

TEMPLE UNIVERSITY  
 REPRESENTATIVE FACULTY SENATE  
 Kiva Auditorium  
 Videoconference: HSC, 342 MERB – AMBLER, ALC201  
 Minutes – Tuesday, March 20, 2018

**Attendance:**

Representative senators and officers: 25

Ex-officio: 1

Faculty, administrators and guests: 8

Guests: Vice Provost Jodi Levine Laufgraben (1:45 p.m.); Dr. Joe Ducette, Associate Dean, College of Education and Gina Calzaferri, Assessment of Instruction Committee

Topic	Discussion	Action
<p>1. Call to order</p>	<p>Meeting called to order by Dr. Sachs. His report followed the presentations by our guests. He mentioned that the minutes from the last (RFS) meeting need to be finalized. He then stated:</p> <p>- I will ask Paul LaFollette, from the Nominating Committee, to come &amp; give a report about our officers' slate for AY 2018-19:</p> <p>Paul LaFollette: Vice-president Pratt will explain that this is the slate that comes from the Nominating Committee, but this is not the final slate! The recommendation of our nominating committee is, for:</p> <p>President: Cornelius Pratt            Vice-president: Rafael Porrata-Doria            Secretary: Kimmika Williams            Witherspoon</p>	<p>Meeting called to order at 1:50 p.m. in Kiva Auditorium.</p>
<p>2. President Michael Sach's Report</p>	<p>Deferred in honor of guest speakers. Thank you, all, for coming to the Representative Faculty Senate meeting. Officers' reports will follow after our guests speak.</p>	
<p>3. Vice President Cornelius Pratt's Report</p>	<p>VP's report: we have a number of vacancies on elected committees. I am encouraging all of us to pass on names from our schools and colleges to Senate Coordinator Cheryl Mack by this Thursday, March 22<sup>nd</sup> so that we can send out the ballot on March 26<sup>th</sup>. The paper work for writing in names for the Executive Committee for the Senate was distributed a couple of days ago by Cheryl Mack, so please contact the Senate office. You can always write in names for the election process. That's about it.</p>	

<p>4. Guest(s): Vice Provost Jodi Levine Laufgraben (1:45 p.m.)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I'm here to give you all an update on the upcoming accreditation visit and Middle States Report. I was in a student affairs workshop earlier this semester &amp; the facilitator was talking about the need for planning &amp; assessment before the 'Paul Revere person rides through &amp; says accreditation is coming!' I hold the title of Vice-Provost for Academic Affairs &amp; Liaison Officer but also, I have had a major role in making sure the university remains accredited for the past 15 years. I want to tell you a bit about it.</li> <li>2. Who is Middle States &amp; why is that important? This is about how they are coming up over the next 2 years. What is reaccreditation?</li> <li>3. Middle States is one of six regional accred bodies in the U.S. Their territory includes New York down to Washington, D.C. (including Pennsylvania &amp; Delaware), Maryland, Virginia &amp; Puerto Rico. Temple University is one of about 500 institutions they serve. We have never been under any probation, follow-up or warning. We were last affirmed in 2015. Temple University has been fully accredited for the last 5 cycles &amp; our goal to remain fully accredited.</li> <li>4. Their focus is on institutional accountability. I know that many of you come from disciplines with specialized programmatic accreditation, so there are many here who do understand the purpose &amp; value of accreditation. There are 42 such programs at Temple University.</li> <li>5. Middle States stipulates that we have to actually confer degrees &amp; graduate people! There are 15 regulations that would be much more onerous. Then there are 7 standards.</li> <li>6. Something new this time: There are expanded compliance reports in 8 areas. These have to do with Title IV funds. An example is loan default. The Feds (House of Representatives) audit Middle States. They want to know whether Middle States is making sure that all its institutions are in compliance with federal regulations.</li> <li>7. When we underwent our last reaccreditation visit in 2009-10, we had to meet 14 standards. Middle States decided that this was 'too many.' These parameters are now</li> </ol>	
---	---	--

combined into 7 standards. Ethics & integrity are important. That's standard # 2. There was an issue at Penn State University several years ago, with a question about whether policies were properly followed. They are concerned with admission through graduation support of students. Standard #5 is critical, and that is assessment of learning.

8. Standard #VI is about assessing everything else. Now all administrative & support services are doing annual reports as well.
9. Standard # VII is about whether we have the proper structures to accomplish our mission.

Middle States has the view that these 7 standards should apply to all areas of operation within the context of Temple University's mission. Also, the main focus is on the student learning experience. The teaching mission of the university, etc.

I am here for you today as a resource, so please ask me any questions. How are we organizing for MS?

First is the design of the self-study document. That is due this April. One of our Middle States people will be here to obtain that document.

The Executive Committee has two chairs. I am one & Rollo Dillworth, from Boyer, is the faculty chair.

We used to have to produce an evidence room with lots of documents. We used the entire lobby area as our document library. Now it's an online evidence inventory. The Executive Committee working with us includes the Computer Services people who will help us compile the online documents.

The Compliance Committee, Host Committee, (Facilities Management, Computer Services & Aramark) will help us produce the 4-day site visit. Feb or March of 2020 is projected. There are Faculty participants on the Steering committee. With the exception of the Ethics & Integrity Committee, all have an administrator and a faculty member. Next year is considered to be 'the self-study year.' Fall 2018, to early 2019, we will start compiling reports & working on the document.

In the fall of 2019, a draft of the document will be made public to the university community. I get that out to Cheryl Mack to be distributed on the listserv. This includes a timeline and a list of membership on the various committees. The decision from Middle States will be revealed in or around July 2020. It would be possible to move it back to July 2019, but that is all in deciding when is best time to host a visit.

It's a process of 'show & tell.' They want to know what's changed in the past 5 years. What do we hope to get from the Middle States visit?

The Steering Committee selected outcomes (see slide) & agreed upon 4. We want to be:

1. Reaccredited
2. Inclusive.
3. Evidence based.
4. Recommendations.

As for determining institutional priorities, there are 3 – 5 that are evaluated through re-accreditation.

How can you get involved? Assessment of student learning is a good way to demonstrate our competence, for example the appropriate allocation of resources to enhance student learning & programs. This plays a huge part in our success. Finding our best examples to show case within the self-study. There are areas where we have incompletes.

Another opportunity for participating is serving on the Planning Commission. There are open meetings with students, faculty, staff and administration to come & comment on Temple University's compliance with the standards.

In the Fall 2019 or 2020, please come help with the preparations for the visit! Are there any questions?

Paul LaFollette (CST): I find this curious. It looks like the evaluations that Middle States has are decided by Middle States.

VP JL: It's a peer evaluation, so I need to lead up to your question with the premise that the visitors are trained. Middle States is a member institution. Temple University's President Englert had a vote on those standards. They do have (the 7 standards) to be approved and voted in.

	<p>The main foci are in the areas of planning, assessment &amp; resource allocation.</p> <p>Paul LaFollette (CST): A moderate focus in the 1990s was on technology availability. Then it moved to assessment. When is that coming to an end?</p> <p>VP JL: I think that this has stabilized. The focus in the 2009-2010 visit indicated continuous improvement. We're seeing subtle shifts in what's happening with public funding for higher education, so fiscal wellness is what you're seeing scrutinized in those visits. (Especially the PASCHE schools.)</p> <p>Paul LaFollette (CST): How similar are Middle States' criteria to those of the other accrediting bodies on the map?</p> <p>VP JL: Very similar.</p> <p>Paul LaFollette (CST): Good to know.</p> <p>Betsy Barber (STHM): The meetings that were set up all conflicted with my schedule. Will there be more set up?</p> <p>VP JL: We're looking at others including electronic opportunities to participate. We do want to say that because it's the first time we've ever extended to Temple University-Rome &amp; Temple University-Japan; also Temple University Ambler &amp; Temple University Harrisburg. Stay tuned when we have to reschedule based on tomorrow's snow forecast.</p> <p>My real name is Jodi, but if you want to refer to me as Paul Revere in the next 2 years, that's fine!</p>	
<p>5. Guest(s): Dr. Joe Ducette, Associate Dean, College of Ed &amp; Chair, Gina Calzaferri, Assessment of Instruction Committee</p>	<p>Professor Ducette reporting: We're here to report on a report. Here to talk about a newly re-named committee, the Assessment of Instruction (AOI) Committee. It was formerly called the Student Feedback Forms (SFF) Committee. Gina's going to stay seated but she can come up if she wants.</p> <p>This is my 50<sup>th</sup> year at TU. I'm entering my 100<sup>th</sup> semester. I expect a very large party in May to celebrate! Since it started in the 1990s, I've been on this committee &amp; was asked to chair it this year. Want to make this informal, because we are at the beginning of all of this. My intent would be to come back at least a couple of times (to</p>	

the Faculty Senate) to discuss. The CATE committee was formed 15 years ago by Temple University President Adamany. His intent was that we were going to use or buy one of the nationally existing forms. We looked into doing so, but it was prohibitively expensive, so we made up our own. The forms were originally called CATEs. They were given on paper. Some information was provided about rank, ordering, etc. About 10 years ago, CATEs were reformed. Now, there are 11 Likert scale style questions on that form with possibilities for three open-ended questions at the back & all instructors get the same form.

Some evidence of problems has accumulated. The idea of changing the name of the SFF Committee to the AOI Committee is so that it is more aligned with the purpose. We had some meetings this year, with not a lot of attendance. This committee has always included faculty & some administrators. The committee has always included membership from the Center for Advancement of Teaching (CAT), the graduate dean, the Vice-Provost for Faculty Affairs & faculty from various colleges in the university.

We are contemplating:

1. One of my research interests is in this area. The recommended version of SFFs is something we kind of, but don't exactly have: a small # of core items. The University of Illinois has 2 forms – teaching & course. Then, stuff about Gen Ed & other things can be incorporated into the form. Not many faculty add their own questions.
2. We want to make changes to the form so that individual items can be incorporated right into the form.
3. Another thing we're looking at: currently, there are 11 items. That is more than recommended in the literature. We're looking seriously at that & reducing number of core items to 5 – 7 items. The idea is that there would be a smaller number of core items, but a larger pool of items that could be chosen by a department. That is the model recommended in the literature. It's our intent to go to that way. One of my intents this summer, & I've asked the university for access to it, is looking at the psychometric properties of the items. That will help

us decide which of the 11 we want to keep. Then, we can make some recommendations for reducing the items down to what we want to keep.

4. The way the data are currently recorded from previously, until now, includes comparisons, where everyone is compared to the overall level of the university & their college. My personal opinion is that for the High-Medium-Low (HML) values, I do not like how it's done & how it's used in some places. IF we do replace the HML, how? It's something we DO need to look at. Also, we must open the committee about for discussion about how teaching is evaluated. There are Formative & Summative kinds of evaluation. Also, we must ascertain how the university Tenure & Promotion committees are using the data.

If we make changes, we can be ready for the first summer session of 2019 if we get the form worked out. We would start with the summer sessions so that if things don't work out well, we can at least correct it.

I'm hoping for a much larger committee now & a much more effective faculty evaluation process. Are there any questions?

Vic Lombardi (COE): Thanks Joe & to the committee for working on this. Can you elaborate a bit more about predictive validity? My follow up question is about how the data are used. Would the committee consider providing guidelines about how the data are used?

Prof. Ducette: I think that would be exactly what the charges of the committee would be. The colleges, T & P committees, etc. It is the case that what we would always hope that the SFFs are really about what the student learns. The gold standard for determining this is multi-section courses with common final exams. This is related to some assessment of a form of learning. I know already that the very first question on the form is a very bad question: "I came very well prepared for class." About 50% of the students do not know what that question even means. There are questions about inter-rater reliability from psychometric data like that.

There is something about 2 particular

questions about 'the instructor taught this course well' & 'I learned what I needed to from this course' that need re-evaluation.

Also, we're currently running at about a 60% response rate. We would never go back [to paper & pencil assessment.] With a lower number of core items, we could improve this. If there are questions that you would like to have, that could help. We are dangerously close to lower than 50% for some response rates in some places. Those are the things that are of most concern.

Justin Gibbs, Sociology: There is currently bias in terms of race & gender, as well as the appointment status of the faculty member. Those who don't seem to fare as well include part-time faculty, Contingent faculty and Tenure Track Assistant Professors. These forms are used for reappointment.

Professor Ducette: Some groups have a lot more at stake than others. I don't know how other colleges do it. In the College of Education, we try not to revert back only to numbers. That's one of my problems with the HML system. It is too easy to look only at L's. I hope people don't do that. I hope that there are other things that you do to assess teaching. Get to know your adjuncts. What simpler systems we need to incorporate, we need to discuss. People do worry about gender, race & other stuff and it's in the literature. I've done this for 30 years & longer. I used to be a stronger believer in SFFs than I currently am. Flow of the literature on this is currently more against than for. I suppose anything is on the table, but I assume that Middle States requires SOME form of assessment of instruction. My expectation is that by summer session of 2018, we'll have an easier version with assessment for laboratory items & other modifications.

Kimmika Williams Witherspoon (TFMA): With regard to the contingent faculty & everyone, too often it is used for retention, promotion etc. The problem is that faculty have no way of responding to these. With regard to race & gender, those metrics are used to eliminate diversity. I'm wondering if there is a way to create a faculty response to these before they go into the record. There are those who have pizza parties before the students fill these out &

	<p>then the students don't fill them out anyway!</p> <p>Professor Ducette: The literature is supportive of the fact that you get fewer comments online, but if you get them, they're quite nuanced &amp; usually more positive.</p> <p>Gina Calzaferri (AOI Committee): If faculty can talk about context of a course right in the form, we reduce the number...</p> <p>Kimmika Williams Witherspoon (TFMA): I'm talking specifically about once the information is compiled about responding to negative commentary. A teacher friend of mine was let go based on these forms, and was widely considered to be a valuable asset to our faculty. Could this be part of the conversation?</p> <p>Professor Ducette: Yes.</p> <p>Paul LaFollette (CST): One of the promises made to us was that CATEs would never be used as personnel matters. That lasted about 30 seconds. I wonder if your committee would consider that these could not be used for hiring decisions!</p> <p>Professor Ducette: There are universities where the faculty contract refuses to let student evaluations be used for promotion &amp; tenure. The politics of that is interesting to think about. Anything is on the table at this time. There might be some issues about that too, but that's clearly not where the intent is. So as I say, if I'm invited back, I will give periodic presentations about where we are, and I will come &amp; get them.</p>	
6. Old Business	1. None.	
7. New Business	1. None.	
8. Adjournment	Thank you all for coming. Good luck with the snow!	Adjourned at 3:00 p.m.
Respectfully submitted, <i>Sue Dickey</i> Sue Dickey, PhD, RN, Associate Professor (Nursing/CPH) & Faculty Senate Secretary, 2016-18		

Next meeting: Representative Faculty Senate, date TBA, September, 2018

SBD/sbd 3-20-18. Revised 6-27-18.