FTLC-AC Minutes

Date: November 12, 2012

Location: 211 A DEV (Grand Rapids) and D-1-142 MAK (Allendale)

Meeting called to order at 1:00 pm

Present: David Bair, Lindsay Ellis, Kyle Felker, Laurie Stickler, Katherine Stieler (for Christine Rener) Darren Walhof, Joy Washburn

(Members of the Teaching Awards Committee are excused from this meeting as they have a sub-committee meeting from Noon-3pm in 327 LOH)

1. Approval of Agenda
    > Motion to approve, Laurie Stickler; seconded, Darren Walhof. Motion passed.

2. Approval of Meeting Minutes (October 22, 2012): DEFER to November 26, 2012

3. Announcements:
    a. Meeting on November 26, 2012: Kim Kenward will demo use of alternative technologies (Blackboard Collaborate) that could be used for FTLC-AC meetings beginning in Fall 2013 (thank you to Scott Grissom who is assisting her on the Allendale campus)

4. Follow-up: 2012-13 Committee Charge for FTLC-AC (see memo of 10-29-12)
    a. Some concern expressed in CLAS regarding the length of the SETs; some work was done prior to 2008. Then paused while the FTLC Task Force completed its work, culminating in the SETTF report from FTLC.
    b. If Provost's office is encouraging this initiative, is there money to support a campus-wide SET? Not known; but we will recommend to UAS and they will discuss cost implications with the Provost.
    c. Joy will send an email to Figen regarding these issues:
        i. Many of these tools for SETs have a cost. We are assuming our recommendation should be made on the quality of the tool, not the cost. Let us know if otherwise.

5. Discussion: Begin initial development of ideas/plan/timeline to meet the expectations of the committee charge
    a. We have narrowed our discussion of SETs to these four: IDEA, SIR II, Digital Measures, and Class Climate

b. Lindsay Ellis will construct a chart/table comparing these four, and send to Joy Washburn next week.
c. Goal is to select one or two of the standardized tools on January 28, 2013 and then move forward with recommendations on how to use the tools within the university setting.
d. We also should make recommendations on the consistent use of SETs across campus.
    i. Student may experience evaluation fatigue; might we consider not evaluating all courses every semester ~ perhaps tenured professors do not need to be evaluated every semester?
    ii. Share research on the validity and reliability of SETs.
    iii. How to use SETs; UAS wants to encourage consistent use within units
    iv. We could look at other universities that use one consistent SET; for example, Louisiana has a state-wide university system of SET. Perhaps North Carolina and New York may have system-wide SETs, since they have state-wide university systems.
    v. We could look at comparable institutions.
e. Create mini-task forces for preparing specific parts of the report; perhaps based on the two campuses, to make it easier for sub-groups to meet.
f. Should we be discussing the "how" in addition to the "why"? Wouldn't other institutions' Teaching Centers have some suggestions for how they use SETs?
g. We could recommend a mid-term evaluation.

Meeting adjourned at 2:00 pm

Respectfully submitted,

David Bair