

Minutes of the UCT

Friday, April 7, 2006

10:30-12:00 A.M., Bourneuf House

Present were : Chris Hepburn, chair, F. Yen, B. Petrie, M. J. Hughes, S. Barrett, D. Willis, and for part of the time Pat De Leeuw and Acad. Vice President Bert Garza

Report from the TAME and TAM grant subcommittee:

5 TAME grants and 14 TAM grants were awarded, \$7,740 and \$143, 485,000 respectively to be granted. Some money has been held back for last-minute TAMES.

Issues discussed included:

The attempt to make salary demands uniform for these grants.

Concern with repeated grant applications from the same people.

Need for chairs or deans to rank applicants lest they disadvantage applicants.

Need for feedback from previous grantees. We agreed to send a letter to last year's TAMS asking for a report and to include on the application form questions about previous TAM grants in the last 5 years, and if so for how much and what was accomplished by the grantee.

Discussion of online course evaluations, with Pat De Leeuw present and for the latter half hour, Acad. Vice President Bert Garza:

Starting April 10, faculty have one week to add questions to the online evaluations. On behalf of Louise Lonabocker, Pat De Leeuw asked each of us to add a question so that the results could be analyzed. Faculty should be reminded that responses to Part C go only to the faculty member.

We agreed that the goal for publishing the results of online evaluations should be as follows:

Part A should be made available to students from courses of ten or more students when the response rate of 70% has been reached. Courses should have at least 5 students to be evaluated, unless specifically requested by instructors, in order to protect confidentiality. These results would be password protected, for the BC community only. They might also be made to be read only, not printable.

Much discussion then ensued as to how to make this process constructive, and to protect teachers of threatening or politically charged material, or controversial points of view, and also how to avoid professors' s attempts to gain popularity at the expense of rigor. How also to support faculty with low ratings in a constructive way? Dean Garza suggested that publishing evaluations would encourage pride in teaching and that we can always go back and revise the process on the basis of more information.

We agreed to consider rewording the questions in Part A in subsequent meetings, especially to distinguish between the evaluation of the professor and the evaluation of the course itself.

We also agreed to get information from other schools with online evaluations, especially with respect to correlations with grade inflation.

Dr. Garza told us that the decision to make the results of Part A public would be issued from the Office of the Academic Vice-President.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Joe Hughes

