

Minutes of the Faculty Standards Committee, University Senate, 11/6/2017

FSC Members in Attendance:

*Jc Beall, Philosophy
*Sandra Bellini, School of Nursing
Fiona Bernardin, Undergraduate Student Government
Lloyd Blanchard, OIRE
Preston Britner, Human Development & Family Studies
*Michael Fischl, School of Law
*Peter Gogarten, Molecular and Cell Biology
*Phillip Gould, Physics
Elizabeth Jockusch, Ecology and Evolutionary Biology
*George McManus, Marine Science – Avery Point
Brandon Murray, Office of the Provost
Andrew Rogalski, Undergraduate Student Government
*Del Siegle, Neag School of Education
*Kathy Segerson, Economics
John Volin, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs (*Ex Officio* Member)
Sarah Woulfin, Neag School of Education

*Senate Member 2017/2018

Guests in Attendance:

Tom Bontly, AAUP
Peter Diplock, CETL
Tom Peters, AAUP

Jc Beall, acting as Chair, called the meeting to order at 2:00 p.m.

Old Business

The 10/2/2017 Minutes were approved unanimously.

New Business

Resources for the Evaluation of Teaching

At the invitation of the FSC, Peter Diplock, Assistant Vice Provost, Center for Excellence in Teaching and Learning (CETL), shared some ideas about student evaluations of teaching (SETs) and other assessments of teaching. His presentation

included the following resources about SETs, self-evaluation methods, and other evaluation methods.

Student Evaluation of Teaching (SETs)

- Faculty that provide dedicated time for students to complete SETs during class time report 70-80% response rates
- Necessary but insufficient condition to document teaching effectiveness moving forward

Self-Evaluation of Teaching

- Broadly speaking (teaching portfolio---needs to be refined and clarified)
- Statement about courses taught that includes discussion of class goals and procedures, course outlines and learning outcomes, descriptions of teaching materials and assignments, and copies of assessments of student learning
- Formative assessments (CETL to provide resources and guidance)

Other Evaluation of Teaching

- Done by CETL: CETL Teaching Enhancement Plans, 1-1 Consultations, and Classroom Observations (not able to scale to cover all faculty, prioritized needs, faculty share results/outcomes voluntarily, CETL does not share)
- Done by Peers inside school/department (facilitated by CETL or Department Head): Peer Evaluation of Teaching (CETL to provide guidance and support for 'train the trainer model' along with documentation) (descriptive and evaluative)
- Done by Peers outside department (facilitated by CETL): Teaching squares to promote self-reflection (therefore we need to gather evidence of self-reflection) (non-evaluative, commit to an initial meeting to discuss expectations/logistics/framework, each member provides syllabi, visit one another's class, meet again to discuss what was learned---self-reflection and square share) members of same department not assigned to the same square.

Questions were raised and discussion ensued on the following topics:

- Response rates for SETs (e.g., use of incentives [including early release of grades] and the ethics and logistics of such practices; time for in-class assessment as a key strategy to enhance participation [supported by student members Fiona Bernardin and Andrew Rogalski])
- The resources available (i.e., type, resources; one faculty enhancement staff person worked with over fifty faculty members last year) at CETL for formative assessments
- The question of whether SETs are "required"
 - John Volin emphasized the requirement that faculty use SETs, but that departments must also supplement SETs with other modes of assessment (for hiring, contract, and PTR decisions). Multiple FSC

members reiterated the repeated (annual) statements by the FSC for the need for supplemental assessments.

- Tom Bontly and Tom Peters (AAUP) stated that they did not believe that SETs were a contractual requirement.
- Del Siegle noted that the PTR form does require SETs (if used, based on the minimum class enrollment required to generate a report, and the minimum response rate to generate the computation of scores) to be included in the PTR record, and that the Department Head is required to provide a broader narrative on the candidate's teaching record.
- Non-tenure track faculty. AAUP colleagues were asked about what complaints were raised about SETs and support for teaching. Most centered around potential bias in SETs (which FSC has previously discussed, and OIRE is tracking) and supports and resources for faculty at the regional campuses, and concerns about use of SETs only (not supplemented by other assessments) for non-tenure track faculty, like instructors, adjuncts, and professors in residence. [SETs are not required of Early College Experience (ECE) faculty in Connecticut high schools.] Peter Diplock described some CETL supports for regional and non-tenure track faculty.
- Interpretation of one global item. Tom Peters also raised concerns (similar to those discussed in 2016-2017 by the FSC, and echoed by several FSC members in the room) about the Office of the Provost's use of "good" (SET rating of "5") or "bad" (SET rating of "1") letters to faculty on the one global item (#14) of instructor effectiveness, instead of a broader use of SET items, SETs over multiple courses and semesters, and other assessments. [John Volin offered some details on how the Provost's Office goes beyond that assessment, for the "bad" letter, but also expressed willingness to hear from FSC about other ideas for a broader assessment.]

Wrapping up discussion, Jc Beall noted that the SEC's charge to FSC on the issue of teaching evaluation (i.e., are we just to look at the assessment itself, or the entire system of evaluation of teaching) needed to be clarified.

FSC Representation on a Working Group on PTR Timing

FSC was asked to provide two representatives to a working group on the timing of PTR reviews, based on a proposal from the Office of the Provost to move the third year review to the end (rather than start) of the candidate's third year on the tenure clock. Jc Beall and Sarah Woulfin volunteered to serve.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:03 p.m.

Minutes submitted respectfully by Preston Britner.