

**Kansas State University Faculty Senate  
Faculty Affairs Committee  
Minutes  
February 7, 2017**

**3:45 p.m. – Business Building 2138 (inside 2121)**

**Attendance:** Charlie Barden, Kristan Corwin, Gayle Doll, Troy Harding, Stephen Kucera, David Lehman, Char Simser, Jackie Spears, Charlotte Self (HCS Liaison), Meredith Clark (Student TEVAL representative), Scott Finkeldei (General University liaison), Mick Charney (AA Liaison), Bill Hsu (guest).

Minutes were approved with a change for the next meeting date changed to February 7 from February 3.

❖ **Old Business**

- **Review status of Section C.** Co-chairs Lehman and Barden had received notes from Lyn Carlin from the Provost's office regarding changes to Section C. Now that this section is complete Section B can be released but we need to add language including the Polytechnic campus. Barden and Lehman will send the committees sections to review. Changes to section C affect Appendix Q that will need to be changed to match. We question why we even need a section Q that seems to be a repeat of Section C. Should there be a reference to Appendix Q in Section C? The committee will review and discuss at the next meeting.
- **Develop plan for addressing Student Evaluation of Instruction Issues**
  - We continued with our review of a draft document developed by Brian Niehoff (see attachment). We discussed forming subgroups to subdivide the 5 areas: 1) POLICY QUESTIONS—should we keep the “all courses, every semester” evaluation? We want further clarification from the Teaching and Learning Center about low compliance rates of courses being evaluated. Does this include the Math Department that has developed its own assessment and classes that are too small to evaluate? Meredith Clark suggested that the best way to get good response rates is to give the TEVAL in paper form at the beginning of a class. Senator Lehman suggested the possibility of using the online evaluation during class time. What courses could be exempted from evaluation? We felt that some of these questions and suggestions would be best shared with Jana Fallin. 2) POSSIBLE CHANGES TO PRACTICE. These changes may include the administration of paper and online TEVALS. Who should administer them? When should they be administered? How do new teachers get reminded to do them? We had several questions about the intersection between CANVAS and TEVAL. Can the TEVAL be added to the student to-do list? Would there be a way to make the TEVAL required online and still be anonymous? Scott Finkeldei was present and said “yes” to both questions. He continued to fill us in on some changes that will make TEVALS easier to implement as they will be fully integrated into CANVAS. Finkeldei promised to do a demonstration for us at the February 21 meeting. An additional process variable to be discussed is a requirement that student feedback be sent to supervisors or department heads. 3) ISSUES THAT AFFECT POSSIBLE CHANGES TO DEPARTMENT DOCUMENTS: i.e. using TEVALS for promotion and tenure. 4) EDUCATING FACULTY ABOUT STUDENT FEEDBACK: Should this education come from us or from the Office of Teaching and Learning? We mentioned preparing some new questions that could be selected from a drop-down menu. Could this education be a tutorial on CANVAS? Scott says that it is already in the works. 5) EDUCATING STUDENTS ABOUT THE USE OF STUDENT FEEDBACK. Meredith said she would be willing to put something about TEVALS into one of the next issues of a newsletter that is put out by Student Government. What is the purpose of the educational campaign? Senator Charney shared that part of the student education should be in how to differentiate how to report what is happening in the classroom. Inappropriate behavior should be reported somewhere else rather than the TEVAL. He also noted a paper relating a new way to take student feedback. That article is attached. Scott was challenged to produce a video with a message that spans many of these topics. We speculated about how to get students to watch such a video. Senator Harding suggested that we choose one or two small

things from the list regarding student feedback (i.e. improving response rates). He believes that smaller steps might lead to better changes rather than trying to revolutionize the process.

- **University Handbook and Policy Committee:** Co-chairs Lehman and Barden requested a volunteer for this committee. No one stepped up. The committee members were asked to contact the chairs if they decided they were interested.

❖ **New Business**

No new business.

- ❖ Meeting was adjourned.

- **Next Meeting: February 21, 2017 (Business Building 2138) at 3:45.**