

TLA Committee Meeting  
February 18, 2015, 2pm-3pm  
Hetzel-Hoellein Special Collections

Present: Colleen Packer, Rachel Cox, Pam Payne, Toni Asay, Jeremy Suiter, Boomer Kelly, Chelsea Bybee, RC Callahan, Vincent Bates, Art Carpenter, Shelly Belflower, Chloe Cai, Travis Price, Hugo Valle, Tim Border

- 1) Welcome by Colleen Packer.
- 2) Approval of Minutes from January 28, 2015 meeting.
  - a. Motion to approve-Pam Payne
  - b. Motion Seconded-Jeremy Suiter
  - c. Motion passed to approve minutes.
- 3) Old Business
  - a. GIFTS Update
    - i. There has been good attendance at the sessions this semester.
    - ii. Next week there will be no GIFTS session because of Inclusiveness Pedagogy conference.
    - iii. Rachel will remind faculty via email that sessions will be recorded and put on the website for future viewing.
  - b. Book Groups Update
    - i. There were 17 titles offered to faculty and staff this semester.
    - ii. 187 people signed up for book groups.
  - c. Red Rock Teaching Retreat Feb. 26-28
    - i. There are still two openings for participants. Any committee members who wish to attend should contact Colleen or Rachel.
  - d. Inclusiveness Pedagogy Conference Feb. 24, 1:30pm-4:00pm in the Shepherd Union Building
- 4) New Business
  - a. Needs Assessment Survey
    - i. Preliminary copy of survey to find out about professional development opportunities across campus.
    - ii. Finding out about awareness of TLF and TLA
      1. What faculty would like to learn through TLF
    - iii. Is there anything we need to know that can be added to the survey?
      1. What are the major obstacles to workshop/event attendance?
      2. What professional development opportunities would you want to be involved in?
    - iv. Sub-committee working on the survey will give feedback to Colleen by Monday, February 23.

b. Course Evaluation discussion

- i. Question 1: Are there any concerns with establishing the 'default date' period to two weeks prior to the last day of class through the last day of finals?
  1. No concerns because of the option to make your dates. Possibly consider leaving it open past finals dates.
  2. Consider making evaluations mandatory before they can submit final assignments.
  3. Need for constructive feedback, but concern about how it looks for tenure review. Possibly instructors could administer their own evaluations for the truly constructive feedback.
- ii. Question 2: Recent feature of Chi Tester evaluation is that students can retake and resubmit an evaluation multiple times.
  1. Should this only be for special exceptions or circumstances rather having it available to all students?
  2. Really a non-issue.
- iii. Question 3: Evaluations are currently available to any student who has registered for a class whether or not they completed the course.
  1. Is it logistically possible to filter who within a class can take the evaluation?
  2. Possibility of utilizing an opening question on the evaluation: Did you complete this course? Why or why not? For those who didn't complete the course, they could be blocked from continuing the evaluation.
  3. As it stands now, individual departments develop the questions for the evaluations within their department. Should the university be allowed to have universal questions on all course evaluations?
  4. Strong consensus of the committee did not want students who hadn't attended a class to be able to submit an evaluation of that class.
- iv. Question 4: A "Tenure Privilege" feature has been developed in Chi that allows tenured faculty the ability to control access (by their chair or dean) to two course evaluations each year either by having only two courses evaluated, or by selecting which two evaluated courses to share with the chair or dean.
  1. Would post tenure review make this a moot point?
  2. Perhaps evaluations should be made public (as at other universities), and take away the anonymous nature of them.
- v. Question 5: Any other areas of concern?
  1. Some evaluation questions need more clarification (for instance, what is considered average?)
  2. Professors and departments need to use evaluations correctly for the purpose of improving teaching.
  3. What do we really want to know?
    - a. Was this faculty member effective? Why or why not?

- b. Is a faculty member competent in subject matter?
- c. We need concrete information about time spent in class.
  - i. Does the faculty member attend class?
  - ii. What amount of time is spent lecturing? Discussing? Group Work, etc.?
  - iii. Were teaching methods effective? Why or why not?
  - iv. How is learning assessed? Were students surprised by the assessment methods?
- 4. What information do tenure and review committees need to make their decisions?

(\*Note: Items 4) b.v.3 – 4) b.v.4 were shared following the meeting)

- c. Mission/vision statement sub-committee met last week. Thoughts on proposed mission statements.
  - i. Discussion of blending #1 and #3 (see agenda)
    - 1. i.e. The Teaching and Learning Forum promotes and provides faculty development and fosters a community of conversation about the art and science of excellent teaching and engaged learning.
  - ii. The combined mission statement will be sent back to sub-committee for tweaking.
- 5) Announcement: Reminder about Red Rock Retreat next Thursday. Be sure to inform Colleen or Rachel if you would like to attend.
- 6) Next Meeting: March 25, 2pm
- 7) Meeting adjourned at 3pm.