

**STUDENT ACADEMIC POLICIES COMMITTEE
MEETING AGENDA**

**Friday, January 22, 2021
12 Noon (or as soon as your class ends)**

Minutes (Catherine)

- approval of minutes from meeting of 12-15-2020

Academic Dishonesty update: brief summary of report presentation to the Academic Senate later today

S.E.T. – ongoing discussion

- What did we decide about inviting Scott Segalawitz to a future meeting re/the Academic Dishonesty survey? After our SET report is submitted to ECAS?
- Update re/expectation to use multiple measures for faculty evaluations:

From Tom Skill: “This senate document, while not comprehensive in offering alternate assessments, does clearly state that SET scores cannot be used as the sole indicator of teaching effectiveness. While student evaluations can play a useful role in evaluating the teaching abilities of faculty members, those evaluations are subject to limitations as evaluative tools. Therefore, for purposes of promotion, tenure, or merit pay adjustments, student evaluations of faculty shall not be used as the sole criterion for judging a faculty member’s teaching effectiveness.”

https://ecommons.udayton.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1036&context=senate_docs

From Carolyn Phelps: “The use of multiple measures was also stated in the draft policy on evaluation of teaching that was moved forward as a recommendation by PRoPT (group formed for Policy Review of Promotion and Tenure)

Summary of SAPC points to date regarding SET:

- The critical issue regarding SET is how it should be used and is used; units must employ multiple measures to evaluate faculty for merit and promotion & tenure; there is a need to put into practice the recommendations of the UPATTF and the PRoPT for Departments to evaluate faculty with multiple measures, not just SET
- Having some kind of faculty evaluation is important and probably necessary; UD’s tool, while not ideal, is an example of one that has been thoroughly researched, well-developed, and carefully written, and probably doesn’t warrant SAPC time to create a new one because no real flaws are observed; student input is needed and important
- SET needs to be administered in person to increase the response rate

- Students need more guidance about the purpose of SET and their responsibilities in filling out the forms
- Faculty need more guidance in preparing to administer SET and how to read and interpret resulting scores and comments, both for themselves and other colleagues
- Faculty must have opportunities to speak about their scores and comments with Chairs and other administrators
- Chairs and other administrators need training for reading and interpreting SET
- Faculty should be encouraged to use other tools for self-evaluation throughout each semester, both for their own information and to demonstrate to students the importance of their suggestions; Isidore check-in tool and Midterm Diagnostic tool can be helpful
- Faculty should have opportunities to review their SET scores and comments with Chairs and other administrators before information is used and without fear of retribution
- SAPC agrees that harassing comments representing threats to faculty life and safety should be flagged and shared immediately with Chairs and other administrators

The SAPC believes there is a need to balance harassing comments with....

- The need for some evaluation tool for student feedback
- Freedom of speech rights
- Faculty protection of safety and health
- The voice of the student as the 'customer'
- University's current efforts to eliminate inherent racism in the evaluation process

Reminder: The charge from ECAS is for the SAPC to have a recommendation report on SET ready for ECAS and then for the Academic Senate by mid-February

Lee Dixon and Sharon Gratto, Co-Chairs