PERSON PRESIDING: George Bailey, Chair of GEIE

REGULAR MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Dr. Debra Ann Kosko, Dr. Mario Rey, Dr. Puri Martinez, Dr. Rosa Bell,

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Dr. Ying Zhou, Dr. Jean-Luc Scemama, Dr. Jen Scott Mobley, Dr. Jody Baumgartner,

Others present: Dr. Mary-Beth Corbin, Dr. Eric Horsman.

Actions:

1. The meeting was called to order at 2:06 PM.

2. The minutes of the meeting of February 19th, 2018 were approved as presented.

3. Requests from Geological Sciences:

   (a) Approved request from the Department of Geological Sciences to retain SC credit for GEOL 1550 Oceanography after the number of credits for the course is reduced from four to three.

   (b) Approved request from the Department of Geological Sciences to retain SC credit for GEOL 1700 Environmental Geology Oceanography after the number of credits for the course is reduced from four to three.

   (c) Approved request for Natural Science credit for GEOL 1400, Bay & Beaches Around the World: Geological Form & Function (3 credits).

   (d) Approved request for Natural Science credit for GEOL 1551, Oceanography Lab (one credit).

4. Request from Psychology

   (a) Approved request for Global Diversity credit for PSYC 3314 Psychology of Religion.

5. Consideration of recommendation to the Faculty Senate as a charge to the Faculty Governance Committee:

   The Faculty Governance committee shall review whether to recommend to the Faculty Senate (1) The best practices for the use of the SSOI in evaluating a faculty member’s teaching. (2) Whether all individuals (both administrators and faculty members) who evaluate a faculty member’s teaching should be required receive training in the implementation of the best practices for using the SSOI in the evaluation of teaching, including faculty who are members of committees whose duties include evaluating teaching (for preparing progress towards tenure letters, tenure recommendations, and for engaging in post-tenure review, for example). (3) Whether to revise the policy governing the use of students comments that are
part of the SSOI to allow student comments to be reviewed by each faculty member's immediate supervisor (department chair or school director), the dean to whom the department chair or director reports, the provost and the chancellor. (4) If the Faculty Governance committee recommends in favor allowing administrators to review student comments, then (a) whether the members of each code unit Personnel, Tenure, Promotion and Post-Tenure Review committees (or the discipline-specific Personnel, Tenure, Promotion and Post-Tenure Review committees within a code unit) shall also be allowed to review the comments, and (b) whether the comments shall be contained in a Personnel Action Dossier for Tenure and/or Promotion, and in each faculty member’s Post-Tenure Review dossier. (5) Whether, if the Governance Committee recommends that administrators or faculty members other than the faculty member commented on be allowed to review student comments, then the faculty member commented on shall be allowed to provide a written response student comments, said response to be provided in conjunction with the student comments to whomever is allowed to review the student comments.

Dr. Baumgartner moved to strike all references to faculty workshops and training. The motion passed.

The recommendation now reads:

The Faculty Governance committee shall review whether to recommend to the Faculty Senate (1) The best practices for the use of the SSOI in evaluating a faculty member’s teaching. (2) Whether administrators who evaluate a faculty member’s teaching should be required receive training in the implementation of the best practices for using the SSOI in the evaluation of teaching. (3) Whether to revise the policy governing the use of students comments that are part of the SSOI to allow student comments to be reviewed by each faculty member’s immediate supervisor (department chair or school director), the dean to whom the department chair or director reports, the provost and the chancellor. (4) If the Faculty Governance committee recommends in favor allowing administrators to review student comments, then (a) whether the members of each code unit Personnel, Tenure, Promotion and Post-Tenure Review committees (or the discipline-specific Personnel, Tenure, Promotion and Post-Tenure Review committees within a code unit) shall also be allowed to review the comments, and (b) whether the comments shall be contained in a Personnel Action Dossier for Tenure and/or Promotion, and in each faculty member’s Post-Tenure Review dossier. (5) Whether, if the Governance Committee recommends that administrators or faculty members other than the faculty member commented on be allowed to review student comments, then the faculty member commented on shall be allowed to provide a written response student comments, said response to be provided in conjunction with the student comments to whomever is allowed to review the student comments.

Dr. Martinez moved to table consideration of the recommendation until the April 16th 2018 GEIE meeting in order to allow time for the GEIE to consider the recommendation in greater depth. The motion passed. Martinez noted that when recommendations of this sort go to the Faculty Governance Committee, they usually come to the committee with an indication of where the committee forwarding them stands on the issue. She noted that it would be good for the GEIE to indicate this if it sends this recommendation to the Faculty Governance Committee. GEIE committee members asked if they would be sent material on the use of comments. Zhou noted that committee members had received this material previously but that material can be resent. Zhou asked that members of the subcommittee be invited to attend the April 16th GEIE meeting. The GEIE agreed to do that.
6. Consideration of recommendation to the Faculty Senate as a charge to the Faculty Governance Committee:

Replace Faculty Manual Part VIII Section I.III Annual Evaluation 1 Teaching

Teaching

Teaching is the primary function of the university. Teaching may include classroom and laboratory instruction, student advising, mentoring student research, and other pedagogical activities. Teaching must be evaluated using multiple methods selected from the list below:
a. review by the unit administrator and/or peers of course materials such as syllabi, reading lists, teaching outlines, audiovisual materials, student manuals, student assignments and examinations, and/or other materials prepared for or relevant to teaching.
b. samples of student work on assignments, projects, papers, juries or other examples of student achievement.
c. formal methods of peer review, detailed in Faculty Senate resolution #17-61. The peer review instrument for face-to-face courses is provided in Faculty Senate resolution #16-60. The peer review instrument for on-line courses is provided in Faculty Senate resolution #11-53.
d. e. review of data from the Student Perception of Teaching Survey (SOIS). The data from SOIS is qualitative data and is not designed to serve the purpose of a measurement instrument. Therefore, SOIS data may not be converted into a numerical score to be used in faculty evaluation.
f. other procedures provided for in unit codes. (FS Resolution #12-76, July 2012)

With the following:

Faculty Manual Part VIII Section I.III Annual Evaluation 1 Teaching

Teaching

Teaching is the primary function of the university. Teaching includes classroom and laboratory instruction, online instruction, other forms of distance education, service learning, student advising, mentoring student research, and other pedagogical activities.

In addition to procedures required by the faculty member’s unit code. (FS Resolution #12-76, July 2012), teaching shall be evaluated using information from multiple sources, including any of the following that were accomplished during the period under review:

Instruction:

The evaluation of a faculty member’s instructional activities shall take into account these core factors:

1. Syllabus, including the course description, learning outcomes when determined by the instructor, and course requirements.
2. Student assignments and examinations, and/or other materials prepared for or relevant to teaching.
3. All other new or revised course materials, such as help sheets (handouts), study guides, reading lists, audiovisual materials, student manuals and the like.
4. Examples of student work, such as tests, exams, quizzes, assignments, projects, papers, juries or other examples of student achievement.
5. Course grade distribution.
6. Changes made to course content and pedagogy to promote student success.

**Workload**

The evaluation of a faculty member’s instructional activities shall take into account these factors:

1. Courses taught by term with numbers of students taught.
2. Numbers of undergraduate, master’s, pre- and post-doctoral students, and visiting scholars advised academically or supervised clinically.
3. Number of Masters Theses or doctoral dissertations directed.
4. Number of Honors research projects supervised.
5. Number of memberships on doctoral dissertation and master's and honors research committees.
6. Number of undergraduate research projects supervised.
7. Number of Directed Readings or Independent Studies courses taught.

**Student, Peer and Unit Administrator Review**

The evaluation of the faculty members instructional activities will take into account, where required or provided by the faculty member:

1. Results of formal assessment by the instructor or the unit’s assessment committee of student achievement of course-specific learning outcomes, where required by the unit code or submitted by the faculty member.
2. Results of formal assessment by the faculty member or the unit’s assessment committee of student achievement of program-specific learning outcomes, where required by the unit code or submitted by the faculty member.
3. Student evaluations or the course and instructor.
4. The results of formal peer review, formal peer review, as detailed in Faculty Senate resolution #17-61, where required.
5. Direct observation of teaching (face-to-face or online) by the unit administrator.
6. Written communications to the unit administrator from one or more student (with instructor’s responses if the instructor choose to provide responses).
7. Number and type of face-to-face or online teaching or related workshops attended.

**Impact of scholarly activity on improving the quality of instruction at ECU or elsewhere**

The evaluation of the faculty members instructional activities shall take into account, when available:

1. Awards and honors recognizing excellence in teaching.
2. Grants to support instructional activities and programs; if collaborative, the faculty member’s distinctive contribution is described.
3. Recognition by professional organizations for leadership in educational endeavors (e.g., serving as a training grant reviewer for state and federal agencies), leadership in major educational bodies (e.g., National League for Nursing), invitations to serve and active participation in education-focused conferences for state and national organizations.
4. Teaching workshops presented.
5. Publication of scholarly articles addressing course content or pedagogy.
6. State, Regional or National leadership roles related to education.
7. Invitations from other institutions to serve as lecturer, visiting professor, or education consultant.
8. Continuing education courses taught.
9. Evidence of leadership and scholarly engagement in the development of course content and pedagogy of face-to-face courses.
10. Evidence of leadership and scholarly engagement in the development and delivers of online education.
11. Scholarly reputations of journals and publishers of the candidate’s teaching publications.
12. Evidence that contributions to teaching are being adopted or are affecting teaching programs at other institutions or other end-users.
13. Evidence of impact on the professional careers of others (e.g., former students, junior faculty, colleagues)

The committee approved the recommendation to the Faculty Senate to charge the Faculty Governance committee to revise the relevant section of the Faculty Manual as indicated above.

7. Other Business:

(a) Dr. Mary-Beth Corbin noted that she will share with the committee a list of upcoming student events sponsored by Student Affairs.

(b) Dr. Ying Zhou described the changes that IPAR implemented in General Education assessment, noting that this year Written Communication and Mathematics (MATH 1065) were assessed. She described some of the results of the Math assessment. At the April 16th GEIE meeting she will present a summary of the assessment results which the GEIE will consider reporting to the Faculty Senate. Since student performance in Written Communication and Mathematics impacts other courses students take, the GEIE will discuss further its role in assessment and in recommending actions to improve student learning at its April 16th meeting.

(c) Dr. Puri Martinez noted the need for units requesting changes to existing courses, such as lowering credit hours or changing a course from social sciences credit to humanities credit, to inform affected departments and schools prior to bringing the request to the GEIE for consideration. The committee agreed to revise the request form to reflect this need.

8. The meeting was adjourned at 2:53 PM.