

PUR YRVW ¶ V \$GYLVRU\ &RXQFLO
March 21, 2019 Meeting
8:30-10am, Lynch Center, Fulton 515

In attendance:

/DXUD 2 ¶ 'Z\HU	& K William Keane	
Anthony Annunziato	Jonathan Laurence	David Quigley
Sharon Beckman	Karen Lyons	John Rakestraw
Mary Ellen Carter	John Mahoney	Patricia Riffin
Chris Constat	Allison Marshall	Akua Sarr
Thomas Crea	7KHUHVD 2 ¶ .HHIH	Billy Soo
Joseph Du Pont	Mariela Paez	Sasha Tomic
Gregory Kalscheur, S.J.	Claudia Pouravelis	Thomas Wall

-
1. The summary of the February 14, 2019 meeting was approved. It will be sent to the 3UHVLGHQW ¶ V 2IILFH \$OO VXPPDULH Web Site. Members are encouraged to share them with colleagues.
 - 2.

- open students to bias as they are not tied to a particular teaching methodology objective
- x The more specific the questions, the more useful the evaluation feedback will be. Course evaluations are sometimes referred to as student satisfaction surveys and can take on the feel of a popularity contest.
- x Course evaluations may discourage innovative teaching approaches, especially by non-tenured faculty members.
- x Course evaluations may lead to grade inflation.
- x The current tool has no diagnostic element. The questions have been in place for years without any significant changes.
- x Core and science classes, and large section courses, are evaluated more harshly than humanities and seminar courses.

Kathy gave an overview of some of the trends and features of newer course evaluations and instruments used.

5 H V H D U F K V K R Z V questions W V X THE WHO DO YOU rate your professors are less likely to generate useful feedback. Newer tools ask students more targeted questions on learning objectives and outcomes. Some tools attempt to help students see themselves as stakeholders in the learning experience, by asking questions about how they are engaged.

Research also shows that narrative comments often overly subjective can stray off topic, and that the number of free-response questions should be limited to one. This approach however, could result in a loss of the additional feedback that is sometimes buried in the free response questions beyond the first one.

Billy Soo added that feedback from the deans and department chairs indicated that while they do read the comments they generally focus on the two primary questions that rate the professor and the course on an overall basis. Free answer questions can also be very inconsistent. Kathy added that students easily get off task and talk about things unrelated to the course or the instructor in the open answer section.

There is also a trend of asking faculty to complete an annual reflection narrative on their teaching for the year based on the course evaluations.

As a result of the findings, a subcommittee was formed to look at the existing system, and suggest alternatives. The hope is that a new course evaluation system will be in place after next year. The subcommittee is looking at two primary questions:

- x What kind of questions will provide the most meaningful feedback?
- x What kind of report is going to help faculty make sense of and act on, the feedback?

The subcommittee has looked at the existing platform (Blue) and an alternative (IDEA). One benefit to Blue is that the school owns the instrument BC has autonomy to create or change questions. There is additional functionality with the tool that is not currently being utilized

that could be explored. An added positive to continuing to use Blue is that there could be a pilot of any new evaluation instrument.

IDEA has four instruments with differing numbers of questions (7, 12, 18, and 40) and questions on learning goals selected by the instructor. It provides a comprehensive diagnostic with feedback for the faculty members as well as the ability to create a report that provides information on the course to students. IDEA can also be aligned with NECHS standards, thus centralizing data for accreditation needs. IDEA would however come at an additional cost and BC would not be able to run a pilot before adopting it.

A council member asked about the inherent bias in blind evaluations. Kathy explained that blind evaluations were administered in a controlled experiment where a faculty member taught two online sections and was unidentifiable by the students. In one section, the faculty member was denoted as male and in the other, female. The evaluations from the female identified faculty member were significantly lower than the one where the same faculty member was identified as male. Kathy added that by focusing the questions on methodology and course organization, the student will be forced to answer based on those areas.

Montserrat inclusion are made by KTH 211LFH RI)LQDQFLDO \$LG DQG ZI package may change from year to year, they remain a Montserrat student throughout their four years at BC.

Jeremiah provided some additional information on need-based financial aid. Need-based financial aid assumes that the parent and student are primarily responsible for financing college costs, and DPLO\TV DELOLW\ WR SD\ LV GHWHUPLQHG WKURX.

- x Federal Methodology determines eligibility for Federal and State funds
- x Institutional Methodology determines eligibility for BC funds

In the past, students were selected on Pell Grant eligibility. But in recent years, BC reevaluated how need was being determined and Pell eligibility was removed as a determining factor. Institutional Estimated Family Contribution (EFC) provides a more accurate depiction of need DQG LV QRZ XVHG WR GHWHUPLQH 0RQVHUUDW HOLJLE range, with an EFC of \$24,485 or below. We are eligible for the Montserrat program.

Yvonne then talked about resources that Montserrat is able to provide to students, through partnerships with a network of offices on campus, including Athletics, Campus Ministry, Learning to Learn, Student Affairs, UGB, and the Volunteer and Service Learning Center, among others. These collaborations allow for Montserrat students to have access to passes for athletic events, tickets to campus events and plays, socials, for trips and retreats and direct access to representatives from partner offices.

Through a partnership with Information Technology Services, Montserrat was able to start a laptop loan program, which allows students to check out a laptop for use during the semester. Additionally, the Office has cultivated a lending library which currently houses over 1300 books, primarily donated by faculty, which can be lent out to students. If there are books that are needed but not available in the library, Montserrat will purchase them. The School of Nursing has an established relationship with the Office, and provide funds for books and nursing-specific needs, such as scrubs.

Yvonne concluded by asking faculty to reach out if there is a student who 0 G n20(stt7tD 1>> BDC

conversations. She talked about the overlap with Learning to Learn Office which also provides significant support to first generation students. Jehan added that the office strives to help them navigate financial aid and billing, a process that is complicated for many students, and not just first generation.

A council member asked if there was a way to connect first generation students with faculty who were first generation students themselves beyond the work that athletics does in that regard. Another member noted that many faculty and staff may not be aware of the work that Montserrat does, but who might be willing to donate if they were made more aware. Yvonne responded that there is a first generation group on campus, and that the Office is working on ways to more meaningfully connect students and faculty members and to get the word out on the needs of the students.

4. 3UR YRVW ¶ V 5HSRUW 'DYL G 4XLJOH\ 3UR YRVW DQG 'HDQ

David introduced Tom Wall University Librarian, to talk about upcoming library initiatives.

Tom began by talking about proposed policy changes regarding electronic theses and dissertations. Based on input from the schools, the library is proposing a pilot program enabling electronic signatures for dissertations. The other proposed change requires that dissertations become part of the BC institutional repository of eScholarship.

Electronic signatures have already been implemented at the School of Theology and Ministry. The hope is to have a pilot in the summer or fall, with a fully functional electronic signature system in place by next spring. He added that BC is one of the few schools to have an open access policy and is leading in this regard.

David urged those with questions or concerns to speak with Tom or the graduate deans at the respective school.

Billy Soo talked briefly about faculty compliance for the annual Conflict of Interest/Commitment disclosure. To date, 92% of faculty have completed their disclosure, and in the course of reporting, a few issues arose that faculty should be aware of.

The first were cases of faculty members teaching on the side at another institution. As per the faculty handbook, teaching outside of BC requires annual permission from the Provost. This pertains to full length courses. While guest lectureships should be disclosed, they do not generally require permission. There were also a few cases where a faculty member was teaching during a sabbatical. Sabbaticals are meant to support research and scholarship for additional teaching income.

Additionally there were cases of a faculty member devoting more than 300 hours annually to outside consulting. The faculty handbook limits outside commitments during the academic year (September through May) to one day per week.

