CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, EAST BAY
FACULTY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Approved Minutes of the Meeting of May 15, 2013

Present: Jeanette Bicais, Linda Dobb, Kelly Fan, Liz Ginno (chair), Dave Larson, Danika LeDuc (secretary), Vish Hegde, Carlos Solomon, Carl Stempel

Absent: Tony Lima

Guests: Elizabeth Bergman, Jennifer Eagan, Sophie Rollins, Mitch Watnik,

1. Approval of the agenda
   M/S/P (Bicais/Hegde)

2. Approval of the minutes of May 1, 2013
   M/S/P (Larson/Bicais)
   Larson pointed out that Julie Marty-Pearson's name has been misspelled in previous minutes. The Secretary apologizes for her error.

3. Report of the Chair
   ExCom approved the Holidays Calendar to go to Academic Senate. The Senate Office will send out an email about a special election beginning a week from today and ending three weeks from today.
   Dianne Rush Woods is now the University Diversity Officer, she wasn't sure if that means she is not Chief of Staff.

4. Report of the Presidential Appointee
   Nothing to report.

5. New Business:
   a. Election of Sue Schaefer Award recipient
      The candidates and criteria were discussed. A recipient was chosen and will be announced at the next Senate meeting.

6. Old Business:
   a. SET discussion
      i. Latest SET draft policy
      Ginno made a change to the previous draft to have current CBA rather than 12-13 CBA. Under contract (15.1), results of evaluations should be placed in the Personnel Action File. So, all need to go there. Stempel raised a point regarding confusion about the term "responses" in 2.5 – should be "student responses." The change was made here and later. Hegde asked if there were any restrictions on what summary of evaluations can be used for? Ginno pointed out that the restrictions are

in 4.6. He asked if they can be used for the evaluation of the program. As it stands, the aggregated statistical data can be used.

Eagan asked if the statistical analysis will be the same as before? Would electronic student comments go into PAF?

Dobb said that for all online courses, electronic comments were there for online, so they have been put in the PAFs.

There are no explicit guidelines in the campus policy or CBA about how the student comments should be treated. It was recommended that something be put in the policy that what goes into PAFs will be changing.

Debate ensued about whether we ought to keep using a "mean" measurement vs a "median" one. Bergman said that mean is a better measure and more commonly used. Stempel said that it is more precise. Watnik would rather use median because the few bad evaluations bring the average lower than the mean. Bergman said that other universities use average. Eagan raised concerns about consistency, other campuses and past practice, in essence, the need to change thoughtfully. She was concerned about potential grievances. Stempel said that the key is to inform the University that past and future evaluations will not be perfectly comparable and the need to educate people about potential biases with the new evaluation methods and/or forms. Fan said with only 4 choices (1 to 4), the mean is more stable. Bicais said that when she uses SETs for evaluation she looks at mean and the point spread, notes outliers, and uses comments to understand them.

M/S Bicais/ LeDuc motioned to use "mean" in the document.   Hegde and Fan wondered if "average" would be better. LeDuc suggested "shall provide a mean measurement of statistical summaries of student evaluations." Passed unanimously.

Bergman raised some concerns: Documents were placed in her PAF without notification. These were online course evaluations, and included student comments. She only learned this since her RTP committee commented on these evaluations, which she had no opportunity to discuss in her dossier since they arrived after the January submission date. Her other concern was the potential impact of online evaluations. She shared articles with FAC that illustrate some of the issues. The article by Poncheri et al. states that "negative comments exceeded positive comments." Bergman did an experiment in her hybrid class by administering both online and in-person student evaluations for the same class. Participation was lower for the online: 24/30 in person, 12/30 online. Also, the comments were more negative. Of the 21 comments from the in-person evaluation, 16 were positive, and 5 were negative. Of the 16 comments from the online evaluation, 9 were positive, and 7 were negative. The paper by Merritt concluded that students' initial ratings of a professor's personality with less than 5 minutes of contact correlates with end of semester evaluation of teaching. Things like gesturing and speaking

loudly increased scores, and students said they learned more, although student performance was virtually identical. Bicais mentioned that students do retain more with expressive teaching. Bicais also had a question: she had never been notified that anything was put in her PAF. Is this a new policy? Eagan explained that at some point in the past, student evaluations went in the PAF. The procedure was for department chairs to choose which two courses were evaluated for each faculty member, and the results would be sent to the chair from Testing to share with the faculty member. Eagan said that now that all courses are being evaluated and asked if all electronic evaluations are automatically routed to PAF. Ginno responded that it is in policy, as point 4.3.

Ginno said that the SET sub-committee did a lot of research on response rates. The faculty member has to be the one to promote response. The SET sub-committee has talked about providing encouragement language for faculty. Bicais remarked that the idea of online evaluations requires a cultural shift and letting students know that their feedback is going to be used. She suggested starting the course with language such as "feedback last year… modified it" and returning to it throughout the course. This was the number one thing that convinced students to give constructive rather than just negative feedback.

Eagan thought it might be helpful for faculty and others evaluating them to have compiled material on best practices and some of the problems and discrepancies between face-to-face and online SETs. Ginno said Testing will do an analysis this summer. Bicais said that the current draft SET is so different. They wanted to include the I LO's but also concepts from the IDEA center where the professor is asked about his or her learning objectives and hoped for accomplishments and analyze the SETs from that perspective to help professors work on their priorities. Instead, the draft SET form focuses on student learning, which is a move in K-12 education, not just about teaching. Bicais agreed it is a lot of change at the same time.

Bergman said that in the interest of fairness to the faculty, there should be some formal recognition that scores are going to be lower (5 – 20%) when we move online. Hegde brought up that the response rate is lower with online evaluations. Ginno responded that online evaluations can also be done on phone while in class and that there are other methods to increase response rate. Stempel said that it doesn't feel as if it is inevitable we are going to go online since there is a pilot period and it must be approved by Senate. This is true, but administering paper evaluations for every course is not sustainable.

Bergman said that Merritt suggests doing focus groups, in a sampling kind of sense, and even administering online evaluations is not free. There remains the question of validity and reliability. Eagan said that we are bound by the contract. The Philosophy department volunteered to be a pilot department because they had no junior faculty and could save staff

time. Stempel said that there is nothing in the current policy about departments adding their own questions. LeDuc suggested that maybe some of the language from the old policy about department questions can be used. Ginno will talk to Eileen Barrett about why this language was not included and edit as needed to bring back to the committee

    b. Appointment and Review document
       i. Appointment and Review document with waiver and MPP edits

          Edits included remove references to department chairs and add request for waiver.
      ii. Draft waiver form

          Fixed mispelling of "administrative." Since we now have Dianne Rush Woods as Chief Diversity Officer, does she (or this position) have a role on this Waiver. Watnik replied that it is up to the President. UARC already does certain named positions – only MPPs reviewed by UARC. Watnik said that the appointment document appendix lists a lot more people. He suggests the document cover this broader swath. Motion to move forward (LeDuc/Stempel) – passed unanimously.
    c. Final Department Chairs Review Policy

        M/S/P (Bicais/Larson) – move to Senate.

Larson thanked Ginno for her leadership. This was agreed to by all. Ginno thanked the members in return for all of their work on the committee.

7. Adjournment.
        (Stempel)