I. Call to Order: Chair Keith Renshaw called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m.

II. Approval of the Minutes of February 7, 2018: The minutes were approved.

III. Announcements

Chair Renshaw: A motion is forthcoming in a later meeting regarding Stanley Zoltek. A memorial service is scheduled for the second weekend of Spring break (Sunday March 18).

President Cabrera provided remarks, noting at first sadness at the loss of Zoltek. He presented information about the legislative session and the budget. The President noted that before he left office, Governor McAuliffe put in a significant increase in operating dollars and financial aid increase ($42M) to Mason to the budget. We also fared well in both the House and Senate versions of the budget, including additional operating, financial aid funds and a capital appropriation to extend science and engineering facilities in Prince William campus. Bull Run Hall was designed for classrooms, for example. There is an agreement to provide $21M additional to both appropriations in the House and Senate. The conferees are in closed session, and because there is a pretty sizable disparity between the House and Senate regarding the expansion of Medicaid, the future of the budget is unclear. One of the two budgets provides a
sizable raise toward the end of the biennial, the other provides no raise to state employees. The university is hoping for an allocation of funds for salary increases. If not, there is the desire for the legislature to allow institutions to have some level of authority to do what they want to do for employees.

There was a surprise in the House budget bill: to create a cybersecurity center in northern Virginia – an area critical to the future in northern Virginia. Part of the language includes Virginia Tech in charge of managing center. We are in conversation with them as we want to be part of the project.

Questions/Comments
A Senator noted that consultations have taken place regarding need for more lab spaces; are we going to do more consultations on the need for space, specifically at SciTech?
President Cabrera: No, when approved a few years ago, was the changes at SciTech were approved for a specific purpose. In doing analyses with deans and looking at trends, we need more lab space in sciences and engineering. Lab space is much more costly than other space.

A Senator asked President Cabrera to comment on fundraising, followed up by a second question about the endowment.
President Cabrera: It’s going very well, we met our fundraising objective of $500M goal by December 2017 (last year). The BOV agreed not to close it, to keep going. We may be able to raise up to $600M. The endowment is going extremely well percentage point-wise. It is now $80M from $50M, going in the right direction.

Questions were posed about transparency of gift agreements from donors, including the possibility of gifts from anonymous donors especially for research as there is a concern for protecting academic integrity. Additional comments around the discussions occurring in the Institutional Conflict of Interest Committee regarding guidelines to guard against conflicts-of-interest in donations, including a reference to the ongoing lawsuit.

President Cabrera noted that the lawsuit is against GMU Foundation, which is a private entity. After explaining the details of how the lawsuit is currently structured, President Cabrera noted that he was not aware of any anonymous gifts we’re received funding research contracts. There are not many anonymous donors. He also noted that the university had turned down gifts from donors when the donors would not agree to the conditions set by the university. However the university continues to need more funding.

A Senator noted that the Institutional Conflict of Interest Committee had submitted questions to University Advancement and the Foundation and were still waiting for a response.

Chair Keith Renshaw noted that he had heard from Janet Bingham (Vice President, University Advancement and Alumni Relations and President, GMU Foundation) today and they hope to have answers back any day.

President Cabrera then noted the significant gains in the number of minority faculty, as this has increased by 4.7 points (about 20%). Among Virginia peer institutions we have moved from the lower end to the mean level. Highlighting the fact that Mason is the driver of higher education growth in Virginia, President Cabrera pointed back to the Strategic Plan and the goal to graduate 100,000 career ready graduates by 2024, that our students have no gaps in outcomes and have among the lowest student loan default rates.
President Cabrera closed his remarks by discussing the innovations and opportunities ahead, from the new advisory group to the Vice President for Academic Innovation and New Ventures, the Wylie partnership, the Online Virginia Network, the ADVANCE Partnership with NOVA, and the possibility of Amazon’s HQ2 (second headquarters) moving to northern Virginia.

Chair Renshaw reminded Senators about the additional Faculty Senate Meeting: March 28 3:00 – 4:15. Ballots for the Provost Evaluation Committee have been distributed. He appealed to Senators to volunteer to fill a vacancy on the Organization and Operations Committee; no one has offered to serve yet.

IV. Committee Reports
A. Senate Standing Committees
   Executive Committee – no report.

   Academic Policies – Suzanne Slayden, Chair
   The 2018 Summer Term Calendar as submitted by the Registrar and reviewed by the Committee appears in see Attachment A.

   This year, the Add and Drop deadlines, and the Selective Withdrawal periods have been adjusted to be proportional to those of the 15-week semesters.

   Because of the many meeting time blocks in each summer session (1, A, B, C, D) and the difficulty in administering three unique deadlines for each, the deadlines for each session correspond to the latest deadline date for all the time blocks in the session.

   The Academic Policies Committee recommends that the Faculty Senate approve the 2018 Summer Term Calendar with the understanding that the individual summer session calendars will still be submitted to the Faculty Senate by the Registrar the preceding fall.

   The motion was approved.

   Budget and Resources – Tim Leslie, Chair
   The salary data has been posted. This elicited many comments and questions, some of which were directed to Human Resources.

   Faculty Matters - no report

   Nominations – Mark Addleson, Chair
   James Metcalf (CHHS) is nominated for the Grievance Committee. Two additional nominations were made and seconded from the floor: John Riskind (CHSS) and Peggy King Sears (CEHD). Their statements of interest appear below:

   John Riskind
   Professor, Psychology
   College of Humanities and Social Sciences
Statement of Interest to serve on the Grievance Committee:

I am interested in serving on the Grievance Committee. I have a lot of experience on the Grievance Committee and served on it a few years ago. I believe that this committee is important because it is one of the few places that faculty can have their voices heard and seek redress and would look forward to serving on the committee again.

Editor:
International Journal of Cognitive Therapy

Former Editor:
Journal of Cognitive Psychotherapy

Former Associate Editor:
Cognitive Therapy and Research

Cognitive Vulnerability to Anxiety Research Lab Website
http://www.cvastudies.org

Peggy King-Sears
Professor, Division of Special Education and disAbilities Research
College of Education and Human Development

Statement of Interest to serve on the Grievance Committee

I’ve been a professor in the Division of Special Education and disAbilities Research since 2005. Throughout my career in special education, I’ve had numerous grants that have required a great deal of collaboration. In fact, my most recent book is titled “Collaborative Teaming.” In the field of special education, there are a number of different stakeholders who are invested in effective education for children and adolescents with disabilities, so I’ve had many experiences navigating between and among those stakeholders to reach decisions that ultimately work best for students. I believe I’m a particularly good fit for the Grievance Committee because of my experiences with parents, administrators, and teachers when they do not perceive things as “fair” for students. That is, many different perspectives come into play, all of which deserve equitable consideration and attention.

While at my previous university, I coordinated multiple teacher preparation programs, including hiring and preparing many adjunct faculty. When there were issues between students and faculty, I was involved, and my focus was on reaching a solution that was fair and equitable for FACULTY and STUDENTS.

Based on my experiences, I believe I am a good match for the position on GMU’s Grievance Committee.

James A. Metcalf
Professor, Global and Community Health
College of Health and Human Services

Statement of Interest to serve on the Grievance Committee:

This important committee protects both the institution and its faculty.

Relevant Experience: I have been a senator (numerous terms). I have also filed grievances of my own over the years. Strong and principled faculty helped then and I am willing to do the same for other faculty.

No candidate received a majority of the vote. There was a run-off election between the two candidates who received the most votes, John Riskind (CHSS) and Peggy King-Sears (CEHD). Peggy King-Sears received the majority of the votes on the second ballot and was elected to fill the vacancy on the Grievance Committee.

Organization and Operations – Lisa Billingham, Chair
Apportionment of Senate Seats 2018-19 was presented. See Attachment B. Due to two digit extension math, the committee rounded down the number of Senators from 51 to 50. The committee continues to work on language regarding the Faculty Support Liaison.

B. Other Committees/Faculty Representatives
Mason Core Committee – Melissa Broeckelman-Post, Co-chair
Proposed Changes to IT/Ethics – 2nd view and vote

Reminded the Senate of the previous meeting’s discussion regarding changing the IT/Ethics Mason Core category to a single, three-credit IT category. The proposal and the learning outcomes were included in the agenda attachment.

An amendment was made and seconded to insert “and computing” in the title “Proposed IT Outcomes” so that it reads “Proposed IT and Computing Outcomes” and also to insert “and computing” in the penultimate statement “Students can use appropriate information and computing technologies to organize and analyze information and use it to guide decision-making.” The amendments were approved. With no additional discussion, the motion as amended was approved. Below is the approved change to the Mason Core IT/Ethics requirement as voted on in Senate. Approved amendments appear in yellow throughout.

Proposed IT and Computing Outcomes
Approved by Mason Core Committee on 1/29/2018

Information technology and computing can significantly augment humans' ability to produce, consume, process, and communicate information. Thus, students need to understand ways to use such technology to enhance their lives, careers, and society, while being mindful of challenges such as security, source reliability, automation, and ethical implications. These factors have made it essential for students to understand how to
effectively navigate the evolving technological landscape. IT courses offered in the majors may focus on disciplinary applications and concerns of information technology.

IT courses meet the following learning outcomes:

- Students will understand the principles of information storage, exchange, security, and privacy and be aware of related ethical issues.
- Students will become critical consumers of digital information; they will be capable of selecting and evaluating appropriate, relevant, and trustworthy sources of information.
- Students can use appropriate information and computing technologies to organize and analyze information and use it to guide decision-making.
- Students will be able to choose and apply appropriate algorithmic methods to solve a problem.

For reference: Current IT/Ethics Outcomes, which will be deleted

Learning Outcomes:

Almost no area of academic, professional, or personal life is untouched by the information technology revolution. Success in college and beyond requires computer and information literacies that are flexible enough to change with a changing IT environment and adaptable to new problems and tasks.

The purpose of the information technology requirement is to ensure that students achieve an essential understanding of information technology infrastructure encompassing systems and devices; learn to make the most of the Web and other network resources; protect their digital data and devices; take advantage of latest technologies; and become more sophisticated technology users and consumers.

Courses meeting the “IT only” requirement must address learning outcomes 1 and 2, and one additional outcome. Courses meeting “IT with Ethics component” must address outcomes 1, 2, 3, and 5. Courses meeting the only IT Ethics component must address outcomes 3 and 5.

1. Students will be able to use technology to locate, access, evaluate, and use information, and appropriately cite resources from digital/electronic media.
2. Students will understand the core IT concepts in a range of current and emerging technologies and learn to apply appropriate technologies to a range of tasks.
3. Students will understand many of the key ethical, legal and social issues related to information technology and how to interpret and comply with ethical principles, laws, regulations, and institutional policies.
4. Students will demonstrate the ability to communicate, create, and collaborate effectively using state-of-the-art information technologies in multiple modalities.
5. Students will understand the essential issues related to information security, how to take precautions and use techniques and tools to defend against computer crimes.

Required: One approved 3-credit course that meets all IT requirements, or completion of an appropriate combination of courses.
Faculty Handbook Committee - Suzanne Slayden, Chair

Faculty Handbook Revisions 2017-2018

At the March 7, 2018 Faculty Senate meeting, revisions will be presented for the first time to selected sections in Chapter 2.

The revisions are posted on the Faculty Senate website at: http://www.gmu.edu/resources/facstaff/senate/FacultyHandbook/2018-FacultyHandbook-revision-2-28-18.pdf

Proposed Revisions to the Faculty Handbook

New text is underlined and deleted text appears with strike-through.

Right Side: Handbook as it will appear if the changes on the left side are approved.

The full text of the current Faculty Handbook can be found at http://www.gmu.edu/resources/facstaff/handbook/.

Faculty Handbook Revision Committee:

Alan Abramson (SSPG), Cynthia Lum (CHSS), Suzanne Slayden (COS)

Provost's Office: Renate Guilford

Human Resources: Michelle Lim

Discussion was encouraged around the presented suggested changes. Faculty were encouraged to submit any ideas/revisions to the committee. Senators were reminded that the material applies to tenure-stream faculty, but will also in time apply to term faculty.

Specific discussion ensued around the composition of the second level review committee (the relevant revised section is included below).

Section 2.7.3 (p. 6) (proposed additions in bold italics, deletions)

“The purpose of the second level review committee is to evaluate all the candidates for promotion and/or tenure in the school/college and to make a recommendation to the Dean. In all cases, The second level of review is carried out by a peer elected committee of tenured faculty, none of whom hold administrative appointments at or above the level of a Dean. The committee members are elected by of the college/school in accordance with its bylaws or standing rules (Section 1.3.3). The second level review committee can include members from outside the college/school who are elected in the same manner as other members of the second-level review committee.”

Effective Teaching Committee - Lorraine Valdez-Pierce, Chair

Proposed Pilot of Changes to Student Ratings of Instruction Form
Motion to Faculty Senate – Course Evaluation Form

The Effective Teaching Committee is charged with developing and helping implement procedures that encourage and reward effective teaching, enabling faculty to improve their teaching effectiveness independent of any evaluation procedures, and implementing procedures for evaluation of effective teaching.

The Committee is charged with recommending policy to the Faculty Senate and monitoring the use of such policy for the evaluation of teachers and courses, including the following:

- A. Review, improve, and provide guidance to Institutional Research and Reporting on the course evaluation form and related procedures at least once every three years;
- B. Review existing policies relating to the faculty evaluation process, identify alternatives to these policies and recommend changes to the Faculty Senate;
- C. Work closely with the Center for Teaching Excellence to support the use of formative and self-assessment techniques and materials for promoting faculty professional growth and teaching effectiveness, including strategies for robust student feedback.

Developing a New Course Evaluation Form – 2014 – 2018

The primary task which the Committee has undertaken since 2014 is making recommendations for revising the Course Evaluation Form. This form last underwent significant revision in 2008. The Committee decided to undertake a rigorous development and review process based on measurement principles and those used for personnel evaluation.

To validate a new form, input has been obtained from a variety of sources, including a review of research on student evaluations of faculty teaching, two online surveys of all faculty at Mason (2014-16), a survey of a stratified random sample of Mason students (2017), a survey of all university Deans & Directors (2016), and a survey of Faculty Evaluation Teams across the university (2016). In addition, we have reviewed the criteria for excellence in teaching proposed by both the Provost’s Office and the Center for Teaching & Faculty Excellence, and we have collaborated with the Office of Institutional Research & Effectiveness, the Provost’s Office, the Center for Teaching & Faculty Excellence, and the Faculty Senate.

An analysis of the literature and survey data revealed several distinct categories of importance with regard to effective teaching. The six categories consistently identified with effective teaching across all stakeholders were:

- Communication with students
- Student engagement
- Learning outcomes
- Preparation & organization
- Respect for students
- Passion for/Commitment to teaching
Based on these identified categories of effective teaching, we scoured the literature for sample items that reflected each category. We added items for online courses. The resulting 21 items are now being proposed, with an additional six items on student demographics, and several optional items on uses of technology. Our intention is to reduce the total number of items for the final form after piloting the identified items.

Further, to identify the usefulness and clarity of each item under consideration for the new form, Focus Groups and additional online surveys were conducted with several faculty and student groups during Feb. 2018 to gather additional input from stakeholders before finalizing and piloting the new form (see draft Course Evaluation Form on the next page).

The next task of the Committee will be to pilot the proposed items with online courses in May 2018 and with face-to-face courses in December 2018.

Thus, the Committee moves:

That the Faculty Senate recommend that the Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness (OIRE) conduct a pilot evaluation of the draft student ratings of instruction form, as shown on the next page, this Spring 2018 with online courses.

All faculty teaching online courses in Spring 2018 are eligible to participate in the pilot testing of the new form, with the conditions that they must have approval from their program chair and have taught the course being evaluated online at least once in past 12 months. Tenure-track, term, and adjunct faculty willing to participate would need assurance from program chairs or evaluation teams that pilot results would not be used for making employment decisions.

In December 2018, a second pilot test of the form with face-to-face courses should be made, after having made revisions based on the May 2018 administration.

Respectfully submitted by Members of the Effective Teaching Committee
On March 7, 2018

Mihai Boicu, Volgenau Schl. of Engineering
Esperanza Roman-Mendoza, College of Humanities & Social Sciences (CHSS), Faculty Senator
Tom Wood, Schl. of Integrative Studies, CHSS
Alexandria Zylstra, Schl. of Business
Lorraine V. Pierce, Chair, Graduate Schl. of Education, CEHD

Background Information and References:

Professor Valdez Pierce presented a brief slide presentation containing highlights of the report:

- The Review Process:
  - Rigorous measurement development process
  - Grounded in multi-disciplinary research
  - Effective teaching
• Personnel evaluation
• Bias in student ratings
• Psychometric considerations
• Online response rates
• Various university databases

• Stakeholder Input:
  o Online surveys - Faculty all programs, Students – graduate and undergraduate
  o Focus groups – students and faculty
  o Faculty Evaluation Committees
  o Deans and Directors
  o Center for Teaching and Faculty Excellence
  o Office of Digital Learning
  o Office of the Provost
  o Office of Institutional Research and Effectiveness

• Key Findings:
  o Learning Outcomes
  o Student Engagement
  o Preparation and Organization
  o Communication
  o Commitment and Passion
  o Respect.

• Validation Process:
  o Identity constructs - *identify multiple items per construct*
  o Stakeholder feedback
  o Pilot test - May 2018 – online courses only;
    December 2018 – face-to-face courses only

**Discussion/Questions:** It was noted that a faculty member has to have taught an online course at least once before participation in pilot testing of new form. Questions arose around the number of items and the requirement of including student information.

**The motion was seconded and approved.**
# Course Evaluation Form

**George Mason University**  
**Course Evaluation Form**  
**Draft for May 2018 Pilot**  

Course Title (e.g., HIST 101 001) ___________________________ Instructors Name ___________________________

## Student Information

1) What is your class level?  
- [ ] Fresh.  
- [ ] Soph.  
- [ ] Junior  
- [ ] Senior  
- [ ] Mast.  
- [ ] Doct.  
- [ ] Other  

2) For your plan of study, this course is:  
- [ ] a required course  
- [ ] elective course  
- [ ] Mason Core/ general education course  
- [ ] Other  

3) What is the class format/delivery?  
- [ ] Face-to-face  
- [ ] Hybrid  
- [ ] Online  

4) How many times were you absent from class sessions?  
- [ ] 0-1  
- [ ] 2-3  
- [ ] 4-5  
- [ ] 6-7  
- [ ] 8 or more  
- [ ] N/A  

5) On average, how many hours per week outside of class did you spend preparing for this class?  
- [ ] 1-3  
- [ ] 4-6  
- [ ] 7-9  
- [ ] 10 or more hours  

6) What grade do you expect in this course?  
- [ ] A  
- [ ] B  
- [ ] C  
- [ ] D  
- [ ] F  
- [ ] Pass  
- [ ] Fail  
- [ ] Other  

## Please thoughtfully consider the following statements and indicate your level of agreement or disagreement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree nor Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>N/A or Unknown</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7) I completed all assigned tasks before each class.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) I consistently contributed to class activities/discussions.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Instructional technologies, resources/tools used in this course increased my engagement with course content.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) The instructor created a learning environment that effectively encouraged my engagement with course content.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) The instructor encouraged expression of diverse perspectives.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Learning Outcomes

12) I gained an understanding of the main concepts in this course.  
- [ ] ☐  
- [ ] ☐  
- [ ] ☐  
- [ ] ☐  
- [ ] ☐  

13) I learned to think critically about issues in this area.  
- [ ] ☐  
- [ ] ☐  
- [ ] ☐  
- [ ] ☐  
- [ ] ☐  

14) The course provided a variety of learning opportunities (e.g. exams, assignments, projects, papers, discussions, group work, peer review).  
- [ ] ☐  
- [ ] ☐  
- [ ] ☐  
- [ ] ☐  
- [ ] ☐  

15) The instructor’s feedback helped me learn.  
- [ ] ☐  
- [ ] ☐  
- [ ] ☐  
- [ ] ☐  
- [ ] ☐  

16) The instructor’s teaching methods/style encouraged my learning.  
- [ ] ☐  
- [ ] ☐  
- [ ] ☐  
- [ ] ☐  
- [ ] ☐  

## Instructor Engagement

17) The instructor treated students with respect.  
- [ ] ☐  
- [ ] ☐  
- [ ] ☐  
- [ ] ☐  
- [ ] ☐  

18) The instructor’s commitment to the course subject matter had a positive effect on my learning.  
- [ ] ☐  
- [ ] ☐  
- [ ] ☐  
- [ ] ☐  
- [ ] ☐  

19) The instructor offered opportunities for students to provide feedback on the course.  
- [ ] ☐  
- [ ] ☐  
- [ ] ☐  
- [ ] ☐  
- [ ] ☐  

Please rate your agreement or disagreement using the following scale:

- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Agree
- Strongly Agree
- N/A or Unknown
20) The instructor offered opportunities to meet outside of class time, such as virtual or in-person office hours.

Instructor Preparation and Course Organization

21) The course materials were well organized.

22) The instructor clearly communicated the course expectations to students.

23) The instructor clearly delivered/presented the course content.

Optional questions on use of technology (can be added as supplemental questions 1-3 below)

24) Navigation throughout the online components of the course was appropriate for the complexity of the course.

25) The course directed students to technology resources to help them succeed in an online learning environment.

Additional questions added by the program or course instructor

1) 

2) 

3) 

Please respond to the following questions

1) Were there any significant obstacles to learning that were beyond the control of the instructor (e.g., scheduling or technology problems, university closings, limitations caused by other students or by group dynamics)? If so, please explain.

2) What 2 – 3 aspects of this course were most valuable to your learning experience?

   -
   -
   -

3) What 2 – 3 aspects of this course were least valuable to your learning experience?

   -
   -
   -

4) What modifications do you suggest for the next time the course is taught?

Optional open-ended question on use of technology

5) To what extent did the technology used in this course (e.g., Blackboard, synchronous learning, discussion board, Wikis) facilitate your learning?

Thank you for your feedback
V. New Business
CEHD Proposed Pilot: New Student Rating of Instruction Form - presented by Senator (Dominique Banville)

Proposed Piloting of a New Student Evaluation of Teaching Form

(This form was developed by a CEHD Task Force)

BACKGROUND

1. During 2016-17 an ad hoc CEHD Task Force developed and "beta tested" a new student evaluation of teaching form in response to a recommendation from Mason's Effective Teaching Committee (2015 Annual Report):

"To address faculty concerns with the current Course Evaluation form..., the Committee recommends the following actions: (1) Establish a university-wide competition for faculty and students to draft a new course evaluation form, pilot it, and validate it..."

2. The Task Force had two primary objectives. The first was to greatly increase the unacceptably low response rate that has been typical for online student evaluations. Two methods were used to accomplish this objective:

   (a) dramatically shorten the length of the form (from 16 to 4 items); and
   (b) initiate the online administration process with a personal, motivationally compelling invitation from the College Dean focused on "helping your fellow Patriots."

3. The second Task Force objective was to significantly increase the validity of the assessment (within the boundaries of what is possible from student perceptions) by eliminating all items describing instructor behaviors and focusing solely on learning outcomes caused by the instructor. The tendency to measure instructor actions rather than instructor accomplishments reflects deeply ingrained behavioristic assumptions about linear causality. Yet effective teaching is about versatility, not about enacting "correct" behaviors that will work for all students in all contexts. There are many different pathways to the same learning outcome (equifinality principle).

   In addition, an entirely new set of open-ended questions was developed. These questions were worded using simple, concrete, action-oriented language focused on practical ways to improve (or maintain excellence in) teaching.

4. Beta testing of the new student evaluation form with 8 classes indicated that students liked the new form and found it to be easy to fill out. A majority of respondents preferred the new form ("[it] asks more questions I want to answer"; "Online surveys with a lot of questions are intimidating"). The beta testing also showed that all classes with high scores on the old form also had high scores on the new form, and all classes with low scores on the old form also had low scores on the new form.
Dear student,

Please help your fellow Patriots by providing us with feedback about your experiences in this class. Your confidential responses will benefit future students while also contributing to our faculty’s ongoing professional development. Your feedback can also help us ensure that we have the right faculty teaching the right classes.

With gratitude,

Name of Dean (or Dean designee)

Answers to the following questions are for your instructor’s use only. Your confidential responses will help ensure that Mason faculty (and future Mason students) benefit from your feedback.
1. Were there any significant obstacles to learning that were beyond the control of the instructor (e.g., scheduling or technological problems, your investment of time and effort, limitations caused by other students or by group dynamics)? If so, please explain:

2. Please comment on any or all of the following topics:

   a. What should the instructor CONTINUE doing?

   b. What should the instructor STOP doing?

   c. What should the instructor START doing?

3. And finally: What would you like your instructor to know about your experience in this class?
FAQs

Why is this pilot only being conducted within just one academic unit (CEHD)?

For various technical reasons, IRR has stated that it is too late in the semester to do a pilot that is more ambitious than the one proposed in this motion. The primary goal of the proposed pilot is to see if it is possible to significantly increase the response rate for online course evaluations, which is an achievable outcome within the population of Spring 2018 CEHD online classes. If the outcome of this initial experiment is favorable, a broader pilot can be planned for Fall 2018.

What about CEHD faculty who are being reviewed for tenure, promotion, and contract renewal in 2018-19?

Because the pilot is restricted to CEHD (online) classes, the CEHD Dean’s Office can ensure that no participating faculty member scheduled for such a review is negatively impacted by this experiment. Faculty scheduled for such a review will also be given the chance to opt out of the pilot. Many course evaluations for online classes are of no value in any case due to an inadequate response rate.

If the focus is on learning outcomes, why is there a question on motivation? (Question 1: The instructor positively influenced my motivation to learn the course content and skills.)

Learning is a dynamic process that is both led and influenced by motivational processes (goals, emotions, and personal agency beliefs). Learning and motivation are thus inextricably linked. In addition, motivation related to the course can persist long after learned content is forgotten, and serve as fuel for re-engaging with and elaborating on that content. It is thus a desired outcome in its own right.

Question 2 seems familiar. Isn’t there a question very much like this on the current form?

Yes indeed – item 3 on the current form. In a recent study conducted by IRR, this item, plus, to a lesser extent, one other item focused on motivation (“...the class was intellectually stimulating”), were the only two items that had substantial and unique predictive power with respect to the “overall teaching effectiveness” question.

Some of the questions seem to be trying to measure more than one thing at once. Is that a problem?

No. There is only one measurement target (construct) for each question. This is only a problem if the words in the question lead the student to think about two different measurement targets simultaneously. The strategy in the questions on the new form is to INCREASE the validity of the item by using multiple construct-relevant words that point to the SAME measurement target.

Question #3 essentially asks students to speculate about the future. Is that wise?

At Mason, “genuine excellence” in teaching is associated with “impact beyond the boundaries of the classroom.” So, we need to ask students for their assessment of whether the instructor helped prepare them for future learning experiences, not just about the outcomes “within the boundaries of the classroom.”

Question #4 sounds kind of like the “overall teaching effectiveness” question. Doesn’t that type of question have dubious validity?
Validity is a concern for questions that are generic and abstract, but this question is neither, as it specifically targets course learning outcomes (“...content, skills, and ways of thinking covered in this course.”).

What about the extra questions that are typically added on at the end of the course evaluation form for online courses?

There are many occasions, and many methods through which an instructor can obtain feedback from students other than on the ONE occasion, through the ONE method that is used to obtain the feedback needed to make high-stakes employment decisions and to satisfy external accreditors. Those extra questions (and many others) can be posed to students in other venues, at other times.

What about the demographic questions that are usually included on a student evaluation form?

These questions are rarely ever used by faculty or by administrators.

One last question: How should the data from the four questions on this new form be aggregated?

The need to aggregate across items may be diminished given that there are only 4 items. But if a single summary number is preferred, it should be the mean of the 4 items, not the students’ response to a single item. Reliability and validity are enhanced when multiple measures of the same fundamental construct are combined.

**MOTION**

The Faculty Senate recommends that the University pilot the new student evaluation form developed by the CEHD Task Force, as shown above, in full-semester CEHD courses that will use online student ratings of instruction during the Spring 2018 semester. This pilot should be structured as an experiment (thus making it possible to compare response rates for different forms) and conducted with the understanding that any faculty member scheduled for a promotion, tenure, or tenure-track contract renewal decision in the 2018-19 cycle should be excluded from this pilot.

**THE CEHD TASK FORCE**

**Instructional faculty**
*(includes several experts in measurement and quantitative/qualitative/mixed methods)*

- Rick Brigham (full professor)
- Anna Evmenova (tenured associate professor)
- Nancy Holincheck (term assistant professor)
- Peggy King-Sears (full professor)
- Joe Maxwell (full professor, now Emeritus)
- Jenice View (tenured associate professor)

**Administrative and professional faculty**

- Martin Ford (Senior Associate Dean)
Ellen Rodgers (Associate Dean for Academic and Student Affairs)
Marie Champagne (Coordinator of Student Services)
Michelle Gnoleba (Academic Advisor)

**Classified Staff**
Mary Wilson (Compliance and Database Integrity Officer)

**Discussion:** The motion was seconded and discussion followed. Clarification was provided that this form would only be used in CEHD where faculty would volunteer to use the form. Any approval would be to collect pilot data in Spring 2018 to be reported out in the Fall. There was concern about lack of comparative data in other colleges/schools and/or class modality.

The motion was approved.

VI. **Remarks for the Good of the General Faculty:** - none.
VII. **Adjournment:** The meeting adjourned at 4:17 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Shannon N. Davis
### Summer 2018 Calendar (updated 2-28-2018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Session 1 12 weeks</th>
<th>Session A 5 weeks</th>
<th>Session B 8 weeks</th>
<th>Session C 5 weeks</th>
<th>Session D 10 weeks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First day of classes</td>
<td>Mon May 21</td>
<td>Mon May 21</td>
<td>Mon Jun 4</td>
<td>Mon Jun 25</td>
<td>Mon May 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Day to Add (No tuition liability)</td>
<td>Tues May 29</td>
<td>Wed May 23</td>
<td>Thurs Jun 7</td>
<td>Wed Jun 27</td>
<td>Fri May 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(census)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorial Day (University closed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mon May 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last Day to Drop</td>
<td>Tues Jun 19</td>
<td>Mon Jun 4</td>
<td>Thurs Jun 21</td>
<td>Mon Jul 9</td>
<td>Thurs Jun 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Recess (Classes do not meet)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tue Jul 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence Day (University closed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wed Jul 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissertation/Thesis Deadline</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fri Aug 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree Conferral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sat Aug 25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Attachment B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Senate Allotments</th>
<th>2017 FTE Full Time Faculty</th>
<th>2017 FTE Part Time Faculty</th>
<th>2017 FTE TOTAL</th>
<th>% of total Instructional Faculty</th>
<th>x 50 Seats</th>
<th>x 50 seats (weighted)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Antonin Scalia Law School</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College of Education and Human Development</strong></td>
<td><strong>119</strong></td>
<td><strong>66.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>185.7</strong></td>
<td><strong>11%</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.59</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Health and Human Services</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>136.1</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Humanities and Social Sciences</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>13.46</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Science</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7.08</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Visual and Performing Arts</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>116.9</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School for Conflict Analysis and Resolution</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Business</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Schar School of Policy and Government</strong></td>
<td><strong>67</strong></td>
<td><strong>18.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>85.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>5%</strong></td>
<td><strong>2.58</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volgenau School of Engineering</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>7.26</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **CVPA 3.52% rounded DOWN to 3 to avoid rounding error that would create 51 seats.** | **1660** | **100%** | **50** | **50** |