

Meeting called to order on 18 September, 2009 at: 9:00 AM

Members in Attendance: Gary Roberson, Betsy Brown, John Ambrose, Donna Petherbridge, Ted Emigh, Natalie Ames, James Bartlett, Christy Moss, Laura Sremaniak, Rick Lemaster

Visitors: Geetanjali Soni, Assistant Director, Office of Faculty Development

1. Welcome and Introductions

2. Overview of the Office of Faculty Development: Betsy Brown provided insight on the OFD and the services provided. More details can be found at the [Office of Faculty Development](#) website. The OFD currently has 2.5 staff members with the director's position currently vacant.

3. Meeting Times: the 3rd Friday of each month will be the regular meeting. The first Friday of each month will be reserved for optional meeting times.

4. Discussion Items for 2009/2010:

The list of items presented in the agenda was reviewed. In addition to the 7 items identified, an additional item was added from the floor. The current list of topics is:

- 1) Review of all questions on the ClassEval Instrument
- 2) Incentives as a way to increase ClassEval response rates
- 3) Extend ClassEval through final exams or beyond
- 4) Peer review of teaching and scholarship of teaching and learning
- 5) Should classes with fewer than 5 students be evaluated
- 6) Requests for ClassEval datasets from faculty and graduate students to do research
- 7) Evaluation of Teaching in RPT dossiers
- 8) Assessment of faculty who use informal survey instruments during the semester and its impact on ClassEval.

5. Request for ClassEval Data: Karen Helm of UPA has received two requests for data from ClassEval to be used for research purposes. Guidance on release of the data is needed. It is believed one of the requests would analyze characteristics of respondents versus nonrespondents. Individual identity of respondents would not be required. Gary will consult with IRB and Faculty Senate for input. Student reps, once named, should be included in discussion. Questions were raised about student's informed consent to release the data. May need to include statement

in future instruments. Suggested that sections with less than 5 not be released. Questions were raised about releasing optional questions. Committee would like to know what the nature of the requests at hand are.

6. RPT template: Page 2 of the RPT dossier template was reviewed by the committee. Suggestions were made to include a Number of Respondents sub-column in each of the Course and Section columns. This should be useful in interpreting the results. Revise the Note at the bottom of the table. Current note does not accurately reflect what SEM is.

Note: the following links provide a definition of SEM:

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Standard_error_%28statistics%29

<http://medical-dictionary.thefreedictionary.com/standard+error+of+the+mean>

Include college and department questions in the template. It is understood that department and colleges may elect to delete some data from the actual RPT dossier.

6. Interpreting ClassEval Results: The committee would like to ask Karen Helm to provide the presentation she made last year on ClassEval results and interpretation.

7. Next Meeting: October 16, 2009

Adjourned at: 10:50 AM

Minutes submitted by: Gary Roberson