

Kansas State University Faculty Senate
Faculty Affairs Committee
Minutes
January 17, 2017
3:30 p.m. – Business Building 2138

Present: Charlie Barden, Kristan Corwin, Gayle Doll, Troy Harding, Stephen Kucera, David Lehman, Char Simser, Jackie Spears, Jeff Stevenson, HCS Liaison—Bill Johnson, Student TEVAL rep—Meredith Clark, AA Liaison—Mick Charney

❖ A committee photo was taken.

❖ **Minutes.** The December 6, 2016 Minutes were approved.

❖ **Old Business**

- We reviewed the status of Section C. Co-Chair Lehman reports that any changes had been forwarded to the Provost's office and has received no feedback regarding additional changes. The assumption is that our suggestions were approved.
- Our instructions for this spring include developing a plan for addressing Student Evaluation of Instruction Issues. We reviewed a draft of potential action items developed by Associate Provost Brian Niehoff. The following bullets outline some of the ensuing discussion
 - Need to check on the “new” online TEVALS pilot. Should one of the committee members be involved in the pilot? We decided that this pilot may have been more about the delivery system rather than substantive changes to the survey.
 - Interest in seeing the A and C points clarified: “A. Provide feedback to the instructor to improve the teaching and learning in the class and C. Provide students the opportunity to give input to the faculty member on how the class was taught”. We felt like A was the instructor perspective and C was the student perspective but some in attendance felt that as written they appear to mean the same.
 - Conversation about the fact that the instrument had not been re-normed. The same tool has been used for years with no changes that might reflect new teaching and learning methods. We discussed the ability to supply additional questions but few are using this. Education writes new questions to reflect the SLOs. We wondered about new questions that would include interactivity or engagement as well as the use of CANVAS. We might consider writing some additional questions that could be added to the online TEVAL in a drop down menu to simplify the procedure for faculty without too much additional effort.
 - In reviewing the section on “All classes evaluated every semester” we wondered if a threshold for small class sizes be used as an exemption. We also commented on the fact that TEVALS do not change much for faculty that have been teaching the same course for many years. Could tenured faculty be exempted from this policy? Our students on the committee think that this would not be acceptable as some of these tenured faculty members are really not good instructors and they feel like they need some recourse to address their deficiencies. A compromise might be to allow faculty to be able to select between a formative (mid-term) evaluation and a summative (end of semester) evaluation.
 - We would like to get information about the courses that are not getting evaluated.
 - We feel it is important that students be educated about how faculty are evaluated by their superiors.
 - Mick Charney discussed an article he had read on Collaborative Midterm Student Evaluations making three points: The method described in the article had students working in groups to provide formative feedback online. **Reference:** Veeck, A., O'Reilly, K., MacMillan, A., and Yu, H., (2016). The use of collaborative midterm student evaluations to provide actionable results. *Journal of Marketing Education*, 38 (3), 157–169.
 - Students requested that someone from the committee present information to Student Government.
 - It was suggested that we ask Jana Falin to visit with us again.

- We were updated on solar eclipse plans for August 21, 2017. The provost had shared a list of reasons why delaying the start of the fall semester would not work. There seems to be some desire on the part of Faculty Senate to continue to debate the merits of the plan.

❖ **New Business.**

- None presented.

❖ **From Committee Members**

- Kucera and Clark said they had articles about teaching evaluations that they would forward to the committee. Conversation ensued about gender differences in student feedback.

❖ **Next Meeting: February 7, 2017 (Business Building 2138).**

- The time was changed to 3:45 for the spring semester to accommodate teaching faculty.

❖ **The meeting was adjourned.**