

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

---

Faculty Evaluation Committee

Faculty Senate

---

12-12-2012

## Faculty Evaluation Committee Minutes, December 12, 2012

Utah State University

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/fs\\_faceval](https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/fs_faceval)

---

### Recommended Citation

Utah State University, "Faculty Evaluation Committee Minutes, December 12, 2012" (2012). *Faculty Evaluation Committee*. Paper 45.

[https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/fs\\_faceval/45](https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/fs_faceval/45)

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](mailto:digitalcommons@usu.edu).



Minutes from Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC)  
12Dec12, 10:30-11:45 a.m. NR 204  
(fourth meeting for Fall 2012)

Present:

Alan Stephens (Business)  
Arthur Caplan (Agriculture)  
Michael Lyons (CHaSS)  
Joan Kleinke (AAA ex officio)  
Karen Mock (Chairperson, Natural Resources)  
Oenardi Lawanto (Engineering)  
Yanghee Kim (Education & Human Services)  
Jordan Hunt (ASUSU Academic Senate President)  
Zack Portman (ASUSU Graduate Studies Senator)  
Jeffrey Banks (Extension, Nephi)  
Anne Mackiewicz (USU Eastern)

Absent:

Kacy Lundstrom (Libraries)  
Thomas Lachmar (Science)  
Thomas Rohrer (Arts)  
Christian Orr (ASUSU Student Advocate)  
Karen Woolstenhulme (Business)

- 1) Approved minutes from November 14, 2012 FEC meeting
- 2) Finalized meeting times for Spring 2013 (third Wednesdays, NR204):
  - January 16: 9:30-10:30
  - February 20: 9:30-10:30
  - March 20: 9:30-10:30
  - April 17: 9:30-10:30
- 3) Discussed progress on focal areas:
  - Focal Area #1: IDEA survey: Working with Michael Torrens on data mining/synthesis potential with IDEA results
    - a. Discussed meeting with Michael Torrens (KM,JH,AM) on Dec. 7<sup>th</sup>
    - b. Decided to request a “benchmarking” report from IDEA through Michael Torrens. FEC members will review the list of IDEA institutions and identify the institutions that seem to be most similar to USU (e.g. land grant institutions). FEC members will send ranked lists of these institutions to KM, who will compile these and make the request to Michael Torrens.
    - c. Reviewed and refined exploratory questions to be addressed with IDEA database:
      - i. Both Raw and Adjusted scores for USU are higher, on average, than the IDEA database (the most recent data – fall 2012 - will be available in January)
      - ii. Response rates by Department and Logan vs. RCDE vs. USUE are available (the most recent data – fall 2012- will be available in January)
      - iii. How do scores vary by faculty demographics and rank, course enrollment size, course level, and class size?
      - iv. Do live courses score better/worse than broadcast courses? Hybrids?
      - v. Do Gen Ed courses score better/worse than other courses?
      - vi. Do courses vary by which learning objectives are chosen?
      - vii. What is the distribution of the number of learning objectives chosen?

- viii. What is the distribution of the specific learning objectives chosen? How does this vary by College/Discipline?
  - ix. How do evaluation scores vary with the average grade in the course?
  - x. How do evaluation scores vary with response rates?
- d. Decided to query faculty within our colleges to identify additional interesting questions/correlates to explore, with the goal of producing a brief report to the Faculty Senate by the end of Spring 2013.

Focal Area #2: Teaching portfolios: KM discussed meeting with Janis Boettinger (Provost's Office), who suggested that exemplar teaching portfolios and resources (e.g. KL list of resources) be included in a Canvas course for faculty (currently under development), so that it would be password protected and could be dynamic. KM and KL will continue to work with Janis on this and will report back to the FEC on this in January.

Focal Area #3: Peer teaching evaluations: AC presented a sample letter resulting from a peer teaching evaluation, and the elements and format were discussed. ML suggested a shorter format or executive summary that might be more useful to administrators. A suggestion was made to include information on and examples of peer evaluations in the Canvas course (see Focal Area #2).

Focal Area #4: Role statements/role assignments: We acknowledged that the Faculty Senate and possibly the BFW Committee might be taking up this issue soon, and we decided to wait to take action on this until our January meeting.