

**CAPP Committee
Meeting Minutes**

MEETING DATE: September 28, 2021 3:30 PM - 4:30 PM
LOCATION: Zoom
ATTENDANCE: [P = Present; A = Absent; E = Excused]

| MEMBERS | | MEMBERS | | GUESTS | TIME |
|----------------|---|---------------------|---|-----------------------|-------------|
| Edo Biagioni | P | Siobhán Ní Dhonacha | P | Prof. Nandini Chandra | 3:30pm-4 pm |
| Michael Cooney | P | | | | |
| Patsy Fujimoto | P | Anna Stirr | P | | |
| Hannah Manshel | P | Jean Thoulag | P | | |
| Jon Matsuda | P | | | | |
| Ashley Maynard | P | Kim Binsted | P | | |

| Subject | Discussion/Information | Action / Strategy / Responsible Person |
|-------------------|---|---|
| Call to Order | Chair called the meeting to order at 3:01. | |
| Review of Minutes | Minute of Sept 7, 2021 - Anna moved to approve; seconded by Patsy | 1. Minutes of Sept 7, 2021, approved by all 8 voting members present. |
| Chair's Report | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. PIG on Tenure continues to be discussed by CAB, CPM, and other groups across campus. Overall concerns surround the process - no faculty involved, and the PIG went beyond their scope. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Does CAPP want to make a statement? (Discuss later under business.). | 1. |
| SEC Report | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Board of Regents PIG on Tenure is of concern. Bruno and Lassner gave general reports to SEC and gave time for discussion. 2. SEC had no new Issues for CAPP take up, and there are just the ones carried forward from Spring 21, plus the proposed changes to EPs and an RP, which were recently referred to CAPP. 3. The next Senate meeting coincides with the MFS Congress. SEC wants to be sure there is enough time to bring things forward, particularly carryovers from Spring. | 1. |
| Guests | Prof. Nandini Chandra joined the meeting at 3:30 pm to speak about the resolution on the Course Evaluation System (CES) and the Summary of the review of the literature and issues surrounding CESs and use by the administration. A previous review of the literature prior to 2016 from eCafe to the present CES expressed reservation, but it was declared that Hawaii's demographic is unique so the research did not apply to Hawaii. Most of the literature was prior to 2010. This review tried to establish that more current research is generalizable and not | 1. |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>anecdotal. The review pointed out that many universities were moving away from this type of evaluation.</p> <p>What is the purpose of student CES and what has changed since 2010? Student CES began in 1960 initiated by students and subsequently developed into a broader system-wide practice as a means to improve the effectiveness and quality of teaching. UH Administration uses the data for assessing faculty performance/tenure. Research shows that the CES are not being used for their intended primary purpose. Additionally, they are not providing reliable data for assessment due to interrater differences and other bias factors such as - race, gender, language proficiency, sex/age, language, disability. Furthermore, the most vulnerable class, casual adjunct faculty, are penalized by CES.</p> <p>Discussion followed:</p> <p>A CAPP member commented that she had read the report or the review of the literature and Debbie Halbert's response. The CAPP member added that the trend is students who either really like you or really don't like the instructor which is not really about effectiveness. Because CES is now done electronically, fewer students are responding. With few responses, the database is too small and this metric is not improving teaching.</p> <p>Nandini reported that the workgroup that prepared the report spoke to Laura Lyons prior to submitting the resolution and bibliography. They suggested that the CES be dissociated from the institutional system used for promotion and tenure, and use a system that gives individual instructors feedback about their teaching.</p> <p>A CAPP member questioned whether the resolution proposed any alternatives that could be used that contribute to supporting tenure/promotion purposes and the need to assess one's own teaching.</p> <p>Nandini responded that peer evaluation and self-assessments were suggested alternatives. She added that the intent of the resolution was to present the issues and invoke debate and fuller consideration of the value and diminishment of these evaluations.</p> <p>A member commented on the testing of freshman and sophomores who showed no significant improvement in critical thinking.</p> <p>A member asked if midterm evaluations of faculty are still available? For her, this evaluation was the only thing she found useful. Ashley responded they are available but optional. Prior to 2016- someone would meet with students for input and students filled out some forms. A report was given to the faculty as follow-up on strengths and how to improve. CTE would help do this.</p> | |
|--|---|--|

| | | |
|----------------------------|--|---|
| | <p>Kim commented that this is not required but she did this and included it in her tenure dossier.</p> <p>Ashley commented that departments are using the CES in different ways for tenure and promotion, i.e., not consistently across the campus.</p> <p>It was noted that the intent of the resolution is not to recommend tossing CES evaluations but rather examine alternatives to the same end of improving teaching/learning. It was suggested to add some alternatives to the resolution.</p> <p>CAPP will continue the discussion of the resolution for the next CAPP meeting.</p> | |
| Committee Reports | | |
| Unfinished Business | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. CAPP resolution on the May 2021 MFS agenda (no time to consider at that meeting): RESOLUTION PROPOSING THAT THE COURSE EVALUATION SYSTEM (CES) BE OPTIONAL, AND NOT BE USED FOR PROGRAM REVIEWS <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. CAPP Sub-Committee Annotated Bibliography on the Ineffectiveness of Student Evaluations of Teaching (SET) (April 2021) b. American Sociological Association Statement on Student Evaluations (2019) c. Course Evaluation Literature Review (2016) 2. Subcommittee report: BA in Marine Biology. Letter The letter was sent to the proposing department on 9/23/21. Supporting documents (also from 5/21 MFS agenda): Siobhán reported the sub-committee with SD, Edo, and Michael discussed the response, had additional questions, and followed by the decision to invite the program group to meet. The invitation was sent. Per Ashley, Department Chair, Cliff Morden informed her that proposal writers Amy Moran and Stephanie Kraft-Terry are away or on leave presently but they might try to respond to the questions. Cliff will try to respond in writing and then if we have more | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. CAPP will pick up the discussion of the resolution at the October 5 meeting. |

| | | |
|---------------------|---|---|
| | <p>questions, he could come to CAPP for the October 26 meeting.</p> <p>3. BEd in Special Education and Undergraduate Certificate in Multilingual Multicultural Perspectives. Letters were sent and received. CAPP is waiting for responses.</p> | |
| New Business | <p>1. Assignment of subgroups for review of 3 EPs (EP 5.201, 5.205, and 7.206) and 1 RPs (RP 5.201) found in the CAPP shared drive. We can work on Questions we have and then if desired invite Debbie Halbert. EP 5.201 Approval of New Academic Programs and Review of Provisional “Program stop outs or terminations”. In reviewing, CAPP should consider the definition of “underperforming” programs mentioned in RP 5. 201</p> <p>Hannah and Ashley will review this set.</p> <p>2. EP 7.206 Concurrent Registration: “Class taught at one campus can be listed as part of the other campus. Concern around admission requirements - need to review. This is occurring, but courses are not cross-listed. Cross-listing of classes is an issue to review. Dual enrollment is possible. Siobhán commented that cross-listing is related to a course equivalency model</p> <p>EP 5.205- combine this review with the review of EP 7.206 Siobhán and Anna will take this for review.</p> <p>A discussion arose about the need to approach the Administration about their “blitz” practice of sending several items for comment and give very short timelines for feedback or responses, comments and consultation. Can this be addressed by SEC and shared with Administration? SEC liaison Kim agrees also there is a constant recurrence of this situation. Further discussion on this pointed out that it can be viewed as a systemic issue in that the reactive/last-minute approach could be addressed and fixed.</p> <p>3. Discussion of BOR Tenure PIG: Possible draft resolution from CAPP related to the BOR PIG proposals. Other MFS committees are discussing possible testimony or resolutions.</p> <p>Discussion: Patsy is unsupportive of the directions contained in the PIG report. It’s unfair after 5 years of</p> | <p>1. Assigned teams will read and come up with comments/questions to pose to Debbie Halbert. When ready, we can invite her to an upcoming meeting.</p> <p>2. Kim will bring our issues to SEC regarding the Administration’s “blitz” practice of sending out simultaneously several items for comment while giving very short timelines for engaging in a consultative process and providing feedback.</p> |

| | | |
|--------------------|---|----------------------------|
| | <p>work and then the position is no longer needed and the tenure-track faculty member is left hanging. Michael commented that the administration has to take some responsibility for ending a tenure-based faculty member if the position is determined as no longer needed. Long-term planning with respect to need would be helpful.</p> <p>Jean suggested reviewing Christian Fern's UHPA response for some points/language to add to our resolution.</p> <p>Siobhán suggested that instead of addressing the situation with what we don't like/want with a more nuanced response of what we want. What's a positive response to this situation? How can we reframe this and speak to an invitation to change this?</p> <p>Ashley- proposed we could add our suggested edits to the draft resolution in case we want to consider it next meeting.</p> <p>If the MFS resolution is on the Senate Agenda by October 13, this will spread to the October Senate meeting on October 20, and then on to the BOR in time for their meeting on 10/21.</p> <p>Edo- commented that the resolution will be symbolic so we might not get all the language we need/want, but we should proceed nevertheless.</p> <p>Siobhán added that she definitely supports a Resolution and thanks the chair for this solid draft.</p> <p>Siobhán and Ashley both recommend suggested ways to illuminate the work and time of faculty volunteers and why the faculty senate is necessary for accreditation and shared governance for the university.</p> | |
| Adjournment | 1. Next meeting: October 5, 2021 | Meeting adjourned at 4:30. |

Respectfully submitted by Jean Thoulag (Secretary)

Approved unanimously on October 05, 2021