

## **FACULTY CAUCUS MINUTES**

**Tuesday, January 23, 2018**

**2:30PM**

**IT 225**

**Present:** J. Baumann, E. Brindisi, L. Charbonneau, S. Crocker, S. Dar, A. Doughtie, A. Fried, A. Haines-Stephan, A. Hazen, R. Huyck, M. Kelly, G. Melendez, C. Miller, A. Radlowski, R. Santos, B. Scantlebury, and B. Shaw

### **CALL TO ORDER**

The Caucus was called to order at 2:31 p.m.

### **APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

The minutes from the December 12<sup>th</sup> meeting were unanimously approved with some changes.

### **CHAIR REMARKS**

#### *CHAIR ACTIVITIES UPDATE*

- C. Miller will send an email reminder about the Faculty Caucus Presenter form.
- C. Miller attended a recent Faculty Tech Council meeting. Scheduling software and a single sign-on portal are in the current 3-year plan. C. Miller will share the full plan when it is finalized.

### **STUDENT EVALUATIONS AND TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS :: SHAHIDA DAR**

S. Dar presented on research conducted by Dr. Phillip Stark regarding student evaluations. Some of the concerns include:

- gender discrimination in student evaluations (see also: <https://tinyurl.com/profGender>)
- they measure opinion, not teaching effectiveness
- they are conducted at the end of the semester, when it's too late to change/improve; consider administering the evaluations mid-semester
- research suggests they are strongly correlated with student grade expectations; enjoyment; gender; ethnicity; and age

A discussion followed about evaluations at MVCC. Some expressed that the comments students leave are not always about teaching, and sometimes inappropriate. Others stated that they do not find the questions and the use of the Likert scale on the evaluations to be valuable, and have created their own surveys with more directed, open-ended questions tailored to their classes. Some institutions conduct evaluations online, which is positive not only from a sustainability aspect, but also might allow faculty to view responses sooner, especially if a move is made to a mid-semester evaluation. However, return rates for online surveys tend to be significantly worse than paper surveys.

There was also some question regarding whether Associate Deans view student evaluations, and whether they should be included in promotion packets. Who sees student evaluations, and what is being done with them?

Should the College consider revising the surveys by changing the questions, and perhaps making them online and/or optional? If the surveys are revised, WISE and IEC should be involved. C. Miller will discuss with M. Eannace and report back.

### **ADVISEE SCHEDULE CHANGES**

A concern has been raised about whether a faculty advisor should contact advisees whose schedules are changed prior to the start of the semester. For example, if a student is deregistered, how do they know? Do they receive an email? What does it say? Should their advisor and completion coach be CC'd to the email? Are there FERPA regulations to bar this? How will this impact advisors with hundreds of advisees?

### **OPEN FORUM**

The calendar and snow day situation were discussed. Some concerns include:

- There are only 2 exam days instead of 3
- Why start on a Tuesday in the Spring?
- Could we have a snow day in the Fall as well as the Spring?
- Overall, there is general dissatisfaction at the Snow Day solution. In particular:
  - What if there are two Snow Days, both on a Monday?
  - It's not really a solution if labs are missed
  - Students may resent teachers who choose to hold class on the last day when others choose not to have class
- Students report feeling more crunched in their schedule
- Are the effects of the schedule change being studied? If so, by whom? Do the benefits outweigh the downsides?

### **ADJOURNMENT**

The Faculty Caucus adjourned at 3:42 p.m.

### **NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting is at 2:30 in PH300 on Tuesday, February 20<sup>th</sup>.

Respectfully submitted,  
Anna Radlowski