Educational Policies and Procedures Committee

February 28, 2011

Alter Hall 405

Attendees: Mary Anne Gaffney (Chair), Nilgün Anadolu-Okur, Suman Batish, Bruce Conrad, Chris Dennis, Dan Liebermann, Keya Sadeghipour, Kate Wingert, Catherine Schifter, Michele O'Connor (scribe)

1. The minutes of February 7, 2011 were approved unanimously with adjustments.
   The meeting opened with the mention of Temple's 4-year graduation rate with is currently ___%. Our goal is to reach 50%. In addition, our first year retention rate went up from 87% to 89%.

2. Chris Dennis: Report on Online Evaluations Pilot. Course and Teaching Evaluation/Student Feedback Forms (SFF) Committee approved an expanded pilot of the online SFF process in fall 2010. A total of 703 courses out of 6405 courses were included in the expanded pilot.   As in the pilot for Spring 2010, all online courses were included. Senior, tenured faculty, who affirmatively elected to participate were included in the Fall 2010 pilot. Adjuncts also participated. The SFF Committee was looking for two outcomes: the rate of return and if there was a statistically significant difference in the responses to SFF questions. The return rate of the S1 SFFs was 44% for online and 79% for paper.   There were no statistical differences when one compared the online responses to paper response for individual faculty in the S1 review.

   EPPC would like to look at the response rate according to the types of courses.

   K. Sadeghipour: Many students thought that when they answered the "additional" questions on paper, that they were in fact completing the evaluation for the faculty member. This is problematic. Is there any way to include the "additional" questions in the online process?

   C. Dennis: In the fall 2010 pilot, there were no incentives for students to complete the online SFFs. Committee is exploring some options.   Must also consider that paper rate has been slipping as well. The SFF committee recommends (1) exploring some incentive strategies, and (2) expanding the online pilot for Spring 2011 to include any faculty who would like to participate.

   M. Gaffney: EPPC would like SFF Committee to unpack the data across schools/colleges at a future meeting.

   N. Anadolu-Okur: Asked if the questions can be revised? M. Gaffney and C. Dennis explained the review process had occurred previously where faculty had opportunities to meet with the committee. She feels that questions need to be less negative. She would also like the committee to revisit the decision that if a course has less than 8 students, an instructor's report will not be produced.

   Chris explained that the provisions for creating reports are codified in the university policy on course evaluations. It would be difficult to provide confidentiality to the students very small

sections and that Pamela Barnett, TLC, is working on a Peer Review process that may be an answer for smaller class evaluation.

3. M. Gaffney: Prerequisites and Banner. Prerequisite checking is not going to "go live" in spring 2011 for several reasons. One is the complexity of the curriculum and another is the length of time for the prerequisite checking process.

   B. Conrad: this is a major problem for CST.

   EPPC recommendation: Provost should convene a prerequisite work group to recommend prerequisite policies. EPPC would review the recommendations. Goal is to make prerequisite checking work before the process goes live.

4. M. Gaffney: would like to discuss enrollment in Writing Intensive courses. Perhaps have a joint WIIC and EPPC meeting?
5. Approved a change in meeting times. Times will shift between 2:00 and 2:30. Next meeting will be at 2:30.