Meeting was called to order by K. Kosbar at 2:05 p.m.

Point 1: Choosing a Chair
Dr. Yin-fa MA was chosen chair of the committee in an unanimous vote. Dr. Ma agreed to accept the position.

Point 2: Purpose of Committee
It was unclear the purpose of the committee at first; however, a definition soon evolved to include the following items:

- This committee replaces the Ad Hoc CET committee of 2008-2010.
- Committee should supply comments on how teaching is evaluated
- Study the electronic versus paper student evaluations debate
- Develop plans or suggestions on how to improve campus teaching
- Go over the current questions on the student evaluation sheet and offer suggestions for changing the questions, adding, or eliminating questions
- Find out if this new CET committee has a budget
- Supply comments on how teaching is evaluated on this campus

Point 3: What the Committee does NOT do
- This committee does NOT deal with teaching awards.

Point 4: Electronic versus Paper Student Evaluations of Professors
- Stephanie Fitch needs to be contacted as she was on the Ad Hoc CET committee and has lots of information from around the United States.
- It was suggested that this committee track the electronic evaluation system
  - As a result, more trial runs were also suggested before the full implementation of the new system takes place.
- It was felt that switching to the electronic system is inevitable.
- Comment was made that evaluations don’t match, one section was considerably higher than another section of the same class (that was considered highly unusual by the professor offering the comment)
- Comment was made that electronic evaluations permitted more students to evaluate professors.
  - It was suggested that the time frame for submitting evaluations be shortened.
  - It was also demonstrated that there are problems with certain classes, such as Math 2 and Math 4 in that those courses end BEFORE the end of the semester.
• Professors NOT getting their evaluations as the system will not allow students to give more than ONE evaluation.
• Cost of electronic evaluations was noted and that it was probably less expensive than the current paper evaluations.
• Opinion was that students should NOT be forced to do an evaluation….i.e., holding their final grades “hostage” until the students complete the evaluation forms.
• Several noted that it is vital that something be done WITH the information (statistics, for example) that are produced in the evaluations.
  o For example, give “how to teach” sessions
    ▪ Offered to all professors on campus
    ▪ This committee will probably NOT be privy to private information so no one particular group of professors could be targeted for improvement of their teaching.
• Regarding paper evaluations, it was noted that sometimes they are lost or the answer sheets are placed in the wrong envelopes which leads to the scantron sheets becoming invalid.
• Question arose:
  o WHO controls the data? Who “owns” it?

Point 5: Go over current questions on the evaluation forms
• It was suggested that all of the questions on the form be looked at.
• It was suggested that the question about “does the professor communicate well” be changed as students sometimes think that means “can you understand a professor’s accent [if a non-native speaker].”
• It was also suggested that the placement of questions be rearranged in some cases.

Point 6: Develop suggestions on how to improve campus teaching
• Develop seminar series to help people improve their teaching
• Cannot force professors to attend above noted seminars
• Also noted that sometimes some professors get low CET scores, even though they are good teachers
• MUST improve teaching, or what else is the purpose of student evaluations (besides raises, awards, and promotions)

Point 7: Action Items
• Dr. Ma agreed to contact Stephanie Fitch for a future meeting
  o This was accomplished and as of 6 p.m. on September 1, the meeting will be on September 29 at 3pm.
• Dr. Ma agreed to contact Provost Wray to see if there is a budget for this committee.
• Dr. Ma requested that the committee contact him with agenda items for the next meeting, as well as future meetings.