AGENDA

Present: Michael Andreychik (Chair), Carol Ann Davis, Cinthia Gannett, Deborah Edelman, Eileen O’Shea, Gwen Alphonso, Valerie Martinez, Christine Siegel

Regrets: none

Invited Guests: Larry Miners, Suzanna Klaf, Tracey Immerso, Kim Baer, Jim Simon

Scribe: Deborah Edelman

1. Approval of minutes (2/28/14, Alphonso)
   Michael will circulate minutes from March meeting via email for approval

2. Update on Short-form Proposal
   Approved by Academic Council
   The short-form will be available for the Fall round of evaluations.

3. IDEA Updates
   Faculty can access results of IDEA on my.fairfield. After some initial hiccups with the my.fairfield IDEA access, the system is now working well.

   Contingent faculty who do not get results of their evaluations can obtain their results by contacting Tracy or Kim. As long as contingent faculty has a Banner ID # they can access their evaluation results. If faculty member is no longer an employee, Tracy or Kim should be contacted. The website will be updated with more information on how to access IDEA results.

   A major discussion topic for the fall semester will concern the possibility of a move to all online and an elimination of the paper IDEA form option. At this point the committee is in favor of such a move, but the first few meetings of the year should focus on figuring out specifics with respect to a formal recommendation for such a move (e.g., what kind of education should accompany the move?).

4. Update on spring FDEC Day scheduled for May 1st
   The organization of stations, space, books are set up but opening and final activity are pending and Mike will finalize materials
   There will be a separate table for CAE
   Faculty should be reminded to sign up to attend FDEC Day. Encourage your colleagues to sign up!
FDEC Day event will occur at 12:30 right after the General Faculty meeting which ends at 12:00. After Mike gives his annual report on behalf of FDEC at the General Faculty meeting, he will announce that faculty who have not registered may join in the event which will occur following the GF meeting.

5. FDEC Members and Topics for FDEC Day Fall 2014

There will be two openings for new committee members on the FDEC for fall of 2014. Mike and Valeria will be rotating off of the committee.

Recommendation was made to discuss the FDEC Day scheduled for fall earlier so that the new member committee can get a “jump start” on planning.

Topics suggested for the Fall FDEC Day were:

a) IDEA. There are still lots of questions and misunderstandings surrounding the IDEA process. Plus, the planned move to all online will necessitate additional education, especially among faculty who have not used the online option in the past. Faculty must be empowered to make the shift to the electronic version.

b) Creating coherence across the university on broad themes in an effort to collaborate (collaborative projects, collaborative teaching, and speakers).

Suzanna Klaf noted that CAE will sponsor a Collaborative Theme Program May 29-30th. In an effort to extend knowledge on instructional tools, CAE is sponsoring an E-Learning Conference May 28th with a keynote speaker from Blackboard.

These common themes between CAE and FDEC suggest that the Committee consider combining efforts on themes for FDEC Day, where the FDEC Day would offer a one-day event and CEA would sustain engagement on the same theme with long-term follow up.

Christine Siegel accentuated the need for the committee to codify two FDEC days a year by selecting a consistent dedicated day for this event such as Reading Day. This idea will be considered and revisited at the next FDEC meeting in the fall, with a formal recommendation to AC likely to follow.

6. IDEA Form Follow Up Report

Jim Simon, Associate Dean spoke to the Committee about how to better utilize the IDEA Evaluation forms. He informed the Committee of a general dissatisfaction of how IDEA is being used across universities nationally. His investigation of the aggregate scores by department at Fairfield University revealed an issue with faculty compliance with IDEA by department. Chairs were charged with following up on their faculty who are not in compliance.
Jim argues that the response rate should be over 60% and reported the following issues that may be contributing to low response rates and/or low IDEA scores:

   a) Some faculty have failed to return paper packets
   b) Some faculty are not selecting the objectives on the IDEA FIF form that align with their true instructional objectives
   c) Some faculty did not give out the IDEA forms to students

Jim Simon emphasized the need to “win faculty over.” Faculty need to inform students of the objectives, fill out the FIF form early, and use these objectives to drive instruction as was the purpose of the IDEA assessment tool.

Jim accentuated the need to focus on the response rate by faculty rather than compare departmental rates of response to avoid internal competition across the university. It was suggested the entire faculty look at the averages and ask how we can use these averages to work together to improve the university average rather than compete within.

Gwen suggested the potential to compare departmental averages with university averages may still exist. She advocated the importance of reinforcing departments who have high response rates in an all out collaborative effort to “pull up the university average.” Knowledge of results of IDEA scores is important for departments because they can use student ratings diagnostically to drive decisions about where to invest time with faculty.

Cinthia emphasized the importance of using IDEA evaluations in a formative way which requires faculty have access to their teaching evaluations. This should include adjunct faculty / part-time faculty. Do all faculty have access was asked?

Christine indicated that, as required by NCATE for accreditation, the Graduate School of Education and Allied Professions distributes all information from faculty IDEA evaluations to all full-time and part-time faculty members.

Cinthia and other members emphasized the need for a university initiative to assure all schools have the same transparent policies and shared evaluation results for full-time and part-time faculty.

Jim Simon distributed an outline (handout) of the advantages of the current system for administering IDEA vs. advantages of going on-line. One issue facing faculty is that the paper version is currently generating a higher response rate. As a way to increase on-line responses, Jim suggested that faculty allow students to bring a laptop to class and schedule a 20 minute period during the last class for students to complete on-line course evaluations. This is consistent with the best practices for online evaluations discussed by the FDEC at other points this year. Jim Simon finished by expressing his strong support for a move to all online.

Meeting adjourned at 3:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Deborah Edelman