

Faculty Senate Minutes
For: 3/7/2023

Members Present: Beverly Alwell, Carol Corbat (Vice President), Rusty Gaspard, Julie Gill (President), Purujit Gurjar, Jennifer Innerarity (Parliamentarian), Guo Yi Ke, Sona Kumar, David Shanks (alternate for Missy Laborde), Matthew Stokes (Secretary), Cynthia Thomas

Members Absent: Hal Langford, Kerry Ordes, Debbie Wood

Guests Present: Richard Elder

Call to Order: At 3:01 pm a quorum was established and the meeting was called to order.

Minutes: 1.31.23

J. Gill announced that the minutes were voted on electronically and passed with a vote of 10-0-0.

President's Report:

J. Gill stated she met with Dr. Coreil last Thursday. She asked about the status of promotion and tenure. The university committee should have met in December. J. Gill stated that her concern was since we recently had a change in administration, where are we in that process? Dr. Coreil provided the following timeline:

All campus materials will be delivered to Dr. Tate by March 15th. Decisions are anticipated in April and delivery of letters will proceed after administration receives the final decision.

J. Gill also stated that she requested permission to work with Dr. Bain regarding "P" grades, as previously discussed. Dr. Coreil gave his consent.

Next, J. Gill announced that she met with Dr. Beard on Friday afternoon to discuss current Senate business. It was a positive meeting. Dr. Beard asked that Senate look at PS 206, the policy on attendance, and move it forward to A&S. Dr. Beard requested faculty input. C. Corbat stated that she had forwarded A&S comments on this policy to Dr. Rowan two years ago; however, nothing happened with it. J. Gill then asked C. Corbat to send the suggested edits to Dr. Beard.

Committee Reports:

C&C 2.6.23

B. Alwell moved to receive the minutes

C. Thomas seconded the motion

Vote: 9-0-0

C. Corbat mentioned there are several action items. First under consideration are two new Accounting courses—an addition of ACCT 4250 and 4350, Fraud and Forensic Accounting I and II.

B. Alwell explained that these two courses were brought about because of an industry need in forensic accounting. Hopefully, they will be rolled out in spring next year as part of a concentration in Fraud. A new ethics course has also been developed. Students are coming from AZ and FL, etc. Some states have different requirements for specific courses. B. Alwell stated that several years ago, a suite of courses was created to accommodate transfer students who have State Boards that require specific courses. These two courses are the next ones that have come up as a request to be offered due to State Board requirements.

C. Corbat made a motion approve the two new courses in Accounting

C. Thomas seconded the motion.

Vote: 9-0-0

C. Corbat stated that the next course for consideration was a modification to the Bachelor of Science in Accounting. The modification is to include a new concentration in Fraud and Forensic Accounting.

M. Stokes made a motion to approve the modification to include the new concentration in Fraud and Forensic Accounting

P. Gurjar seconded the motion

Vote: 9-0-0

Next, C. Corbat stated that a new Nursing course is under consideration—NURS 4052, Leadership and Management Scholarly Project, an addition to the RN-BSN degree. The new course will replace two current courses, NURS 4050 and 4051. C&C voted to approve this course then deleted the two old courses.

B. Alwell made a motion to accept the addition of NURS 4052 to the RN-BSN degree

C. Thomas seconded the motion

Vote: 9-0-0

Next, C. Corbat indicated we need to address the deletion of the two courses NURS 4052 replaces, NURS 4050 and 4051.

C. Corbat made a motion to delete NURS 4050 and 4051

J. Gill seconded the motion

Vote: 9-0-0

Next, C. Corbat stated there is a proposed modification to the Bachelor of Science in Nursing in the RN-BSN Program. The modification is putting in NURS 4052 and deleting NURS 4051 and 4052.

C. Corbat moved to approve the modification to the BS in Nursing

B. Alwell seconded the motion

Vote: 9-0-0

Finally, C. Corbat said we need to address a modification to the BGS Humanities, a Humanities Concentration in the Bachelor of General Studies degree. This concentration was approved by ICC. The modification broadens the foreign language requirement beyond French and Spanish. Also, the order in which the concentrations appear in the catalog will change to an alphabetical listing. Finally, the modification would add Africana Studies as an enrichment block.

Discussion ensued. It was noted that some students were transferring in with a language that was not offered at LSUA, so this modification would accommodate those students.

It was pointed out that the C&C minutes do not accurately reflect the changes to be made. There is some disparity between the concentration and enrichment block. Essentially, the choice of courses in the Humanities enrichment block was expanded. However, the C&C minutes reflect that an enrichment block is being added, but that is not what happened. Africana Studies was added to the Humanities Enrichment Block.

C. Corbat stated that we have two items on which to vote: One is for the BGS degree and one is for the Humanities Concentration.

J. Innerarity entered the meeting.

C. Corbat observed that it seems like all that was actually done was add to put the disciplines in alphabetical order and add Interpretation (sign language). Essentially, it is easy to see what the department intended but the C&C minutes do not reflect it.

GuoYi Ke entered the meeting

J. Gill made a motion to send the materials back to C&C so their minutes properly reflect the changes that were requested by the department who sent the materials forward.

S. Kumar seconded the motion

Vote: 11-0-0

Improvement of Instruction 1.27.23

B. Alwell motioned to receive the minutes

C. Thomas seconded the motion

Vote: 11-0-0

J. Gill stated that she sent an e-mail to M. Stokes earlier in the week which may be of interest to the IOI committee. Essentially, a faculty member was taking some classes in Shreveport and had to take a survey that she really liked. The faculty member shared it with J. Gill who is now passing it on.

Old Business:

ICC—Senate Ad-hoc committee

C. Corbat stated that J. Gill had asked the senators to send her ideas for what should be in the charges for the committee. C. Corbat had sent the following suggestion: “The Interdisciplinary Curriculum Committee serves as a surrogate academic department in situations where courses or curricula (degrees, certificates, etc.) cannot be assigned to a single department but require interdisciplinary input. Responsibilities of the ICC are limited to development, modification, and deletion of courses and curricula and assessment of student learning outcomes for those interdisciplinary curricula. Within its area of responsibility, there are no differences in ICC and departmental actions. Faculty must vote on course and curricular matters and all ICC actions regarding courses and curricula must be submitted to the Courses and Curriculum Committee and Faculty Senate for approval.

Chancellor’s Funds – update

J. Gill stated that she sent out an email on Friday. Nearly all of the funds have been given out. J. Gill then stated that she sent an email to Dr. Coreil to update him on the status of the funds.

Next, J. Gill announced that P. Gurjar and R. Gaspard have agreed to take the lead to put together criteria regarding these funds so when we start in August, we can move forward.

M. Stokes noted Dr. Coreil looked forward to seeing reports on how the funds are used.

Advising Concerns – Report

J. Gill will make appointment with Dr. Abbey Bain regarding the “P” grades.

Update RE Revision of Policy Statements

PS 202 (A&B)

J. Gill announced that the committee is meeting weekly and should have a document by April.

Administrative Committees List

J. Gill announced that there is no update.

CurricuLog Update

J. Gill stated that there is a meeting tomorrow with Carol Corbat, Deron Thaxton, and Julie Gill.

Bookstore

J. Gill stated that Kristen Meche-Miller, Director of Auxiliary Services, had recently sent out an email. In the email, it was noted that the previous manager acknowledged he was not reaching out or responding to phone calls. Faculty were directed to send all concerns forward to Mrs. Meche-Miller. J. Gill explained that Mrs. Meche-Miller has been in conversations with the Barnes & Noble company; they have indicated that someone will be in the store day-to-day to run it.

New Business:

PS 206 – update with policy revision

Student Class Attendance Policy

C. Corbat stated that there is nothing inherently wrong with warning students that they might be dropped. The policy was written back when we would contact students via physical mail. The policy needs to be edited to reflect electronic correspondence. It was noted that the first semester after COVID and after Hurricane Laura, some students just never showed back up. C. Corbat had to call Sheila Hudson in the Registrar's Office to create a form notifying students they were being dropped for non-attendance because the only form that existed was the paper copy that had to be mailed via snail mail.

C. Corbat next noted that Admissions and Standards (A&S) reviewed this policy about three years ago. They were not pleased to learn that their recommended actions had gone ignored all this time. They had considered what would be deemed as allowable absences. For instance, they wanted to say that students could not be penalized because of travel absences for athletics. C. Corbat had sent this language to Dr. Rowan and recommended that we incorporate it into the policy. Another example of absences where students should not incur penalties was field trips. C. Corbat stated that she pointed Dr. Rowan to a list from LSU that noted acceptable reasons to allow absences. Finally, C. Corbat stated she sent all this information to Dr. Beard last week.

J. Gill asked if Senate wanted to forward this information to the current A&S committee to show them what was suggested three years ago.

It was stated that Academic Affairs should first edit the document and include updated language to reflect electronic correspondence. A&S should not have to write that language.

J. Gill announced that she will respond back to Dr. Beard and note that C. Corbat forwarded the information regarding the policy. Conversation would reflect that A&S revisions were included and that Senate would forward the completed document after the rewrite.

S. Kumar said that when her student goes to Self-Service.as of now, the student cannot see the cost of courses until after registering. Students used to be able to see the cost prior to purchase. This current setup discourages students from registering to courses.

It was suggested that Jason Normand in IET should be consulted on this matter.

R. Elder recommended this issue be taken to Student Government because faculty cannot see what students see.

M. LaBorde entered the meeting.

C. Thomas stated that this morning, her students were complaining about the schedule and start dates. For instance, next week is spring break but it is also when some online classes start. She encouraged them to talk to Student Government.

J. Gill stated that the 2023/24 calendar will allow everyone to have fall break and spring break. She mentioned that we have not seen a 2024/25 academic calendar when she met with Dr. Beard and also expressed concern that the summer 2023 drop dates may not be accurate. J. Gill mentioned that Dr. Beard added this issue to her list.

M. LaBorde stated that she was not aware that midterm grades were not required. They are only required for dual enrollment students. P. Gurjar brought up that failing to enter midterm grades may still adversely affect raises.

B. Alwell brought up advising students who are applying to graduate. She asked, how can some students apply for graduation when they are admitted after the deadline? In other words, they can feasibly take the courses they need to graduate, but they have missed the deadline. She noted that when one is dealing with 120 students to advise in six weeks, it is hard to meet that deadline.

J. Gill stated that late requests were made to Dr. Rowan in the past and were approved for justifiable reasons.

C. Corbat then mentioned a frustration in that when a student applies for graduation, the version of the degree audit in Degree Navigator that is sent forward is the matriculated version—not the one where the courses have been moved around. It defaults to the date of the degree requirements when the student enrolled (matriculated) for first time even if there have been changes in degree requirements since, and the student is following a newer curriculum. Neither the student nor the advisor is able to send a newer version through for application for graduation. C. Corbat stated that she was told by the Registrar's office that the student has to file a form to change their degree of record; however, at least one faculty member has stated that Andrew Hirschack has changed them when asked by the faculty member.

S. Kumar brought up summer advising, wondering what are the chances faculty could be paid? J. Gill stated that the issue has been addressed with SLT, but she can bring it up again; also, J. Gill recommended going through the Department Chair and even the Dean. S. Kumar wondered if being required to do summer advising is standard university-wide. Several in the meeting

responded that at one time, a faculty member for each department was paid to advise in the summer. C. Corbat noted that Department Chairs used to handle summer advising when they were here 8-4:30, but now that has changed.

C. Corbat stated that faculty originally got paid in the summer at a different rate than the current rate. For example, if a faculty member taught full-time in the summer, he or she received the two-month full time pay. It was suggested that it would not be completely out of line to ask that we go back to that pay scale where it was prorated based on our salaries and depending on how much one was teaching in the summer. The only issue is that if a faculty member is teaching in the summer, he or she would have to advise.

J. Gill pulled up PS 209 regarding faculty pay for summer and advising responsibilities and discussion ensued.

A question was raised about new hires. Someone asked, if faculty should have a departmental vote. C. Corbat clarified that if it is a tenure track or otherwise permanent position, under PS 202, faculty should have a departmental vote.

Announcements:

Next meeting: March 21st, 2023

Pats on back: C. Corbat gives one to Dr. Christof Stumpf for his role in the Louisiana Academy of Sciences meeting. Two LSUA students presented.

Adjournment:

M. LaBorde motioned to adjourn

Jennifer I. seconded the motion

Vote: 11-0-0

Meeting adjourned at 4:30 pm

Faculty Senate Agenda
March 7, 2023 at 3:00 p.m.
Live Oaks Room

- I. Welcome and Determination of quorum
- II. Approval of minutes
 - 1.31.23 – approved by vote of: For: 10, Against 0, Abstain 0
- III. Report of President
- IV. Reports of Committees
 - 1. C&C 2.6.23
 - 2. Improvement of Instruction 1.27.23
- V. Old business
 - ICC – Senate Ad-hoc committee
 - Chancellor’s Funds - update
 - Advising Concerns - Report
 - Update RE Revision of Policy Statements
 - PS 202 (A& B)
 - Administrative Committees List
 - CurricuLog Update
 - Bookstore
- VI. Introduction of new business
 - PS 206 – update with policy revision
- VII. Announcements/Looking ahead
 - Next meeting: March 21, 2023 at 3 p.m.
 - Please send *Pats on the Back* to Julie and/or share at Senate Meetings
 - Departmental accomplishments
- VIII. Adjournment

**Courses & Curriculum Committee
Minutes
February 6, 2023**

Present: Alice Blackwell, Sandra Purifoy, Laurie Pittman, Richard Elder, Beverly Alwell (proxy for Bob Jones), Cole Franklin, Conley Hathorn, Jennifer Dupont, Andrew Pham, John Allen

Absent: Michael Waller and Beth Whittington

Guests: Kent Lachney, Catherine Doyle, Holly Wilson

After a quorum was established, the meeting began at 12:01 pm.

The first order of business was to approve the minutes from the January 23, 2023 meeting. Laurie Pittman made a motion to approve the minutes with Jennifer Dupont seconding the motion. The motion passed with 10 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstaining. Three members were not present for this vote.

A corrigendum from the November 8, 2022 minutes was presented. The DSEM 3701 course should have been titled POLI 3701. Similarly, BIOL 4504 should have been BIOL 4540. Conley Hathorn made a motion to approve the corrigendum changes with Cole Franklin seconding the motion. The motion passed with 10 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstaining. Three members were not present.

Next the corrigendum from the November 22, 2022 minutes were discussed. The committee's prior minutes misidentified the BGS with a concentration in Cybersecurity as degree in Cybersecurity. We have issued a corrigendum to reflect the correct title: BGS with a concentration in Cybersecurity. Richard Elder made a motion to approve the corrigendum with a second by John Allen. The motion passed unanimously with 10 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstaining. Three members were not present.

The first course on the agenda reviewed was ACCT 4250, *Fraud and Forensic Accounting I*. The new 3-hour credit course was approved by the department. The CIP code was listed along with approval signatures from the department chair and dean. The course would be required in the newly proposed concentration in Fraud and Forensic Accounting in the BS Accounting degree, according to Dr. Kent Lachney. No discussion ensued as the CSS was reviewed. Dr. Blackwell noted in the RSS that adjunct faculty would be hired to teach the course in conjunction with regular faculty. She also reminded the Committee that the Program and Course Descriptions included in the proposed MCO were there to meet accreditation requirements. Furthermore, the course description was in alignment with the course objectives. Dr. Chris Stacey entered the meeting at this time. With no further discussion Dr. Richard Elder made a motion to approve the addition of ACCT 4250. Dr. Conley Hathorn seconded the motion. The motion passed with 11 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstaining. Two members were not present to vote.

The next course considered was ACCT 4350, *Fraud and Forensic Accounting II*. The CSS and RIS were reviewed. It was noted that the prerequisite, ACCT 4250, was the previously approved course in this meeting. Dr. Lachney reiterated the College of Business requirement of including the Program Objectives in addition to the Course Objectives. After no further discussion Dr. Elder made a motion to approve the new course, ACCT 4350, with Dr. Hathorn seconding the motion. The motion passed with 11 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstaining. Two members were not present to vote.

Next the modification of the BS in Accounting to include the new concentration, Fraud and Forensic Accounting, was discussed. Dr. Lachney explained the national need in the workplace for this concentration. Government agencies, law firms, and other accounting agencies would be benefited from this addition when conducting audits. The 18-credit hour minor will be possible with the addition of ACCT 4250 and ACT 4350. All other remaining required courses are already being offered. Dr. Elder made a

motion to approve the modification to the BS Accounting to include the Fraud and Forensic Accounting concentration. Dr. Chris Stacey seconded the motion. The motion passed with 11 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstaining. Two members were not present to vote.

Dr. Catherine Doyle explained the addition of NURS 4052, *Leadership and Management Scholarly Project*, to the RN-BSN degree. The proposed 5-credit hour course would be a combination of two current courses. This would be a required course. The two courses currently being taught would be deleted and replaced with NURS 4052. Currently NURS 4050 involves writing a paper, and NURS 4051 involves the development of a quality improvement project supported by the assignments in NURS 4050. In addition, the new course, NURS 4052, modifies the language of the course descriptions to support the terminology as defined by the nursing accrediting body and the student actions in the course. For example, the lab hours for this course are no longer defined as practicum hours; they are now defined as project hours. This course is a capstone project supporting professionalism for students earning their RN-BSN. The proposed course has been endorsed by an advisory committee along with receiving department approval. The new course objectives align with standards and terminology articulated by the nursing accrediting body and QSEN, as indicated in the MCO.

With no further discussion, Dr. Richard Elder made a motion to approve the course, NURS 4052. Dr. John Allen seconded the motion. The motion was approved with 11 in favor, 0 opposing, and 0 abstaining. Two members were not present.

With the approval of NURS 4052, Ms. Laurie Pittman made a motion to delete NURS 4050, *Leadership and Management*. John Allen seconded the motion. The motion passed with 11 in favor, 0 opposing, and 0 abstaining. Two members were not present for this vote.

A deletion of NURS 4051, *Leadership and Management Practice-based Experience*, was discussed. Because NURS 4052 was approved, Dr. Conley Hathorn made a motion to approve deleting NURS 4051 with Dr. Cole Franklin seconding the motion. The motion carried with 11 in favor, 0 opposing, and 0 abstaining. Two members were not present for the vote.

Dr. Blackwell introduced the Modification of the Nursing (RN-BSN) BSN. This modification reflects the newly approved course, NURS 4052, and the deletion of NURS 4050 and NURS 4051. All other requirements for the degree remain unchanged. Dr. Elder made the motion to approve the Modification of the Nursing (RN-BSN), BSN degree. Ms. Pittman seconded the motion. The motion passed with 11 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstaining. Two members were not present to vote.

The last agenda item considered was a modification of the BGS Humanities degree. Dr. Blackwell noted the 12-0-1 approval by the ICC prior to presenting this to this Committee. Four members did not vote. Dr. Holly Wilson explained the need for the changes. The first change was to broaden the foreign language requirement rather than having only French and Spanish courses. Next, the order in which the concentrations appear in the catalog would change to an alphabetical order. The last change was to expand the choice of Enrichment Blocks by adding Africana Studies. With no further discussion Dr. Elder made a motion to accept the modification of the BGS Humanities degree with Dr. Chris Stacey seconding the motion. The motion passed with 11 in favor, 0 opposed, and 0 abstaining. Two members were not present to vote.

Dr. Hathorn made a motion to adjourn with Dr. Allen seconding the motion. The motion carried with 11 in favor, 0 opposing, and 0 abstaining. Two members were not present to vote.

The meeting officially adjourned at 12:50 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Sandra Purifoy
Secretary

Improvement of Instruction Minutes

January 27, 2023

Members Present: Cheryl Bardales, Skyler Braswell, Sandra Gilliland, Long Li, Tanya Lueder, Matthew Stokes, Michael Waller, Emily Weeks

Members Not Present: Cathy Robinson, Mattie Cedars (student), John Rowan (ex-officio)

Call to Order:

A quorum was established at 12:05 p.m.

Overview of Meeting:

M. Stokes reviews original charges of committee and the recommendations made:

1. *Determine if the IDEA evaluation form we are now using is the only one available from IDEA or if there might be one that has questions more suitable to faculty use for improving their teaching.*
2. *Investigate other products (non-IDEA) to determine if there is one that would work better for us than what we are using.*
3. *Suggest ways to obtain better completion rates than what we are currently getting with the online evaluations.*
4. *Make a recommendation on evaluations to use and how to administer to increase completion.*

M. Stokes was tasked with finding what last year's committee found. He read through minutes and reported findings. He mentioned that there was some discussion of student perspectives within the IDEA evaluations but that probably does not align with the committee's charges. He found it interesting that some research suggests that sending evaluations between midterms and finals may be more effective than at semester end. M. Stokes noted that another member of last year's committee volunteered to draft a survey. Finally, M. Stokes shared last year's committee's recommendations:

1. *Examine the possibility of each department developing customized evaluations to measure teaching effectiveness based on departmental program outcomes.*
2. *Seek clarification of the utility of the IDEA course evaluations in tenure and promotion determination.*
3. *Explore the degree to which departmental teaching evaluations are used in determining tenure and promotion.*

The Senate sent these back to last year's committee since these recommendations would be typical topics Senate would ask the committee to investigate. M. Stokes mentioned that the committee is back at square one. M. Stokes then opened the floor for questions.

T. Lueder attended an event at LSU where they discussed the mid-semester evaluation. She did this in her class to get students to change how they studied. She will send the form out to the

group.

E. Weeks shared information from conversations with tenured faculty about the weight IDEA evaluations hold in the process of tenure and promotion. The evaluations definitely show one viewpoint of a faculty member- the viewpoint of the students. The data would not make or break someone from gaining tenure. One negative comment may not hold much weight, as students sometimes emotionally respond when they are unhappy with a grade. The committee more closely analyzes trends in comments. For example, if multiple comments over a course mention lack of responding to email, something like this would hold more merit than one stray comment. Ultimately, the evaluations are definitely used, but they are only one point of reference among other factors

M. Stokes followed up with some concerns. What about if a student has a grudge? What if the class is an upper-level course, which are typically more rigorous? Is it a fair representation of the faculty member?

L. Li reported findings from the College of Business. He mentioned peer evaluations along with student evaluations. He mentioned a system with guaranteed quality. Feedback is collected at the beginning of each class meeting and seemed more effective than waiting until the last week of class.

C. Bardales added that tenured faculty in Biology explained they notice that often, the evaluations correlate to the grades received. For example, professors who “give” higher grades have higher ratings and vice versa.

L. Li noted the conflict of interest as well. He explained that the faculty should look at qualities and rationale of evaluations. “If students say they learned a lot but the process may be painful. But if they learn a lot, that’s great. Students have no clue if the professor is good or not. Maybe a couple of years later, they realize it.”

M. Stokes noted that there are definite concerns. He used himself as an example of a non-tenured faculty member. If he has poor evaluations, does that raise a red flag? Does he become at risk of losing his job?

C. Bardales spent time reviewing narratives from other universities in how they give and receive feedback. About 98% of campuses she reviewed use IDEA. Two other evaluations that she saw were SmartEvals and Watermark. She went on to explain, “Rather than jumping to another tool, how can we utilize what we have? One thing, I was looking how faculty thought how valid and reliable the surveys are. They do think it’s reliable and valid. One big question was “can we include other questions?” There are a lot more questions and some are specific to certain classes. Maybe we should allow more customization.”

M. Stokes summarized C. Bardales’ report. LSUA currently has 11-12 questions for every course, but professors CAN add more.

C. Bardales explained that there are currently two types of question types and rating options:

Describe the frequency of your instructor's teaching procedures.

Describe your attitudes and behavior in this course.

She continued to explain that there are a lot of other options within the product that the university is not currently using. The questions LSUA uses are generic, and the response rates are problematic. She explained that she has poor response rates but has not yet taken action to address it. She indicated that a new recommendation to Senate would be that the university does not need a new tool. LSUA needs to use the one we have more effectively. She suggested that CTE could help with faculty development.

M. Stokes said that he read a comment that suggested grades could be held until students completed surveys but questioned the feasibility of doing such.

S. Gilliland reviewed the findings from her survey. She had opened the survey for two weeks, and the majority of the participants completed the survey within the first three days. She reported that the majority of the people are unsatisfied with current IDEA evaluations and don't know how to read and use the information from the evaluations. Ultimately, no one is satisfied with the response rate.

M. Stokes said some people indicated they were pleased that the surveys were no longer pencil and paper, while others suggested they preferred the "old way," when hard copies were distributed in-class.

S. Gilliland reviewed more information gathered from the surveys. A majority of faculty indicated they have received very little (if any) training on IDEA. She suggested a recommendation that we need to offer some (required) trainings on how to use the surveys. When looking at different strategies to increase response rates, faculty provided different ideas. However, most indicated that the strategies have not improved the response rates across the board. When faculty reported on which feedback was most important, there were lots of answers. Most prefer the comments versus the ratings. They love the suggestions on how to improve. If that's what they want, S. Gilliland suggested that the survey should be more specific.

M. Stokes was encouraged and noted the great strides the committee has made. He revisited the charges. Number 1 (*Determine if the IDEA evaluation form we are now using is the only one available from IDEA or if there might be one that has questions more suitable to faculty use for improving their teaching.*) C. Bardales addressed that, so it can be checked off. Number 2 (*Investigate other products (non-IDEA) to determine if there is one that would work better for us than what we are using.*) C. Bardales also mentioned and shared that most universities are using IDEA. This can be checked off. Number 3 (*suggest ways to obtain better completion rates than what we are currently getting with the online evaluations.*) M. Stokes said he'd like to further discuss. How can we increase the response rates? Number 4 (*Make a recommendation on evaluations to use and how to administer to increase completion.*) How to use and administer the surveys. We will work on this.

M. Waller explained that when he is trying to figure out an issue that he likes to view it like a student would. He said he typically has good response rates, but his class is in-person and in a computer lab. He suggested that a demo account be available to faculty to show what the student experience would be like on a mobile device or computer.

C. Bardales suggested that maybe someone from IDEA could join via ZOOM during trainings to answer questions and show how students experience the survey.

T. Lueder reminded that if we create our own survey, we cannot compare to others. IDEA evaluates you across the nation, and she noted this as a reason to keep IDEA. This allows faculty to get feedback and to see how they fare across the nation. She wondered if IDEA could share what they are seeing as far as participation goes. She would like for us to reach out to IDEA for suggestions on increasing student response rates as well as using the survey.

C. Bardales noted that she wants to see what IDEA is controlling for and where they compare results. How do we find out what the national norms are? She has not found the information but would like for IDEA to share the information.

M. Stokes said we should focus on three things moving forward:

1. Let's keep IDEA but use what we have and make it better-maybe different questions or get more ideas from IDEA.
2. Start a conversation with CTE about faculty development on interpreting and using data.
3. Response rates- what is user experience like and how can it be used/improved

T. Lueder suggested incentivizing students on campus who complete their surveys.

M. Stokes stated that he will draft some charges, but he wants to share with everyone before sending to Senate. He wants feedback. He commented on the progress and opened the floor for additional comments and questions.

C. Bardales said that she feels the committee is a lot closer to the goal. The recommendation is to get someone from IDEA. She thinks the committee should be able to send the recommendations soon.

Meeting adjourned- 12:50 PM.