

c. “Processes for Meetings” document

Dr. Wallace outlined several ideas for the revision of the “Processes for Meetings” document including the addition of a proposal template, a procedure for changing the “ownership” of a Microsoft Team, and those necessary to reflect the changes to the creation of charges. Dr. George motioned to table this item, and Dr. Hill seconded it (approved unanimously). The Committee will consider a formal proposal for specific changes at the next meeting.

Adjourn. 10:12 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Evaritus Obinyan
Assistant Professor
School of Education and Behavioral Science
Recorder, MGA Executive Committee

Appendix A—

- In response to question 4, almost all of the respondents thought that a change to how charges are created is warranted. The general consensus seems to be that at the end of each academic year, the committee or board should develop a list of mandates or charges for the upcoming academic year. These lists would then be reviewed by the Executive Committee and/or the Provost's office. The Provost would then issue the charges as early in the Fall semester as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

Steve Wallace

Appendix B—Proposal from Academic Quality Committee to put forth recommendations both to the Administration and Faculty to increase student responses on the End of Course Evaluations.

Proposal: The proposal sets forth recommendations for the Office of the Provost and the Faculty at MGA to help increase the number of end of course evaluations that are returned each semester. It provides both the recommendation, explanation, and even examples of ideas to consider to help raise the number of evaluations returned.

Rationale: Data provided by Chris Tsavatewa and the Office of the Provost during FY 2022 showed that the number of evaluations returned each semester is very small in comparison to the size of classes and the number of evaluations sent to students. The Academic Quality Committee was charged with creating recommendations to help increase the number of evaluations returned by students each semester. This increase would be one way to create a better picture of the quality of the course and effectiveness of the instructor. These recommendations will go hand-in-hand with the new version of the Course Evaluation questions that should be forth coming to the faculty of MGA for review. The proposed recommendations are listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

V. Paige Crump Associate

Professor of Spanish

Chair of the Academic Quality Committee

Recommendations for Administration of Student Evaluations of Teaching From the Academic Quality Committee Fall 2022

Purpose

The quality of the data obtained from student evaluations of teaching (SETs) is dependent on several factors. One of those factors is the response rate. Low response rates can lead to nonresponse bias (Adams & Umbach, 2012; Bacon et al., 2016; Chapman & Joines, 2017), meaning that the scores from students who do respond are not representative of the class. Additionally, when responses are low, the numerical data (e.g., means and standard deviations) cannot be considered reliable (Gerbase et al., 2015; Nulty, 2008).

Below is a set of recommendations, based on research and/or best practice, for increasing response rates. More details on the recommendations for faculty follow.

Recommendations to the Office of the Provost

1. Explore digital solutions to facilitate responses. Some suggestions to consider include:

- a. Allow links to the SET instrument which can be shared directly via D2L tools (e.g., announcements) and content folders, in addition to the widget.
- b. Provide a function within D2L where students can receive badges or other records of their completion of the SETs. Any such system would need to maintain confidentiality of individual responses.

2.

For online courses, dedicated synchronous class time may not be possible. However, instructors may build encouragement of SET completion into instructional modules in other ways. For example, students may be asked to confirm that they have access to the student evaluation form as a release condition for accessing other course activities. As another example, a typical course component (quiz, activity, discussion, etc.) may be removed from a module near the end of the course, and the instructor may communicate to students that the time it takes to complete the SET is assumed in place of this typical component.

2. Provide Threshold-Based Incentives. Providing tangible incentives for students can increase response rates significantly (Goodman et al., 2015). Instructors should be allowed to provide incentives for completion of the evaluations. Given the anonymous nature of the evaluations, it is not possible to responsibly provide incentives to individual students. Therefore, a threshold-based incentive, which applies only if a certain percentage (e.g., 80%) of students complete the evaluation, could be used instead. The incentive can be points-based (e.g., extra credit totaling no more than 1% of the course grade), or not points-based (e.g., ability to bring a notecard to a final exam; a fun activity for the students). We do not recommend punitive incentives (e.g., grade reductions, or withholding the release of grades).

3. Communicate Value. Students are more likely to complete SETs if they believe that their

Appendix C—Proposal from Executive Committee to Change MGA Senate By-Laws, RE: Student Vetting Taskforce Membership

Proposal:

We propose to amend the MGA Senate Bylaws Article VIII, Section Q, subsection 10b. The proposed change is in red.

Membership: The Task Force for the Vetting of Student Representatives shall consist of the following members:

Chair, Executive Committee (ex officio)	voting
Member, Executive Committee	voting
Chair, Student Affairs Committee (ex officio)	voting
Faculty Member, Student Affairs Committee	voting
Vice President of Student Affairs (ex officio)	voting
Associate Vice President of Student Affairs (ex officio)	voting

Rationale: