

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

Faculty Evaluation Committee

Faculty Senate

10-12-2015

Faculty Evaluation Committee Minutes, October 12, 2015

Utah State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/fs_faceval

Recommended Citation

Utah State University, "Faculty Evaluation Committee Minutes, October 12, 2015" (2015). *Faculty Evaluation Committee*. Paper 28.

https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/fs_faceval/28

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at DigitalCommons@USU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Evaluation Committee by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@USU. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@usu.edu.



**Minutes from Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) Meeting
12 October 2015, 12:30-1:30pm (DE 012)**

Present:

Clay Isom (Agriculture and Applied Sciences)
Nathan Washburn (Business)
Raymond Veon (Caine College of the Arts)
Cacilda Rego (Humanities and Social Science)
Kit Mohr (Education & Human Services)
Curtis Dyreson (Engineering)
Mary Conner (Natural Resources)
Tom Lachmar (Science, Chair)
Dory Cochran (Libraries)
Elias Perez (USU Eastern)
Thomas Buttars (USU/SA Executive Vice President)
Ty Aller (USU/SA Graduate Studies Senator)
Joan Kleinke (ex officio)

Absent:

Jeff Banks (Extension)
Scott Allred (Regional Campuses)
Ashley Waddoups (USU/SA Student Advocate)

Activities:

- 1) Approved September 2015 minutes
- 2) Discussed the results of the IDEA survey circulated among teaching faculty and department heads, as well as offered various opinions concerning shortcomings and benefits of the IDEA evaluation instrument and possible recommendations for improving its use. The committee came up with the following list of issues and recommendations:
 - a. The IDEA student evaluations gauge student perceptions, yet they are used by department heads as a measure of evaluating teaching effectiveness. Perhaps a policy limiting the importance of the IDEA evaluations to a relatively low percentage of measuring the effectiveness of an individual faculty member's teaching would at least be a partial solution to this potential problem.
 - b. Two common complaints among the respondents to the survey are that some faculty have difficulty in obtaining a sufficiently large proportion of students in a particular course to make the results statistically meaningful, and that the evaluations are "self-selecting/sorting" in that students who are dissatisfied with the instructor or course are more likely to respond. Also, students have complained about receiving excessive e-mail messages about completing their evaluations. Perhaps a solution to this problem is conducting the evaluations only in class, either electronically when possible or using "hard" (paper) forms. This would also allow instructors to schedule the evaluations at a time late in the semester, preventing students from completing their evaluations when they might be upset over some aspect of a particular course.
 - c. Because there are only two truly peer institutions currently using the IDEA instrument, perhaps the questions could be customized and the comparison with peer institutions could be eliminated.

