item i.:

i. to coordinate the activities of all University sectors in the promotion of teaching excellence.

Proposed language:

i. to coordinate activities that promote teaching excellence.

Rationale:
This change better approximates the committee’s role, as the committee is not in a position to be responsible for “all University sectors,” but does “coordinate” activities around “teaching excellence” with their partners in Academic Affairs and CAE.

B. Current language item iii.:

iii. to design a regular system of classroom evaluation for all University faculty.

Proposed language:

iii. to monitor and improve the regular system of classroom evaluation for all University faculty.

Rationale:
This change reflects the evolution of the committee. The original FDEC was the committee that designed an internal student evaluation system and then helped to transition the University from this internal system of evaluation to the IDEA system of evaluation. Now that the IDEA system is in place, the role of the committee in designing “regular system of classroom evaluation for all University faculty” has ended and transitioned to one in which we monitor and improve the evaluation instrument as needed. This reflects the committee’s current practice and updates the charge accordingly.
Present: Carol Ann Davis (chair), Deborah Edelman, Amanda Harper-Leatherman, Ying-Zhang, Amalia Rusu, Tracy Immerso, Christine Siegel, Emily Smith, Linda Roney, Shannon Harding.

Scribe: Deborah Edelman

Meeting called to order at 1:00 by the chair.

2. DISCUSSION OF ROLE OF CAE on COMMITTEE AND GOVERNANCE STEPS TO FULL MEMBERSHIP RE: HANDBOOK LANGUAGE CHANGE

Committee took on charge to make changes to the writing in the handbook so that the language in the first paragraph is updated to reflect true role of CAE as discussed at meeting.

The General Purpose remains as it is in the handbook (unchanged).

Specific Duties changes:

i. Is a revision and slight simplification of handbook language (omitting "all University sectors")

ii. Remains as it was in handbook—no revisions

iii. Is a revision of the original iii. from the handbook—no longer appropriate, since it directed the committee “to design a regular system of classroom evaluation for all University faculty.”

iv. Remains as it was in handbook—no revisions

FDEC members will submit these changes in April to Academic Council. The topic will be put on the agenda for Academic Council and attached and put forward to AC in April. Carol will write up a rationale for the changes and add the rationale to minutes. Amanda moved to make motion to accept changes in the handbook language and Shannon seconded the motion. All members were in agreement.
Faculty Development & Evaluation (FDEC) Meeting Minutes
Wednesday, September 23, 2015 1:00-2:30pm
CNS 306

Present: Eileen O'Shea, Carol Ann Davis (Chair), Kris Sealey (scribe), Amalia Rusu, Ying Zhang, Deborah Edelman, Amanda Harper-Leatherman,

Regrets: Christine Seigel

Invited Guests: Suzanna Klaf, Tracy Immerso

AGENDAITEMS
• Approval of Minutes
•
•

Meeting called to order: 1:40pm
1. Minutes: Committee unanimously approved minutes from 04.01.15.

2. New Chair
   - Davis self-nominates
   - Elected new chair unanimously

3. Introduction of new members/Re-welcoming old members
   - Ying, Zhang (Finance)
   - Amalia Rusu (SOE)
   - Kris Sealey (Philosophy)
   - Eileen O'Shea (Nursing)
   - Amanda Harper-Leatherman (Chemistry)
   - Carol Ann Davis (English)
   - Deborah Edelman (GradEd)
   - Suzanna Klaf (CAE, invited guest)
   - Tracy Immerso (Academic Affairs, invited guest)

Discussion of making a CAE representative an ex-officio member of the committee in the future. For now, motion was presented to invite Suzanna Klaf and Tracy Immerso to all meetings

4. Discussion of faculty responses to IDEA survey
   - Sent to everyone who taught a course in Spring 2015
- Survey conducted after Spring 2015 (first semester after course evaluation went fully online)
- About 100 responses
- On question “What prevented you conducting survey in class? Many responses — snow!!”
- Possible response to this: Make faculty aware that even though survey is online, they need to devote class time to conduct survey.
- Many comments indicate that faculty didn’t entirely understand (newer) process.
- Future steps: Glean responses and determine actionable items to which to respond.
- Many faculty distributed links via email, posted on Blackboard.
- Problems linking to Blackboard (10.71%). Suggestion: target this group, and trace their other responses to the survey.
- Future action: Read through all comments, make a discussion of this an agenda item for next meeting.
- Suggestions from Immerso: more PSAs moving forward
- Ken Ryles (president of IDEA) meeting with Academic Affairs.
- Anticipated move to create the survey for mobile platforms
- Rusu asked whether or not this move will also include making faculty results available in a more user-friendly online format.
- Rusu suggested that our committee send a survey specifically to faculty with low response rate? Davis wondered if this would amount to targeting a potentially vulnerable population? Possible to conduct this at the end of the Fall 2015.
- Klaf suggested that, if such a survey were sent out, there should be questions like (a) long/short form used and (b) type of faculty (full time/part time/adjunct)
- Klaf suggested that our committee should pay attention to IDEA timeline, and educate/inform/alert faculty as actions are about to happen.
- Driving this concern: How quickly are we going to ‘mobile’?

5. Report on Spring 2015 FDEC Day
- Most highly attended event, at least since 2009 (approximately 101 in attendance)
- 48 respondents to workshop survey
- Reported as useful: having interactions at round tables with other faculty, the presentation on the 21st century learner, ipad showcase, which made the use of the ipad in the classroom more accessible
- More faculty asked for more ipads, possible as a result of the FDEC workshop, which perhaps led to Fairfield’s deal with Apple.
- Suggestions for future topics:
  1) use of mobile devices in teaching
  2) discipline-specific discussions on technology
  3) gamification workshops
  4) open-educational resources
  6) incorporating diversity across curriculum
  7) scholarship that integrates teaching and learning
Dates for this year’s workshops:
  - Fall, Tuesday December 8
  - Spring, Wednesday May 4

On topics for workshops this year
  - From previous discussion, Fall workshops would focus on IDEA issues, Spring workshops would focus on education
  - Committee members are charged with getting feedback from their respective departments, about possible topics this year.
  - Motion to propose 2 FDEC events per year (Fall, Spring). First focused on evaluation, second to focus on teaching. Unanimously approved
  - We need a subcommittee to work on FDEC workshop planning.

6. Challenges with yellow forms
  - We lose all demographic data in moving from paper yellow sheets to mobile.
  - Mobile interfaces need to be anonymous, and so no way to track student comments across demographics. We can do this with yellow forms.
  - Rusu suggests that we could administer an online version of the yellow forms with a system other than IDEA (like Survey Monkey, Blackboard, Google Forms, etc)
  - O’Shea reminded us that the FDEC indicated to the Academic Council that we would continue to research this
  - Immerso pointed out that students complain about survey fatigue. Is the yellow form giving us information that is additional to IDEA forms? Davis pointed out that we will always need qualitative data.
  - Committee members charged with the following: Ask colleagues (anecdotally) about yellow forms.

7. Development of part-time faculty
  - Agenda item for next meeting
  - Davis will re-send the status of our committee’s report on this.
  - We need a subcommittee to work on this project

8. FUSA task force on FUSA questions for IDEA
  - FUSA president approached FDEC last fall, about changing FUSA questions.
  - FUSA wants information about teaching styles and methodology for faculty, and they feel they’re not getting this from the present questions.
  - Perhaps students need a period in which to ‘shop’? Which could be addressed without touching the FUSA IDEA questions.
  - For Fall 2015, keep JoR approved questions in survey.

9. Scheduling meetings for Fall 2015
  - Oct 21, 1 - 2:30
  - Nov 18, 1 - 2:30
Meeting adjourned 2:15pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Kris Sealey

Fairfield University
FDEC Meeting
Wednesday, October 21, 2015
CNS 200
1-2:30pm

Present: Carol Ann Davis (chair), Deborah Edelman, Amanda Harper-Leatherman, Eileen O'Shea, Amalia Rusu, Tracy Immerso, Suzanna Klaf, Christine Siegel

Regrets: Ying Zhang

Meeting called to order at 1:02pm by the chair.

I. Approval of September Meeting Minutes

Amalia made a motion to approve minutes. Amanda seconded. All in favor, motion approved.

The chair proposed to reorder the agenda since some members need to leave early, and push up agenda item V. All in favor of reordering the agenda.

II. Discussion & Planning of FDEC Day Tuesday Dec. 8

The chair mentioned that with the expected changes with the IDEA evaluation, that would be more appropriate for Spring and a workshop on innovative teaching is more appropriate for Fall.

Eileen suggests to look at the feedback received at the prior Spring workshop.

Suzanna wants the committee members to be aware of the fact that CAE in collaboration with ITS plans an iPad workshop in the same day as the FDEC workshop and FDEC is welcome to endorse it.

The chair proposes to look at what is innovative teaching without necessarily having the technology involved.

Suzanna sees this as a way to celebrate good teaching and take it to the next level, and more as an opportunity to discuss and ideas to be shared.
The chair entertains better the idea of a workshop format rather than a panel discussion.

Eileen asked if there is any FPLC related to iPads this Fall.

Suzanna said no unless it is department or school specific that she might not be aware of. The iPad workshop planned for December is flexible and tries to build the momentum and have the ability to reflect on it. Deborah is wondering if we should do something strategic for junior faculty from a variety of topics that would benefit them. Why don’t have them present their innovative teaching as well?

Amanda mentioned that in CAS they usually have something for non-tenure junior faculty and then later on for tenure faculty, alternating between Fall and Spring. The faculty also leaves with good handouts. Why not to expand that or similar to all schools?

The chair thinks the event will be in the format of an workshop and have a poster presentation component. It would perhaps be in Kelley Center presentation room. First have an open discussion of what is innovative teaching and then open up the walls and show what faculty is doing.

Amanda supports the idea of the 21st century learners as a group discussion.

The chair envisions the workshop as table discussions and requests volunteers to help plan the agenda.

The chair, Amanda, Eileen and Suzanna volunteered for a subcommittee to discuss further the FDEC event.

Christine asks what setup would we want; she proposes to have lunch and discussions 12-1:30pm and desert and walk around/poster presentations in the lobby 1:30-2:30pm.

The chair asks all committee members to encourage junior faculty in respective departments/schools to present and reaching out to our colleagues for this.

Eileen proposes to look at an overview of what each table will be doing and also to include a discussion on remodeled classrooms.

Christine mentions that she will work with Lynn Babington on opening remarks at 12pm, showing improvements on campus, what is offering around campus, updates on technology classrooms, and hopefully report on the instructional leader position for which we currently interview.
The chair sums it up that the subcommittee and Jay will work on planning the event further and start recruiting junior faculty to contribute to the event.

III. Report on meeting with Ken Ryalls (IDEA)
Tracy mentions that she was really pleasantly impressed by the new platform; it will not cost more and rather it would be yet another change for the faculty; there will be more real time information; overall all positive comments. As a summary, there are 40 questions down from 47, with the highly correlated questions eliminated. She suggests that a recommendation would need to be made by FDEC to AC at some point as we talk about 6 months process at their end after a recommendation might be adopted.

Eileen mentions that Campus Lab is a deeper resource and utilizes more expertise than IDEA currently has so if we commit to IDEA we should commit to the new Campus Lab. Would it be possible to pilot it first?

Tracy clarifies that in order to pilot anything ITS would need to already set it up so while it is a good idea it might not be feasible. If we know that a recommendation was approved by January-February 2016 then it could be implemented by Fall 2016.

The chair asks what could be done today to move toward making a recommendation.

Tracy explains that the IDEA results are currently on our servers. Instead, you will go to a Campus Lab link with a better presentation so the data will be stored on the cloud. For the students there is easier accessible evaluation on the mobile devices while looking exactly the same to the students.

The chair wants to confirm that the yellow forms will not be affected by the IDEA changes.

Tracy confirms that is the case but still encourages the discussion on having the yellow form questions added to the IDEA evaluation even if losing the demographics. Can we poll the faculty if they use the demographic information from the yellow sheets or could live without it?

Amalia suggest that if there are any benefits for Tracy’s office then maybe it should be considered to administer the yellow sheet questions as a separate online survey rather than in the paper version.

At this point, the general committee consensus is that we should postpone this discussion until after the next round of the IDEA evaluation changes.

Christine suggests to ask Ken directly about demographic questions and how to work around it.
Tracy suspects that they are committed to completely anonymous evaluations.

Eileen recommends we all read the slides and develop a recommendation to the AC for the February meeting the latest.

**IV. Review of Survey Results**
Amanda noticed that there are several complains that were repeated such as problems with the link, suggestions to reserve students grades until students do their evaluations, and requests for extending the evaluation period. Tracy mentions that in theory if the link is still available the students should still be able to do it if they have not done it in class.

Amalia points out that some of the comments are contradictory; by extending the period beyond the last class, we might violate the good practices that we advertise and also it might cause conflict with potential grades added before the evaluations are done.

Amanda consider educating faculty more on good practices and the R&T committee on the impact of online evaluations.

The chair suggests to consider having a white paper on the changes, statistics and best practices and store them on Fairfield website and on my.fairfield under FU server.

Christine suggests that a good place might also be the general faculty secretary website so that is would be accessible to the R&T committee and other.

The chair aims at having that ready for Spring and asks Amanda if she would be willing to create a draft.

Amanda agrees to craft the white paper with the statistics and survey results.

Christine suggests adding a future agenda item in order for the committee members to review the charge and composition of FDEC; CAE was not existing when FDEC was included in the handbook; should look at other committees on how to deal with ex-officio members.

A motion to adjourn was made by Amalia at 2:35pm, seconded by Amanda. All in favor.

Respectfully submitted,
Amalia Rusu
Present: Carol Ann Davis (chair), Deborah Edelman, Amanda Harper-Leatherman, Ying Zhang, Amalia Rusu, Kris Sealey, Jay Rozgonyi, Debbie Whalley, Tracy Immerso, Suzanna Klaf, Christine Siegel

Regrets: Eileen O'Shea

Meeting called to order at 1:00pm by the chair.

I. Conference call Ken Ryalls, President of IDEA, to discuss Campus Labs platform

Tracy makes conference call to Ken Ryalls to learn more about the changes to the IDEA student evaluations including a change to the Campus Labs platform that we may choose to adopt. All went around and introduced themselves.

Tracy asked Ken to give brief overview of what the new Campus Labs platform can do for us and what changes have taken place in the IDEA form that we would be adopting if we chose to go to the new Campus Labs platform.

Ken explains that four to five years ago, their company realized that they were falling behind the curve in terms of their interaction with technology. Therefore, they decided to partner with the technological innovator Campus Labs. They wanted to move the IDEA evaluation to the Campus Labs platform. Eventually, this will be the only platform. Although there are not imminent plans to eliminate the current paper or current online versions, within the next 3-5 years, these will probably no longer be available.

On the front end, data are easier to input into this new Campus Labs platform. Once in, it is all delivered to administrators and faculty members automatically. It is possible to customize survey dates and emails to students. There are four different surveys rather than just the two available now. One of these four is an instant feedback survey available to faculty to use as they wish during any class. This particular instant feedback survey is just for faculty members to use as they wish, and only takes a minute to administer in class. The new reports from the Campus Labs platform are highly interactive and color-coded for easy consumption. These reports are available within two days to the faculty member. In addition, pedagogical development materials are directly connected to the report when it is delivered through links that can be clicked to view.

Tracy asks about using info available through Banner related to student demographics, such as a student’s class year or major to customize our results.
Ken says this would have to be done internally at Fairfield. The Campus Labs platform can accept fields from Banner, but these don’t go into the current report template they have. The Banner fields would be in the raw Banner reports. Fairfield could then generate any reports that we want to from this and IDEA and Campus Labs would not be involved. However, Ken said that he liked the idea of running customized reports with Banner and so they are currently looking further into this for IDEA and Campus Labs to potentially do.

Chair probes further into this topic by explaining that at Fairfield there is currently a form that students fill out separate from IDEA in which faculty members receive qualitative written responses from students. She explains that at the bottom of this form a student fills out demographic data about the student.

Ken says that at IDEA with Campus Labs, they are working on text analysis of qualitative data to be able to give faculty members more of representative summary of written responses.

Chair explains further that with our current form, the faculty member receives the written feedback in which all demographic data stays with the corresponding written responses.

Ken says that to keep this demographic data with the responses using the IDEA Campus Labs, Fairfield may need to find a way to do this internally. He said it is possible with IDEA to get some data that could be related to student class year status or major by analyzing written responses inputted electronically into IDEA’s form from the level of the course such as analyzing 400 level course responses versus 100 level course responses.

Tracy asks for Ken to explain the reasoning behind the deletion of seven questions from the IDEA evaluation making the evaluation now down from 47 to 40 questions total.

Ken clarifies that although there are changes to the total number of questions in the new Campus Labs IDEA platform, IDEA is not deleting the questions from the old platform (the one we currently use). Ken does hope to convince us to migrate to the new platform that has the seven questions deleted though. He says that the changes they made in the questions for the new platform were done to map the learning objectives better with those of regional accreditors, such as the AACU. They also had statistical reasons and reasons related to research into the objectives for eliminating what was eliminated. Ken then defers to a member of his research team, Steve, to explain further.

Steve says that the process occurred across four years. They did statistical analysis of responses to IDEA forms from 2002 to 2011. They also worked with focus group users of IDEA, expert panels, item writers, faculty, administrators, students, and
higher education institutions to make the decisions that they made. The new IDEA in Campus Labs is seven items shorter, but some items were dropped while others were added. He explains that there were four experimental items that appear at the end of the 47 item current diagnostic. These four are not involved in any evaluation scores or suggested actions. They have remained on the form, but maybe should have been taken away a while ago. In addition to removing these irrelevant items, they also combined some learning objectives. They combined objectives 1 and 2 because there is high correlation in terms of faculty selection and student ratings so it seems these were giving redundant information. Therefore, they created a new item to join objectives 1 and 2.

Steve goes on to explain that they found that some learning objectives were outdated. For instance, objective 10 is not emphasized by any higher ed organization anymore. So they have replaced objective 10 with an ethical reasoning objective that is emphasized now. They improved on other objectives such as making one objective not just about finding and using resources, but also evaluating these resources. They took out objective 12 that research shows has the least amount of validity. With respect to teaching methods, they retained teaching methods helpful to faculty on improving student learning outcomes. They took out ones that were not helpful. They took out four that weren’t contributing anymore and created three new ones. Steve says in summary, the new Campus Labs IDEA now has 13 learning objectives and 19 teaching methods.

Steve explains that with respect to student and course characteristics, they took out ones that were on the form but were not used to adjust scores. They also added some new characteristics that focus groups were enthusiastic about concerning student efficacy and student background preparation for courses.

Tracy says in summary these were very measured changes that were made by IDEA.

Ken says the current IDEA form and the new Campus Labs IDEA form are very different instruments. It is best not to get bogged down in the differences, but instead to look for consistent levels of teaching effectiveness that each form can show.

Christine asks if IDEA has any advice for how faculty can look at trends over time in their results when moving from one form to the new form as the changes have been made.

Ken says they don’t have any official advice, but that this can be worked on and they will plan to come up with some kind of white paper or guidelines for faculty that could be helpful when compared results from the current form to the new Campus Labs form.
Tracy asks if IDEA has any data on how student responses may vary when students use cell phones (as can be done with the new Campus Labs IDEA form) versus laptops to complete surveys.

Ken explains that he sent some research articles with data on this question to Tracy this morning that are general for surveys that people take on cell phones versus lab tops (not necessarily for student course surveys). These data seem to indicate that there is not a big difference in quality of responses. He also says that IDEA has looked at this question anecdotally, to look for patterns in responses. They haven’t seen a drop off in responses so far from students using cell phones.

Jay asks how Ken sees the data getting from Banner into the new Campus Labs platform.

Ken says he will get Jay in touch with someone who can answer better, but in general the way they most recommend is with an API build, a flat file, or a fstp.

Jay asks if the seven week courses versus the fourteen week courses can be automated in terms of sending out links, etc. since currently this is done manually at Fairfield.

Ken says it is possible to upload classes and tag them with information on when the emails for the surveys should be sent out depending on the length of the course. He will give a more definitive answer by email.

Jay asks what the time frame is for moving to this.

Ken says they can do it in three months after we decide. They need to start in early June if we want to have this available by the end of August. The service is ready to go now. They have 100 clients now using the newest platform. The new platform also renders on any device automatically.

Tracy asks if it is necessary to go on a three year contract if we decide to go to Campus Labs.

Ken says, not necessary, they recommend this, but they can do 1 to 2 year contracts if we desire.

Tracy asks if it is possible to get in touch with on-campus coordinators for IDEA at other institutions to find out advice when moving to the new platform.

Ken says he can certainly help get Tracy in touch with other on-campus coordinators. He also mentions that Azusa Pacific University is writing a paper on dos and don’ts of implementation since they are in the process of implementing now.
We say goodbye to Ken and then continue our discussion.

Christine says that it is important that IDEA should have some guidelines on how to look at these data versus the old for faculty members.

Chair notices a nice objective gone in the new Campus Labs version.

Amalia comments on this saying that it can be helpful to have redundant objectives if a faculty member gets two good scores on those two items. She is interested to know how the weighting of the new combined objectives compared to the old form. Since having only one objective where there used to be two could make a significant change for some faculty members.

Amanda mentions that the benefit of reducing the size of the survey is that students may respond more thoughtfully if the survey is not as long and cumbersome.

Suzanna emphasizes the ease for faculty to find out teaching resources and advice for improving teaching using the new Campus Labs platform. The resources are directly linked to the evaluation results a faculty member receives. She says this information is currently available at a website and has been shared with Fairfield faculty, but that she still talks with some full-time faculty who do not know about these resources. So a direct linkage to these resources could be very helpful.

Everyone seems to be feeling confident in moving forward with going to the Campus Labs platform since the benefits seems to outweigh some potential drawbacks.

Amalia says that in order to do this, we would need the minutes from this meeting and everything else should be together to get on the calendar of Academic Council. Chair has plans to send email to Amalia and Susan Rakowitz from Academic Council. Tracy, Suzanna and Chair will prepare background documents to bring to the committee to approve next time.

II. Approval of October Meeting Minutes

Amanda makes a motion to approve with a friendly amendment. Chair seconds and all approve

III. Fall FDEC Day Planning

Suzanna says subcommittee (Amanda, Eileen, and Chair) met last Friday along with Emily Smith, Jay Rozgonyi, Debbie Whalley, and herself. Currently there are 53 people signed up for the event, not including all FDEC members. There are currently a number of volunteers for the teaching demonstration/poster session portion of the event. However, there is currently not a faculty member from GSEAP represented yet. Deborah may have someone to recommend. Suzanna summarizes who has currently volunteered. Suzanna has been working with Fran Levine on logistics. Christine has come up with money for giveaways.
After discussing when the next call should go out by email for faculty members to sign up, the committee agrees that Monday, November 23rd is best.

Jay mentions that he can roll over the tvs from BNW 124 if necessary for any presentations.

Christine says she is ordering 100 pens with styluses that say Fairfield U and something about teaching innovation on them as giveaways. She has also completed the order for lunch. We discuss possible raffle prizes and decide on some ipad covers, ipad key boards, and gift cards for the book store.

Chair summarizes the change in schedule for the FDEC day compared to what was on the original email announcement to faculty.

Suzanna says she will revise the wording for the next email to go out in order to reflect this change and will send it to the subcommittee to approve.

Everyone thanks Jay and Debbie for their help with the FDEC Day.

IV. Discussion of Role of CAE on Committee and Governance Steps to Full Committee Membership

Christine says that the Faculty Handbook FDEC membership charge was written before the CAE existed. Therefore, there is not currently an official seat for the Director of CAE on FDEC. Christine recommends changing the charge to add an official seat for the Director of CAE as to do so would legitimize the CAE on this committee and would show appreciation for the collaborative work between FDEC and CAE. This proposal will need to go to Academic Council. Chair will write to Susan Rakowitz, Secretary of General Faculty to ask about the proper process.

Amalia said that the exact same problem came up in the Faculty Handbook Education Technologies Committee (ETC) a year or so ago, and they wrote a memo to the Academic Council giving the argument for their proposed change to the committee charge.

Christine mentions that it will be important to look over the rest of the duties and charge of the committee as well, as these may also need to be revised to reflect CAE involvement in this committee.

Deborah volunteers to write a first draft of the revised charge to bring to the committee at the next meeting.

V. Review of White Paper Recommendation for Rank & Tenure Committee on Evaluating Fall and Spring 2015 IDEA Results (Post Online Implementation)
Tracy worked with Chair to change the FDEC Recommendations on IDEA Administration Best Practices document to indicate that there is now a Fix My Link
app for faculty to use that helps with the link problems seen last semester. In this document, it was also updated that faculty have the responsibility to administer the evaluation within the given time frame that is communicated to them. These edits were made without the committee’s input, because the document needed to be sent out to faculty this week.

The committee can still look this new document over though and suggest any edits if necessary. Faculty actually just have a link and so this can be updated easily with a revised document again.

Chair can also send a highlighted version to help committee see what was changed, but she also described these changes to the committee.

Chair goes on to describe the white paper she wrote that is informational for the Rank and Tenure Committee. Chair describes how she organized what is in the faculty member’s control and what is out of the faculty member’s control in terms of any lower than usual response rates during Spring 2015 and Fall 2015.

Amanda gives typos to correct to Chair.

Amanda brings up that the third bullet under ‘Faculty control’ could be reworded for clarity that this was indeed under the faculty’s control. It is reworded to be, “The faculty member attempted to give evaluation after survey window closed.”

Amalia says there were guidelines on service learning developed recently for Rank & Tenure that were included in the Journal of Record.

The committee agrees that the White Paper the Chair has written should be available online on the GFS’s website. Chair will send White Paper to chair of Rank & Tenure as well as Secretary of the General Faculty.

VI. New Business
The committee thanks Tracy for all of her help and thanks Suzanna for everything she has done for FDEC Day planning.

Chair will send doodle poll to get meeting times together for next semester.

Suzanna says one more thing for FDEC Day is that we want an FDEC member at each table like in the past to facilitate discussions.

A motion to adjourn was made by Amanda at 2:35pm, seconded by Amalia. All in favor.

Respectfully submitted,
Amanda Harper-Leatherman
MINUTES
Faculty Development & Evaluation Committee (FDEC) Meeting
Monday, February 8th, 2015 9:30-11:00 am
DMH

PRESENT: Carol Ann Davis (Chair), Shannon Harding, Amanda Harper-Leatherman, Tracy Immerso, Linda Roney.

Regrets: Deborah Edelman, Christine Siegel, Emily Smith, Ying Zhang (snowstorm)

Meeting called to order at 9:30am by the chair.

I. Approval of November meeting minutes.
   This was deferred to the next meeting due to the lack of members that were at the meeting (snowstorm).

II. Appointment of Scribe
    Shannon Harding agreed to take minutes at the meeting.

III. Welcome New Members—Brief Introductions
    Introductions were made:
    • Shannon Harding from Psychology is replacing Kris Sealy.
    • Linda Roney from the School of Nursing is replacing Eileen O’Shea.
    • Tracy Immerso introduced herself as the IDEA coordinator and implementation staff, and Director of Academic Budgets and Operations.

IV. Fall FDEC Day Debrief
    The responses and turnout were good. Development Day activities focused on innovative teaching, with faculty members from different departments giving posters.

    ACTION STEPS: Carol Ann offered to send faculty and administration leaders thank you notes with copies of brochures.

V. Discussion of CampusLabs Proposal & Appointment of subcommittee
    Carol Ann Davis and Tracy Immerso began the discussion by providing background about the new platform being promoted by IDEA, and the virtual meeting with the IDEA president. They spoke to some of the key improvements of the platform, including being able to run it on a mobile device, and access to resources (papers) to improve teaching with embedded links.

    Shannon Harding asked if the committee had talked with Rank and Tenure about changing the form. Carol Ann Davis talked about common problems that people are having with the form, including online implementation and low turnout,
administration issues, etc., that will need to be addressed if faculty are applying for rank and tenure are missing data. The discussion continued about switching to the new platform. Amanda Harper-Leatherman suggested that for now, we can use the old forms and not make changes. Tracy Immerso suggested that the old form will be phased out, and that if we make the switch, we can do it thoughtfully and planned. Amanda Harper Leatherman further stated that the advantages of the new platform seem to outweigh the disadvantages. Carol Ann Davis asked which questions will be dropped in the new platform, and stressed the importance of including this change in a proposal to adopt the new platform. Carol Ann Davis said that the options seem to be change it now, or wait until the last minute. Tracy Immerso said it will take 6 months to implement the new platform. Carol Ann Davis suggested we discuss this at the next meeting, when more members of the committee are in attendance. In the meantime, the Powerpoint from IDEA will be circulated to new members of the committee.

ACTION STEPS: Carol Ann Davis, Tracy Immerso, and Amanda Harper Leatherman agreed to put together the proposal, and Shannon Harding agreed to review it. The IDEA Powerpoint will be circulated to new members of the committee.

VI. Discussion of Role of CAE on Committee and Governance Steps to Full Committee Membership
The suggested changes to the Handbook from Deborah Edelman were circulated. There was discussion about how to make things simpler. Shannon Harding offered some changes to the wording, and asked about the line suggesting “at least three tenured faculty be on the committee”. She argued that this committee is a good fit for younger faculty, particularly if they have had access to newer technology in the classroom. The consensus was that this should be removed, and that fewer changes / minimal changes would be preferable. There was also a lot of discussion about changes to the duties for FDEC. It was suggested that we have Christine Siegel and Emily Smith weigh in on these.

ACTION STEPS: Shannon Harding agreed to make initial changes to the document, explaining that in reviewing the duties, we noticed that several things are outdated. We would like to thank Deborah Edelman for the first draft, and to get feedback from others on the suggested changes before discussing it as a committee at the next meeting.

VII. Discussion of role of chairs and program directors in evaluating adjunct faculty (IDEA results)—request from department chair
Carol Ann Davis received a formal request from a Chair asking about ownership of the IDEA forms, and whether Chairs can have access to them to make hiring decisions. Historically, IDEA forms have belonged to the faculty, however, Chairs who rely on adjuncts for instruction would like evidence of good teaching. Tracy Immerso explained that in some schools (like GSEAP), faculty are required to share their results / evidence of good teaching for rehire. Tracy Immerso reminded the committee that part-time faculty and full professors default to the short version
ACTION STEPS: It was suggested that we bring this issue to the newly formed committee on non-tenure track faculty, perhaps scheduling a joint meeting with members of that committee in April. The solution to this problem should not come from FDEC. In the meantime, we can get input from the SVPAA office by talking with Christine Siegel.

VIII. Planning for Spring FDEC Day—subcommittee formation

Carol Ann Davis offered a brief history of FDEC Faculty Development days, which typically deal with teaching in the Fall, and evaluation in the Spring. Since we did a technology / teaching day in December, and since we are considering a move to a new platform for IDEA, perhaps a workshop on broadly utilizing IDEA resources would helpful. These might include:

- Online implementation: one year out (Problems? Airing of grievances?)
- How to seek improvements
- How people are using IDEA to make cases for tenure and promotion
- What problems are adjuncts facing? (Including low response rates)
- What can we do with the yellow sheets?

Shannon Harding suggested the low response rate for IDEA with non-tenure faculty should be brought up in the joint meeting with the non-tenured faculty committee.

There was follow up discussion about the future of the yellow sheets / folding questions into the online form.

ACTION STEPS: Carol Ann will ask Christine Siegel to reserve the room for the Faculty Development Day. We will consider polling the faculty to determine the topic to be covered.

IX. Adjournment.
The meeting was adjourned at 11:00am.

Respectfully submitted by,
Shannon Harding
Fairfield University
FDEC Meeting Minutes
Wednesday, March 16, 2016
Donnarumma Hall 230
2-3:30 pm

Present: Carol Ann Davis (chair), Deborah Edelman, Amanda Harper-Leatherman, Ying-Zhang, Amalia Rusu, Tracy Immerso, Christine Siegel, Emily Smith, Linda Roney, Shannon Harding.

Scribe: Deborah Edelman

Meeting called to order at 2:00 by the chair.

2. MOVING IDEA EVALUATION TO CAMPUS LABS PLATFORM PROPOSAL

Follow up discussion ensued based on November conference call with Ken Ryalls, President of IDEA, whether to adopt a change to the Campus Labs platform.

Reference to handout distributed on Proposal to Adopt Newly Revised IDEA Platform and Evaluation:

Advantages discussed for adoption that should be emphasized to faculty:
- Much better interface and survey (color coded-ease for students and faculty)
- The revised survey is now available on a new platform based on a collaboration between IDEA and the technology company, Campus Labs
- The Campus Labs platform provides easier input and access to formative information than current version of IDEA provides and even has an option for a mid-semester survey that offers feedback on teaching that can be used before end of semester to drive changes in instruction.
- Faculty results from Campus Labs IDEA platform is in the Cloud and available within 48 hours.

Questions by FDEC members:
- Should we stay with current PDF version of IDEA or a slightly different form that aligns with our mission?
- Have other academic institutions piloted Campus Labs? Yes, Azusa Pacific University is one example of a university successfully using the new platform.
- Information from Ken Ryalls, IDEA president, indicated no difficulties with the Campus Labs platform based on university experiences.

Cost: Approximate additional cost is 1500.00 per year and Academic Affairs has budgeted for this cost.

Suggested Improvements Related to the Proposal on the Evaluation and Presentation of Instrument to faculty:
Amalia suggested need for more transparency when proposal to adopt Campus Labs is presented to faculty. Committee agreed that we should add more content/explanation showing the link to instruction and why this revision is beneficial to faculty.

Reference Changes: Reverse the two major improvements cited in proposal handout to read:

3. An improved, more valid and reliable evaluation form based on statistical analysis with updated teaching methods and learning outcomes mapped to those of regional accreditors such as the AAC & U.
4. A user-friendly web version of the evaluation and diagnostic report with substantial improvements in data presentation and interpretation through the Campus Labs format.

Additional comments to support use of Campus Labs over IDEA Evaluation:

e) Some of the additional information in original IDEA Evaluation was not valid so Campus Lab offers fewer questions getting at the targeted points to be assessed.
f) Tracy will obtain the “old language vs. new language” to demonstrate repetitive questions.
g) Many learning objectives are the same, but some have been revised or combined to fine tune instrument.
h) On campus IDEA coordinator will upload information easier into the new Campus Labs IDEA platform

In sum:

Revisions will be made and distributed to FDEC members by email along with the 90 page PDF which will be attached when submitted / sent to Academic Council by Friday, Mach 25th for approval.

Motion to approve the proposal to adopt Campus Labs with suggested amendments presented by Shannon and seconded by Amalia. All eight members approved. No abstentions.

2. DISCUSSION OF ROLE OF CAE on COMMITTEE AND GOVERNANCE STEPS TO FULL MEMBERSHIP RE: HANDBOOK LANGUAGE CHANGE

Committee took on charge to make changes to the writing in the handbook so that the language in the first paragraph is updated to reflect true role of CAE as discussed at meeting.

The General Purpose remains as it is in the handbook (unchanged).

Specific Duties changes:

i. Is a revision and slight simplification of handbook language (omitting "all University sectors")
ii. Remains as it was in handbook—no revisions

iii. Is a revision of the original iii. from the handbook—no longer appropriate, since it directed the committee "to design a regular system of classroom evaluation for all University faculty."

iv. Remains as it was in handbook—no revisions

FDEC members will submit these changes in April to Academic Council. The topic will be put on the agenda for Academic Council and attached and put forward to AC in April. Carol will write up a rationale for the changes and add the rationale to minutes.

Amanda moved to make motion to accept changes in the handbook language and Shannon seconded the motion. All members were in agreement.

5. FDEC DAY in MAY

Discussion ensued on various topics that would be relevant and attractive to faculty for FDEC Day scheduled for May 2 (?), 2016, 12:30-3:30.

The major suggestion for the FDEC Day theme involved the issue that have surrounded recent events at Fairfield University regarding the faculty's charge on How to Deal with the Off Campus Party that brought to light issues of racial relations on campus. Groups such as Black Lives Matter has become a large national movement and our students are calling for a response from the University. Christine summarized the many informal and formal efforts the Administration has taken thus far. Among these efforts include the hiring a new Student Diversity and Multicultural Program Leader to serve as one who will outreach to all sectors of the University. The NCLL is working to facilitate student meetings on campus and breakfast meetings have been made available for FF staff.

FDEC members expressed concerns about how to integrate conversations relating to dealing with theses events in the classroom, particularly in content areas that are not necessarily conducive to such conversations. Faculty have shared that some of these intentional conversation have gone well and some not. Is the faculty prepared to manage students’ remarks and reactive behaviors and then smoothly transition to teaching the content at hand?

FDEC members recognize the need to offer information for faculty on this situation to help them prepare to address issues with their students. Emily is interested in being proactive and talked about what the ECA and FDEC could do to promote a better understanding for faculty. Emily suggested:

- Lunch during Student Orientation
- Ongoing Discussion on how to facilitate pedagogy on how to address these issues with teaching
- Opportunities lead by campus faculty with skill in counseling
Discussion ensued:

Is the classroom the place to have these discussions?
There are many questions across faculty on how to discuss these issues and where this should occur in the curriculum.

Maybe the outcome from FDEC Day could be a list of questions about racial justice or an opportunity to discover through examination examining our own biases.

Members agreed that FDEC Day could be an opportune time to address this ongoing fluid situation. The title for FDEC Day was suggested, “How to Have Discussions on Racial and Multicultural Differential Treatment in the Classroom?”

The structural format and theme pertaining to the 21st Century Teaching could remain similar to that used during our fall FDEC DAY and we could continue to use stakeholders as resources.

Discussion ended with:

Christine will try to reserve the Kelly Center for this event. FDEC Members who volunteered to serve on a subgroup to plan the FDEC Day for May were Christine Siegel, Emily Smith, Shannon Harding, Linda Roney, and Carol Anne Davis. Carol will organize this and report back to the FDEC members.

A motion to adjourn was made at 2:30 by Amalia and seconded by Linda. All in favor.

Respectfully submitted,
Deborah Edelman
Members present: Carol Ann Davis (chair), Amanda Harper-Leatherman (scribe), Ying Zhang, Amalia Rusu, Shannon Harding, Linda Roney, Emily Smith, Christine Siegel

Regrets: Deborah Edelman, Tracy Immerso

Visitors present:
Chanel Ward, Director of Student Diversity and Multicultural Affairs  
Erica Hartwell, Assistant Professor Marriage & Family Therapy, Faculty U.S. Diversity Committee Member, and Racial Justice is Social Justice Member  
Martin Nguyen, Associate Professor Religious Studies and Faculty Chair for Diversity  
Mike Andreychik, Associate Professor Psychology

Meeting called to order at 1:55 by the chair.

Chair welcomes everyone indicating that some meeting participants will be coming later while others will need to leave early, so the meeting will get started even though not everyone present yet.

Edited FDEC meeting minutes from March will be circulated by email for approval.

This entire meeting is focused on discussing the upcoming FDEC Day in May.

Introductions of people at meeting today take place.

Chair explains that she has sent around a draft advertisement about FDEC Day that incorporates the idea of the 21st century teacher that was part of the FDEC Day theme last semester along with the ideas of diversity, bias and difficult conversations in the classroom. She explains further for the visitors present that FDEC Day is a one afternoon event for faculty development, certainly not a full university committed response to potential issues on campus. FDEC Day should, however, hopefully be a part of the continued and repeated efforts of the whole university.

Prof. Hartwell reports on a recent US Diversity Committee meeting. The committee is planning workshops or training for faculty who teach US diversity courses. The committee is interested in making sure that the courses are meeting the US Diversity goals and that faculty members are supported in their teaching. Members of the group Racial Justice is Social Justice (RJSJ) and the Center for Academic
Excellence (CAE) were also present at the meeting. The committee and others present came up with three workshop or training ideas of interest: 1. Pedagogy (privilege, power and oppression) (including planned pedagogy versus something happens on campus and how do you discuss) 2. Assessment (goals and how to measure if attaining goals) 3. Broader resources (resources that can help teach in a planned way or in moments that arrive). The idea was that the committee didn’t want these workshops/training events to be one-time events, but that they would help faculty work to improve teaching over the course of time and would be sustainable.

Prof. Smith says these US Diversity committee meeting ideas could also be used as potential break-out session topics at FDEC day. For instance, some faculty may want to learn how to teach about diversity issues and some faculty may want to learn how to assess what they are already teaching.

Chair mentions that a break-out session for faculty who are in areas that are outside subject areas of diversity would be useful because being aware of multicultural issues is an obligation of all faculty, not just those who teach this topic.

Chair gives an example of one of her students telling her that she was the only faculty member that the student had who mentioned racial events going on in the world in her class. Chair found this surprising.

Prof. Harding says diversity and bias topics are outside of her subject area, but that she invited Prof. Mike Andreychik to this meeting because he does research on bias and stereotyping and may have something to add to FDEC Day.

Prof. Andreychik explains that most of the students in his courses are Caucasian, female students. One of his course goals is to teach students that all people have implicit biases and the science behind understanding this. He gives the students an online test known as the Implicit Associate Test (IAT) to complete outside of class and then they discuss the results in class. The test helps reveal hidden biases that students may not have been aware, and students are usually surprised by these results. Prof. Andreychik helps the students to understand that this is natural and not something to be ashamed of, but to instead use this information to be more aware of possible biases. Students like this experiential method of learning about this topic. Giving faculty members who attend FDEC Day this IAT test with an intro from Prof. Andreychik could be a starter to the FDEC day. This could then be followed by guided reflection.

Director Ward says this kind of beginning personal inventory is a great idea. She explains that ever since starting at Fairfield in January, students and faculty have come to her with many narratives on diversity and multicultural issues they have and it would be nice to make faculty more self-aware in terms of these issues.
Prof. Nguyen also speaks in favor of the beginning faculty assessment led by Prof. Andreychik. He says that the day could be organized to start with the assessment, followed by reflection, then break-out sessions and finally each break-out group reporting out a summary for the whole group.

Prof. Smith says may even be helpful to take it one step further back by starting out with who a faculty member is as a person when coming in the class room, relating to power and dealing with power in the class room.

Prof. Hartwell asks what everyone’s perceptions are on how comfortable faculty will be talking about their own possible biases and other similar ideas we will be bringing up.

Chair says there will be range of levels of comfort with this, so we should keep this in mind.

Prof. Nguyen brings up that he has been talking with Prof. Hartwell and Director Ward about trying to develop a sustainable monthly program for faculty members. It would be a faculty forum open to all faculty members and the agenda would vary and might depend on particular events taking place on campus. It would be a forum for faculty to discuss these current events and how to best respond to them.

Prof. Nguyen explains that FDEC Day could help advertise for these monthly forums that will begin in the fall and also help brainstorm ideas for them. Some faculty may not realize they should be part of the conversation, but all faculty will be invited.

Chair says that this is a great idea and in the exit survey at the end of the FDEC Day, it could be possible to ask faculty members to write down ideas for fall forum topics.

Going back to the idea about faculty members reflecting on themselves as teachers, Director Ward says that faculty could reflect on how they perceive themselves and on how students perceive them and what that may mean in terms of teaching.

Director Ward also says that as part of the FDEC Day afternoon it would be nice to have a person talk about institutional goals related to diversity and multicultural issues to make this event more comprehensive and relevant to the big picture of what is going on at the university. One idea would be to bring up the AAC&U Intercultural Knowledge and Competence Value Rubric to show how these topics are important nation-wide.

Vice Provost Siegel says that this particular AAC&U Rubric is something that has come up many times throughout the week at various meetings she has attended and would certainly be appropriate for FDEC Day.

The rubric is pulled up on the computer and displayed for the meeting attendees and Vice Provost Siegel explains it and its background.
Prof. Smith says that it may be helpful to put all of these issues in context by starting out the FDEC Day with this AAC&U rubric.

Discussion ensues about trying to schedule out the FDEC Day afternoon given all the ideas that have come up.

Vice Provost Siegel indicates that in all of this, we should be clear on what our overarching goals and common take-aways are for this FDEC Day. The group came to consensus on some common take-aways or threads that should result from this FDEC Day. Hopefully faculty will come away understanding a little bit more that 1. We all share in the responsibility to educate ourselves and our students about diversity and multicultural issues 2. Where they as faculty are in terms of developing multicultural knowledge and competence and 3. How to step into the classroom while still growing in terms of multicultural knowledge and competence.

The event will take place in the Kelley Center and Vice Provost Siegel said she would reserve this space.

A draft schedule is shown below:

**Lunch** – People are invited to begin getting lunch from the buffet line as soon as they arrive (1st 10 minutes are saved for this)

**Welcome** – Carol Ann (5 min)

Once people have begun to take their seats with their lunches, Carol Ann welcomes everyone and introduces the afternoon

**University goals/context and then AAC&U rubric explanation and discussion** – Christine (15 min)

**Written Reflection** – Carol Ann and Christine (5 min)

Once Christine has introduced the AAC&U rubric, faculty will be invited to reflect on where they think their students fall on this rubric, and then where they think they themselves fall on this rubric in addition to what a faculty member’s role should be when considering helping students move towards the capstone level on this rubric

**Implicit Association Test Power Point Presentation** – Mike and Shannon or Shannon and Erica if Mike is not available (20 min)

**Reflection and Pair Share** – (10 min)

**Break-out Sessions** (20 min)

Each Break-out session would ideally have a student narrative for the facilitator to share initially related to the topic to give faculty a real-life example

**Topics:**

- Where do I start when it comes to teaching about diversity and multicultural issues? (Erica Hartwell)

- I have taught about diversity and multicultural issues, but what are the next steps I should take in assessment? (Emily Smith)
• How do I talk about hot button issues? (Stephanie Storms)

• I am out of my depth or discipline, but want to learn how these topics can relate to my teaching? (Martin Nguyen)

• What are students saying about these topics? (Chanel Ward)

• What does a safe classroom feel like and how do I create one? (Carol Ann Davis)

**Discussion and Debrief** (20 minutes)
Each break-out group will have a chance to report on a summary of what was discussed in their group

**Final Thoughts and Announcements about Upcoming Events to Continue the Discussion** (15 minutes) – Carol Ann thanks everyone for coming and then introduces all the faculty and staff resources on these diversity and multicultural topics. Each person can then make announcements about upcoming planned events such as Martin Nguyen’s Faculty Forum, Erica Hartwell’s RJSJ June Workshop, etc.

Meeting adjourned at 3:30pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Amanda Harper-Leatherman