Faculty Development & Evaluation (FDEC) Meeting
Monday, October 21st, 3:00-5:00
CNS 200

Attendance
Those present were: Michael Andreychik (chair), Cinthia Gannett, Carol Ann Davis, Deborah Edelman, Eileen O’Shea

Invited Guests: Patricia Calderwood, Suzanna Klaf, and Tracey Immerso, and Bill Taylor

Regrets: Christine Siegel, Valeria Martinez, David Winn,

Minutes were taken by Deborah Edelman

Minutes
The minutes from the September 25th meeting were unanimously approved.

Invitation to Engineering Representative
The committee voted by acclamation to invite Bill Taylor from the SOE to represent the voice of the SOE on this year’s FDEC.

IDEA Updates on Campus Labs Platform
Tracey Immerso discussed IDEA’s new campus labs platform and referred the committee to a webinar detailing the platform (https://www.dropbox.com/l/qbEOQ0UxDBSO4tgesvStc). In short, with the growing popularity of mobile devices, IDEA has partnered with campus labs to create a platform that allows for completion of IDEA forms on basically any mobile device. Although this platform is currently in its infancy, it is likely that IDEA will sunset paper evaluation sometime in the future, making the creation of the campus labs platform an important step toward ensuring broad access for students to IDEA evaluation forms. Cost of the campus labs platform is comparable to our current platform.

Carol Ann asked if student will still be able to use laptops to do evaluations. Tracey shared that ITS will provide laptops if a student does not have a mobile device.

Michael asked if IDEA eliminates paper format, will other systems follow suit. Basically, is this move toward all electronic evaluations inevitable? Tracey indicated that this trend toward all electronic evaluations seems to be one that all systems are following.
Carol Ann asked if we could get data on transitioning to on-line evaluations. She reminded the committee of the impact that poor response rates and/or poor data—even for a semester—can have on junior faculty and faculty on short tenure clock re: P & T.

The committee agreed to look at “best practices” in an effort to gain an adequate percentage of data. The CAE Newsletter offers information on “best practices” and the IDEA center has a variety of helpful tips on increasing the quantity and quality of student responses when using the online evaluation system.

Cinthia stated the importance of educating students and faculty on the evaluation process as an important charge for FDEC. If this requires coordinating efforts to offer an educational campaign, a member of FDEC should sit on the committee.

Tracey reminded that having only 1 platform (Blackboard) will ease the transition. Blackboard now offers a host of services that will facilitate on-line evaluations and data collection.

Michael shared advantages offered by the new platform and asked if the all on-line platform will enable us to get “real time” data for evaluation in a reasonable turn around.

Tracey shared that the present 6-week process will change to approximately a 5-day turn around to gain access to data. This is a critical advantage since we use this data to determine faculty we are re-hiring or not retaining (this is particularly relevant for contingent faculty).

**IDEA Issues from Academic Deans**

**Ownership of IDEA Evaluations for Part-Time Faculty**
Discussion ensued about ownership of individual data received from course evaluations. Although the JOR specifies that individual faculty own their data, a question arose as to whether this applies to individual full-time faculty only, or whether this extends to contingent faculty as well. The issue arose because some Part-time faculty is required to submit their course evaluations to the Deans or program directors. The Journal of Record indicates that individual data belong to the individual faculty member but the Dean/director may request the data from the individual faculty member. Concern as to whether the faculty has power (quality control) in this case. Members questioned what else could administration do to observe teaching of part-time faculty because some part-time faculty welcome feedback particularly since the University needs evidence in order to make hiring decisions.
Members questioned whether student evaluations alone are a valid indicator of teaching effectiveness and shared that the university does not have a culture of encouraging/requiring peer observations or multiple measures to evaluate part-time faculty.

Suzanna shared that CAE offers information and workshops for these faculty and that the needs are varied and field specific.

Our role as FDEC in regard to “faculty ownership” of individual data from evaluations was discussed. Do they (i.e., contingent faculty) own their evaluations? Should we expect them to turn over their data? The FDEC will look to the Journal of Record to ascertain how this issue is defined as it applies to part-time and full-time faculty. We can also check the Faculty Handbook to ascertain how these terms are operationalized.

Michael agreed to talk to Academic Council and the SVPAA’s office about the meaning of “faculty” in the Journal of Record. He shared the importance of clarifying this for the newly hired Deans.

**Issues with FUSA Question Data**

FUSA questions are not associated with IDEA. It is student-generated evaluation data. The committee concurred that the FUSA questions have not generated useable data.

Questions and concerns voiced:

- a) Is FUSA data available to the Deans and Chairs?
- b) Is this data student owned vs. IDEA which is faculty owned?
- c) Who has access to data beside faculty?
- d) Students see FUSA data that is not viewed by chairs and deans.

Tracey added information re: FUSA data:

- a) Faculty can opt in or default to opt in FUSA distribution
- b) If less than 3 responses on FUSA, the data is eliminated
- c) If overall responses rates are less than 50%, data eliminated

The purpose and use of FUSA data is unclear to the faculty. The FUSA Committee needs to collaborate with FDEC and other University bodies to discuss responsible use of FUSA data.

Tracey stated that Christine Siegel and David Sapp are planning to meet with students about the use of FUSA data.

The FDEC requested more clarification on FUSA data. Michael will contact Christine Siegel and David Sapp who are working with FUSA representatives and inquire as to how students are using this data. Michael will request that FUSA questions are sent to
all FDEC members so the committee can reflect on these questions prior to the next FDEC meeting. The urgency of meeting on this issue was discussed so as to address the concerns and questions before the FUSA distribution for fall semester.

**Fall FDEC Day**

Michael generated discussion about possible topics for the upcoming FDEC Day which is scheduled in for December 12th. Michael offered “Technology” and Cinthia suggested “Writing across the Curriculum” as themes.

Cinthia advocated for promoting communication across the University. The members concurred that it is important to keep faculty actively involved in combining technology and writing.

Options on how to structure FDEC Day and the importance of “marketing” the day to give practical use for faculty were discussed. Other themes offered by Patricia, Cinthia and Carol were:

a) Integrated Learners across the Curriculum
b) Becoming Learners Again (cross-disciplines) and giving the faculty a chance to engage in risk taking
c) Looking at the most effective faculty who seem to have that “secret juice.”

Michael questioned whether we should have a subcommittee to plan the day before the next meeting and decided against it. Instead, members were asked to think of models although concern about the timeline was an issue entertained. Michael decided to summarize all of these themes for members so members can collaborate on a theme for FDEC Day.

**Additional Items:**

Tracey shared that she will resend the campus labs webinar to members of the FDEC.

**Adjournment:**

Meeting adjourned, 5:00

Respectfully submitted,

Deborah Edelman