

**COMMITTEE ON TEACHING  
MINUTES  
October 20, 2015**

**Present:** Judith Scott (chair), Phil Hammack, Matthew McCarthy, Dannie Scheie, Marc Matera, Jim Phillips (Director of Learning Technologies), Mark Baker (NSTF) Christopher Kan (Grad Student Representative), Mecaila Smith (Chancellor's Graduate Intern), Leanna Parsons (CUIP Intern)

**Announcements**

Chair Judy Scott announced she will be meeting with VP Student Success Jaye Padgett and the Director of the Institute for Science and Engineering Educators Lisa Hunter. She also reported on the WASC (Western Association of Schools and Colleges) campus visit which is part of the accreditation process. The WASC team was very positive about the proposal for the Center for Innovations in Teaching and Learning (CITL). There was a sense that because of this very positive reaction, it will be difficult for the administration to back away from establishing a center of some kind. COT agreed it would give an oral report at the November 13 meeting to update the Senate on the CITL proposal.

Director Jim Phillips raised the issue of the Course Hero, a website that posts course content. A faculty discovered there is a process to get the site to take materials down. The VPDUE and the VPAA will send a reminder to students not to sell anything that is not their own intellectual property. COT noted that there are many such sites that post course materials and asked if there was a central campus resource for contacting companies when faculty find their materials on-line. Jim noted that this is not possible, since the owner of the intellectual property has to contact the company to request removal of the material. In this case, the university cannot act on behalf of the faculty.

This led COT to consider sending a message to all faculty to make them aware of this issue. By googling themselves, they can find if their course materials or exams are posted. Also, COT may want to suggest using common disclaimer language for their syllabi or course material to let students know they should not post/sell notes or materials to these types of services. There is a policy on the IT site that tells faculty what to do. Jim will send a draft, with the link to the policy and all the language that should be on everyone's syllabus.

**CUIP Intern Project**

CUIP Intern Leanna Parsons project is to create a comprehensive resource for instructors on campus climate, giving trigger warnings, creating an inclusive environment, micro aggressions, etc. She requested input from COT on what would be useful to have on the website. COT recommended looking at resources that might be available at the ethnic resource centers. The committee was clear that there needs to be a very balanced approach to presenting the material since there is a range of experiences for faculty depending on the discipline in which they teach.

### **Center for Innovations in Teaching**

Due to lack of time, COT agreed to move this agenda item to the next meeting.

### **Course Evaluations – Pre consultation**

VPAA Lee has requested Senate participation in establishing a campus policy and process to improve feedback through student course evaluations. Current practice allows each department to choose how to implement the course evaluations. VPAA Lee has proposed that COT act as the Senate committee which oversees course evaluation policies.

COT reviewed the proposal from the VPAA, the current policy on course evaluations and CAP's' response to the proposal. COT agreed that the current situations with course evaluations has a lot of issues; problems with inappropriate content, students who do not complete the course can submit evals, incentives are offered by some faculty, timing of the open period for students, lack of standardization, unreliability of the current system, variability of which responses are used in the personnel process, and lack of connectivity to other systems (like AIS).

### **Consultation with VPAA Herbie Lee**

VPAA Lee explained there is a lack of clarity about who has purview over the policies for evaluations, so he wanted to start an explicit conversation about it to hopefully reach a campus agreement going forward. Since the current vendor is problematic and we will be replacing the system, this is an opportunity to change how we do things. Historically, there has been a lot left to the discretion of the departments, even though there is no policy that give them authority. When evaluations converted from paper to on-line, there was a sense that we wanted to keep the integrity of the process, using the same questions.

COT acknowledged that the evaluations need to be useful for the departments, but there could be some standardization for other users, like those involved in the academic personnel process. The committee sees the problems with evals as crossing both policy issues and issues of implementation. There needs to be particular care taken in creating the system requirements for the selecting the new system, and these requirements intersect with policy. VPAA Lee is developing an Implementation Steering Committee for on-line evals, so that smaller issues can be vetted through them. But for large policy issues, and creating guidelines for the departments, his preference is to work with COT.