

Deans Council
May 7, 2012
1:30 PM
Allen 611

Members Present: Jerry Gilbert (chair), Terry Jayroe (for Richard Blackburn), Steven Brown, Timothy Chamblee, Frances Coleman, Lou D'Abramo, Jerry Emison, Mark Lawrence (for Kent Hoblet), Julia Hodges, Walter Taylor (for George Hopper), Brandon Jolly (for Joan Lucas), Gary Myers, Sharon Oswald, Mike Rackley, Sarah Rajala, Peter Ryan, Christopher Snyder, Butch Stokes, Jim West, and Shelby Balius (for Park Wynn).

Others Present: Ann Bailey, Bill Broyles, John Rush, Renee Snyder, and Judy Spencer.

Minutes Taken By: Martha Thomas.

1. Upon a motion by Sarah Rajala and second by Gary Myers, the minutes of the April 16, 2012 meeting were approved unanimously with no corrections.
2. Announcements:
 - a. Jerry Gilbert announced that Maymester will begin Wednesday, May 9, 2012, with enrollment slightly less than last year's enrollment (40 students fewer).
 - b. Dr. Gilbert announced that IHL has approved a 7.9% tuition increase for the 2012-2013 academic year. This tuition increase includes the 6% increase originally requested plus an additional amount needed to cover the budget cut and PERS increase. For the 2013-2014 academic year, a 6.5% tuition increase has been approved by IHL. Dr. Gilbert indicated that there have been discussions regarding the potential of a small merit raise pool. If this is approved, additional information will be forthcoming.
 - c. Dr. Gilbert discussed a plan to address salary compression of full professors. Dr. Gilbert has joined with President Keenum, Greg Bohach, and David Shaw to budget over the next five years for a salary increment for compressed full professors who meet certain productivity and years of service requirements. Dr. Gilbert stated that, if approved, in the first year, 40 faculty would have these salary increments funded from E&G with another 14 funded from the Division of Agriculture, Forestry, and Veterinary Medicine and the Division of Research and Economic Development. This salary increment would be \$10,000. At the end of the five year period, Dr. Gilbert estimates that approximately 60% of those faculty members with compressed salaries would have received this salary increment. Dr. Gilbert stated that this program is modeled after a similar program undertaken by West Virginia University ten years ago. Dr. Gilbert opened the meeting for questions and discussion of this proposal:
 - i. Steve Brown asked whether studies had been done to examine the salaries of MSU full professors in comparison to peer universities. Dr. Gilbert indicated that studies had been done. Just in comparison to the University of Mississippi, MSU full professors on average earn \$12,000 less.
 - ii. Dr. Rajala stated that there is some imbalance at the associate professor rank as well.

- iii. Dr. Gilbert stated that this proposal does not preclude departments addressing individual merit and equity situations. This proposal is a means to provide a university-wide method to address salary compression of full professors.
- iv. Jim West stated that he is pleased that the university is making progress towards addressing salary compression.
- v. Jerry Emison asked whether there have been projections as to what impact this proposal will have on salary compression – how much of a problem that exists today will be solved by this solution?
- vi. Dr. Myers asked whether this plan would be in place of more faculty positions. Dr. Gilbert stated that the amount of money funding this plan would amount to approximately 4 or 5 tenure-track faculty positions.
- vii. Several members of the Deans Council indicated that they were appreciative of the effort but that there would be additional questions in terms of productivity and selection criteria as this proposal is implemented.
- viii. Peter Ryan suggested seeking input from West Virginia University as to how their similar program was received.
- ix. John Rush stated that this program would be well-received by external supporters of MSU as it shows that we are making efforts to retain our best and brightest employees.

3. Development Training:

- a. Mr. Rush stated that his office is considering arranging a training session to be led by Advancement Resources, “Insight into Philanthropy,” which would provide a deeper understanding of philanthropy and the donor development process. Mr. Rush distributed a handout on the subject. This training would be a four-hour training session with 50 spots available for members of the Deans Council, Development Officers, and Associate Deans or Department Heads (if space permits). Advancement Resources gave a similar presentation to the Foundation Board two years ago. This presentation was well-received by members of the Foundation Board.
- b. There was discussion as to when this training session should be scheduled, with the general consensus being that the first week of August would be an ideal time for this training to take place.

4. Graduate Student Housing Options:

- a. Bill Broyles and Ann Bailey discussed the new graduate student housing options on campus: 36 rooms (18 male and 18 female) on the third floor of Critz Hall and 14 rooms (7 male and 7 female) in Ruby Hall. Graduate students living on-campus during the summer will be located in Rice Hall.
- b. Mr. Broyles requested assistance with informing interested graduate students about these options. Inquiries should be directed to Ann Bailey’s office in Herbert Hall.
- c. Lou D’Abramo stated that these housing options are a great option for maintaining the student presence on campus.

5. Online Course Evaluations:

- a. Dr. Gilbert introduced Renee Snyder who works at the University of Maryland (UMD) and was invited to share her experiences with online course evaluations.
- b. Dr. Snyder gave a presentation on UMD's process challenges, and directions in online course evaluations.
- c. Dr. Snyder indicated that the Student Association requested online course evaluations in 2000 and the Faculty Senate approved of online course evaluations in 2006.
- d. Dr. Snyder stated that all new students can see a portion of the results of the online course evaluations. Only those sections with a 70% or higher response rate have their results revealed to students (this is approximately 45% of all courses).
- e. Dr. Snyder stated that, in her experience, students are more likely to complete their course evaluations when their instructors explain why the evaluations are important and how the results are used.
- f. There were questions and discussion on this subject:
 - i. Mike Rackley pointed out that under UMD's system, the only incentive to students to encourage completion of course evaluations is that, if enough students submit their evaluations, students can see the results of the course evaluations.
 - ii. Dr. Emison asked whether UMD's system prevented students who were enrolled in courses but did not attend class from completing the evaluation. Dr. Snyder stated that a "snapshot" is taken of class enrollment on a certain point in the semester (for example, November 10 for fall) and that those enrolled at that point in time can complete the course evaluation.
 - iii. Dr. Snyder stated that the course evaluation window opens approximately 2-3 weeks before the end of the semester and closes at the end of Reading Day.
 - iv. Dr. Snyder discussed the response rates of UMD's system. In the first semester, UMD attained a 63% response rate. In a later semester, they reached a high of a 66% response rate. Various incentives have been utilized, including giving away an iPod and utilizing a lottery to allow 100 students to register early.
 - v. Dr. Snyder discussed the varying number of questions posed by each college and unit.
 - vi. There was discussion about the comments on course evaluations being viewed by various parties. Tim Chamblee stated that online course evaluations allow students to provide more informative comments.
 - vii. Dr. Snyder encouraged MSU to have multiple conversations prior to deciding to switch to online course evaluations.
 - viii. Mark Lawrence stated that the College of Veterinary Medicine has its own online course evaluation system and asked whether this would be absorbed into the university's system if adopted.
 - ix. There was discussion regarding various incentives that could be utilized to encourage completion of online course evaluations.
 - x. Dr. Snyder stated that, of the 15 university-wide questions of UMD's online course evaluations, approximately half of those

questions dealt with the course while the other half dealt with the instructor him/herself.

6. Academic Operating Policy 13.10 – Other Employment.
 - a. **Upon a motion by Dean West and second by Dr. D’Abramo, AOP 13.10 – Other Employment was approved unanimously with no revisions.**
7. Other Items:
 - a. Dr. Gilbert distributed copies of the Maroon Edition book, “Unbowed,” to members of the Deans Council.
 - b. Butch Stokes announced that final grades for the spring 2012 semester are due Tuesday, May 8, 2012, at 12:00 noon.
 - c. Mr. Stokes announced that Commencement walk-throughs will be held at 10:00 AM and 3:30 PM on Thursday, May 10, 2012. College flags will be arranged at the back of the stage. Prior to Commencement exercises, faculty and students will be assembled in the Mize Pavilion.
 - d. Mr. Stokes described the current term electronic withdrawal process that will go in effect Wednesday, May 9, 2012.
 - e. Mr. Rackley announced that starting July 1, 2012, MSU is going live with the legislatively mandated accountability and transparency website with data concerning university expenditures being open to the public to view. The website will share data from July 1, 2012, forward.
 - f. Mr. Rackley announced that the eForms system is now live with a few test offices. He will contact Deans and Associate Deans over the next few days to arrange a demonstration. ITS is also developing a Camtasia video to assist with training in this system.
 - g. Dr. Chamblee announced that institutional effectiveness reports will be due August 31, 2012.

Handouts

Insight Into Philanthropy

Deans, faculty, and other academic and organizational leaders will gain an understanding of philanthropy and the donor development process. Key content in this workshop is based on exploring commonly-held myths about development and delineating roles of faculty and development professionals in donor engagement and solicitation.

Syllabus

Introduction

An overview of philanthropy in America and discovery that every individual who is committed to the mission of the organization is important to the work of development.

Who is Responsible for Development?

Participants explore the first role, articulating a compelling Vision Story, and identify criteria that aid in connecting your Vision Story to donors' passions.

Process Concepts in Development

Participants study the process for donor development and the steps for conducting successful meetings with donor prospects.

Donor Motivation

Participants discover how donors view development, philanthropy, and the engagement process, while also exploring concepts about relationships in development.

Donor Development Tools

Participants explore tools and techniques to help identify potential major donors and examine the vital role of making professional referrals.

Gaining Gift Commitment

Participants examine "Making the Ask" and review the Strategic Elements of Successful Solicitation.

Creating Gratifying Gifting Experiences

Participants learn how they can create a return on philanthropic investment (ROPI) that ensures donors feel appreciated and valued and sets the stage for future gifts.



UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

**CourseEvalUM:
Our Process, Challenges, and New Directions**

Renee Baird Snyder, Ph.D.
Institutional Research, Planning and Assessment (IRPA)

Initiate with Eyes Wide Open

- Culture change is a process (e.g., Stages of Change)
- Campus desires & support
- Software choices
- Intersections of software with course, student, instructor data files (SIS)
- Management and staffing (systems, process, expectations)

Basic Overview

- Senate mandate 2006, initiated fall 2007
- 5800-6200 sections/term (summer 400)
- 15 University-wide items (optional others)
- Results sets for instructors; administrators; fully participating and new students
- Response rate around 63%-66%
- 1 FTE coordinator, 1FTE tech developer, and...

Software Decisions

- Examination of proprietary “off the shelf” options, LMS options, open source development
- LMS provider would build it; very pricey
- Off the shelf limited capacities
- Chose Sakai open source partnership (e.g., UMD, Michigan, MIT, Cambridge, Capetown, others joined)

Software Decisions Cont’d

- Best choice at time
- Had to meet campus needs or face competing systems
- Needed college level, dept level items, TA specific items; desired instructor level items
- Trade offs of tailored vs. expediency
- We are still building tech capacities...

Managing CourseEvalUM

- Coordinator for Course Evaluations/IRPA
 - Point person for campus (college leadership teams, faculty, students, IT, etc.)
 - Liaisons group/implementation
 - Schedulers contacts/flagging courses & instructors for eval
 - Advisory Group/policy, big picture development
 - Help Desk/3rd level responses
 - Promotions and publicity
 - Software testing & eval set up and mgt
 - Certification of reporting

Student Involvement

- SGA was impetus, along with Lilly Fellows
- Students on committee to determine University-wide items (including recent TA-specific items)
- SGA and GSG on Advisory Group
- SGA and GSG consultants/collaborators in promotions, decision making (e.g. timing, reminders, publicity messages, tech development)
- Regular meetings with student leaders

Student Uses & Access

- All new students, with caveats
- All current students who completed all CourseEvalUM evals X term can see results when posted for fall 2007 through X term
- Limited student view 7/15 University items, no comments; sections w/ 70%+ response rate
- Legal counsel stance
- Use during registration
- Example https://www.irpa.umd.edu/Assessment/CourseEval/sample_student_report.pdf

Instructor & Administrator Access

- Instructors see all results of all items, regardless of response rate & including “student view” items
- Authorized administrators see results for University-wide 8 administrator items (and now also 4 TA specific items), college items, and (next year) department items

Generally Positive, Still in Transition

- Instructors are mixed; would like to ask their own items too. TBD.
- Dept chairs contact me regularly
- Colleges mixed initial response. Resistance diminished over time.
- Provost liked bird’s eye view for University items; by unit (e.g., University, college, department, by course level)
- Students want comments, link in registration to courses, different reminder format

A Couple of IRPA Studies

- Students are most likely to complete their evaluations when their instructors explain why important, how used
<https://www.irpa.umd.edu/Assessment/CourseEval/ReferencedFiles/interviewsSpr09.pdf>
- Evaluation ratings are not explained in any substantial way by response rate
https://www.irpa.umd.edu/Assessment/CourseEval/ReferencedFiles/response_score_fall09_report.pdf

Course evaluation information on IRPA department page
https://www.irpa.umd.edu/Assessment/crs_eval.shtml

CourseEvalUM landing page:
www.CourseEvalUM.umd.edu

Email: rbsnyder@umd.edu



Fear the Turtle