ADVISORY COUNCIL ON INSTRUCTIONAL EXCELLENCE  
Laurie Kirsch, Chair  
May 6, 2015  

Minutes  


Approval of the Minutes  

Laurie Kirsch asked for a motion from council members to approve the January 23, 2015, meeting minutes. The motion was offered, seconded, and approved. The minutes will be posted on the ACIE website.  

Student Opinion of Teaching Surveys  

A packet of information was distributed to the committee which contained a recap of the online student opinion of teaching surveys from the spring semester. The suggestions that the ACIE subcommittee generated in the January meeting with members of the Office of Measurement and Evaluation of Teaching (OMET) were implemented in this spring’s online surveys. The largest increases in response rates occurred when there was a combination of direct emails and social media posts targeted at students. The faculty also received reminder emails to let them know what their response rate is. The threshold of when they would receive these updates was increased from 50% to 75%. There was a new suggestion that sending differentiated emails may improve response rates, e.g. an email that lets the faculty know when they are below 50% and another email that lets the faculty know when they are below 75%. (This is not possible with the current system.) Additional suggestions that OMET implemented included: posting guidelines for administering surveys in class, posting a syllabus template on Blackboard, and providing future survey period dates on the OMET website so faculty can plan ahead. A recommendation was made to have two separate email reminders sent to students to complete their survey; one could come from their advisor and the one could come from the Chancellor as they have greater name recognition with the students. Although the survey response had a 3% decrease from the fall 2014 response, the University of Pittsburgh is on par with or doing better than the institutions we benchmark against. OMET is still processing the survey results from spring and will continue to update the committee. OMET is also planning to meet with each dean to review their school’s survey policies and to identify best practices to share with the other schools.  

Diversity Programming for Faculty Development  

An update was provided on diversity-related activities that have been held or will soon be held. These types of activities are created to assist faculty to better increase their capacity to teach in a diverse and multicultural environment, and to provide programming to help faculty develop curriculum and learning materials that reflect a diverse and inclusive environment.  

A task force, charged by the Provost, has reviewed the past offerings, benchmarking data, and suggestions made by the ACIE subcommittee and is looking into ways to expand diversity related programming to reach more faculty. This year, the Provost’s Diversity Institute for
Faculty Development is offering a series of programs that began with a kick-off event of an interactive theatre performance that explored race relations in the classroom. The performance had a follow-up workshop the following morning to continue the discussions that arose from the performance and work on strategies that faculty could use in their classrooms as they encounter these issues. The performance had 47 attendees and 35 came to the follow up workshop the following morning. Three faculty development workshops (one on implicit biases, one on creating an inclusive classroom for LGBTQIA students and one on race in America) will follow as part of the Provost’s Diversity Institute for Faculty Development.

CIDDE also hosted several workshops this spring as part of a series called “Destination Diversity.” These are lunchtime sessions that often host a mix of faculty and graduate students. This year was the first year that sessions were live-streamed and this greatly increased the number of overall attendees, especially at the regional campuses. Last year’s Diversity Summit provided a source of topics for this year’s lunch time sessions. The “Destination Diversity” sessions will be continued in the FY 15-16 year.

**Innovation in Teaching Awards Review**

This year there were 11 applications for Innovation in Teaching Awards, versus the average number of applications in previous years, which ranges between 24-30 applicants. This year was the first time the request for proposal (RFP) was sent via Read Green rather than a full paper application being sent to all faculty members. A suggestion was made to send a one-page paper announcement that would direct the interested faculty members to the online link which would contain the full RFP. Another consideration that arose was the maturity of the award; is it time to revamp the award slightly? The committee suggested reviewing the evaluation of the awards to determine if the emphases of the award is appropriate or a hindrance.

A discussion ensued about alternative options for reaching potential applicants. The committee discussed and evaluated the pros and cons of changing the application process to a two-step process; the first step could be a one-page pre-application that the committee could review and choose those applications that they would like to receive a full proposal from. There was not strong support for this suggestion.

The committee reviewed the value of having a symposium of awardees to showcase to potential applicants what other faculty have done and how they created their proposals.

**Adjournment**

There being no further business to conduct, the meeting was adjourned at 12:45 p.m.