

Summary of Feedback on Spring 2018 Policy Revisions:

Comment:

In 4.9.1, it mentions that there's a six-year cycle instead of the current 3-year rotation; am I understanding it correctly that non-probationary faculty would only have to have one classroom observation, for example, every six years?

Also, out of curiosity, what was the reason for evaluating new faculty in the first year rather than the first semester?

Response:

For 4.9.1, the intent with the change is to place equal value on different sources/types of evaluation feedback to obtain a more holistic perspective. As written, the three-year cycle prioritizes student evaluation of teaching and a supervisor's observation over other forms of feedback.

With respect to student evaluations, not only is there a low and bimodal response rate for the online evaluations, the evaluations themselves are often biased. A large number of studies have consistently found bias against women and marginalized populations in evaluations of teaching. See here for an op-ed on the subject that contains links to some of those studies (<https://www.insidehighered.com/advice/2018/02/09/teaching-evaluations-are-often-used-confirm-worst-stereotypes-about-women-faculty>) and here for a couple other recent articles on the subject: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/S0047272716301591> & https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3129019 & https://academicworks.cuny.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1166&context=qc_public

A classroom observation is valuable, but we had a lot of discussion about whether that classroom observation had to be done by a dean or if it could also be done by an academic peer. We felt there was value in getting the input from a colleague's perspective, particularly when that colleague may have more developed knowledge on the content covered. So, if a peer observation and a dean observation are both part of the evaluation process, then there is still a classroom observation twice in three years' time, it's simply a shift in who does that observation.

The change in language for the schedule for evaluating new faculty does not preclude that observation happening in the first semester, but it does recognize that that doesn't always happen. In the past, we have been out of compliance with our own policy. We felt it was necessary to consider the feasibility of the policy as written. Allowing for evaluations for new faculty to occur over an academic year can potentially help avoid situations where an evaluation "falls through the cracks," simply because of a shortage of time. Additionally, in the case of new faculty, the interview process has allowed for a review their teaching portfolio and, in the case of a new probationary faculty member, a teaching demo.

Reply:

Thank you. This is clear and helpful.

Comment:

I handle the Credit for Prior Learning in the advising center (PLA and CLEP). I see a few issues with the way the procedures are currently written.

Procedure Information

Number: 3.35.1

Name: Credit for Prior Learning Procedure

Under Subpart B - Course-Specific Examinations Designed by College Faculty

1. **Under 1.** It states that there is a list of a “Course-Specific Examinations” are available on the website. (I do not know of any place on the website that has this list. Many times when I approach faculty, they do not even know about this option.)
2. **Under a.** It currently states that the VP of success will be the first contact to students who are enquiring about prior learning assessments. (this is not really accurate)
3. **Under e.** It states that a student will either get a Pass or a F for failure. This seems odd. Wouldn't it be a NC. As a P does not affect GPA but a F would. Also, the evaluation form used asks “If a letter grade we to be given, it would be...?” (see attached form)

Response:

1. We will remove the reference to the website.
2. We will confirm who this would be and update to the correct person.
3. Yes, it should be Credit/No Credit. The “letter grade if given” portion is relevant for courses in a transfer pathway that may require a specific letter grade or higher for the course to count in the pathway.

Comment:

Should something related to the Title IX Pregnancy accommodation requirements be in this policy or procedure? In advising, we often get questions from students regarding missing classes due to pregnancy or childbirth and it seems like faculty are not aware of the Title IX rules around it.

Response:

This information is covered in our 1.B.1 policy, which reverts to Minnesota State Board Policy. We can insert a sentence referring to that policy as it relates back to MN State Board Policy 1.B.1.