

Date: Wednesday, September 1, 2010

CORRECTED MINUTES (9/29/10)

Time: 2:00-2:50 p.m.

Location: 137 EE

Those Attending: Ma, Yinfa; Dharani, Lokesh; Chin, Yoo-Mi, Ahmad, Diana L.; Price, Clayton E.; Kirgan, Mary Ellen, Miller, F. Scott, Kosbar, Kurt

Those Missing: Sharpsteen, Don J., Bieniek, Ronald James, Daniels, Mitsy

Secretary: Diana L. Ahmad

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.
 - 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:
 - 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
 - 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.