

## CEPP meeting October 10, 2012

### Minutes

**In attendance:** Michael Arnush (Chair); Peter von Allmen, Josh Ness, Beau Breslin, Chris Kopec, Bill Lewis, Benjamin Bechand ('14), Emily Kowal ('13) and Hope Casto.

Guest: Mark Hoffman (Math and Computer Science), CAPT.

#### "Dean's Card" discussion

- Role of CAPT: Current members of CAPT think it inappropriate to comment in an open forum on the content of the Dean's Card revision since they must use the forms for current evaluative purposes. Past members of CAPT may be resources to shed light on the use of the current or former Dean's Card in previous tenure and promotion decisions.
- Role of CEPP: In the past two years of discussions, CEPP has been interested in the use of a revised Dean's Card for pedagogical development purposes, both for instructors to see strengths and weaknesses in their teaching and perhaps an overall improvement of teaching on campus. CEPP questions what its role is in leading an effort to revise the Dean's Card as an evaluative tool, and acknowledges that it is the most appropriate committee to bring the form to the faculty for consideration.
- Content of revised Dean's Card: Discussion of the components and the 'big questions' (nos. 8, 20 and 24) included the possibility that while the 'big questions' are similar to the current Dean's Card, the questions that precede 8 and 20 will lead students to more nuanced answers to the 'big questions'. From Pilot (Spring 2011) data analysis the component questions are highly correlated with one another but the 'big questions' are not averages of those components but tend to be lower. Analyses also indicated that responses to all three big questions in the pilot (#8, 20 and 24) were correlated with the answers to their counterparts in the conventional form (i.e., individual faculty that were rated highly in one of these components in the conventional form were rated highly in the corresponding question in the pilot), although the values for #24 in the pilot were lower than the values in the conventional form. One explanation is that the possible responses to #24 differ from those provided in the conventional form ("Much more ... to much less than most courses" as opposed to the 1-5 scale). The question was raised whether or not these 'big questions' are needed and if the component questions and an average may be a more useful set of information.
- Use of revised Dean's Card: Unresolved and important issues seem to hinge on the implementation and use of the revised Dean's Card. A faculty discussion will need to occur to answer the question of what information the instructor, the Department Chair and CAPT will see (e.g., just #8,20,24 or all information, or somewhere in between). In addition, the implementation for new faculty, untenured faculty, and tenured faculty will need to be planned and concerns of those 'mid-stream' will need to be addressed.
- Implications for department 'long forms': Discussion of the implication of department long forms included that some departments' forms may become obsolete with most of their

questions being represented on the revised Dean's Card. The responsibility lies with individual departments to revise long forms; however, DOF/CAPT can offer advice or models that work well.

- Next steps: CEPP in partnership with DOF and in consultation with CAPT will move forward with a faculty discussion of the current version of the revised Dean's Card. A proposal or an organized discussion with faculty can include issues of implementation and use of the revised form. CEPP will consult SGA and/or Academic council about the revised Dean's Card as well.

#### Minutes

- Minutes approved for October 3, 2012

#### Culture-Centered Inquiry Proposal

- Next steps: CEPP will move ahead with this proposal. The chair will distribute it to the faculty via email and the next conversation will be with SGA on 10/16.

Respectfully submitted,  
Hope Casto