

Georgia Southern University Digital Commons@Georgia Southern

Faculty Senate Index

Faculty Senate Documents

4-7-2014

SRI Committee Meeting

Georgia Southern University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-index>



Part of the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Georgia Southern University, "SRI Committee Meeting" (2014). *Faculty Senate Index*. 206.
<https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/faculty-senate-index/206>

This other is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate Documents at Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Index by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons@Georgia Southern. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@georgiasouthern.edu.

SRI Committee Meeting

Monday, April 7

Present: Rebecca Ziegler, Trent Maurer, Helen Bland, Sonya Shepherd, Jim Harris, Jim Reichard, Bill Levernier, Nan LoBue

1. Rebecca put Trent's final report on the screen for all to see. Several committee members had not found it in the google drive folder and so had not read it yet, but Trent went through each section of the report and summarized its main points. He then asked for comments.
2. Rebecca was concerned about the recommendations; she expressed strongly that we should recommend that the SRI instrument should be redesigned to solicit only written comments from students. She felt that this would be more helpful to faculty than the numbers generated by the Likert scale. She also felt that faculty would be able to discern without too much trouble which students were providing serious, thoughtful feedback and which were not, and that the results would be less likely to be used punitively against faculty. Trent pointed out that a well-designed instrument like the one by Skowronek et al. cited in the report would elicit valuable numerical data without the problems uncovered in our surveys. Rebecca seemed unconvinced, but when Trent suggested that he would make the recommendations suggest more strongly that the information from a redesigned SRI not be used punitively, she agreed to accept the report as written.
3. Jim then commented that he would like to do away with SRIs altogether. He felt that they were of limited use in helping faculty improve their teaching, and they were of no use in helping chairs evaluate faculty; in fact, he said, often the best teachers were the ones with the lowest scores on SRIs and vice versa. In fact, he said that when he was department chair, he regarded high SRI scores as a red flag. Trent explained that because of the BOR mandate that we use SRIs, eliminating them is not an option. In fact, he argued that the Skowronek model could provide a model that would genuinely help faculty improve teaching by focusing on the achievement of student learning outcomes.
4. Since Trent would be unavailable at the next Faculty Senate meeting, Nan offered to present the report and recommendations to the Senate. Her offer was accepted. There was some discussion about whether or not the report needed an Executive Summary (because of its length). Helen expressed concern that summarizing the report might dilute its effectiveness; she feared that providing a summary might encourage decisions or actions to be based on incomplete

information. At the same time, she recognized that the report is very lengthy and that a summary might be convenient. Nan said that she had been planning to write one for her own use in making the presentation to the Senate, but that she would be unable to complete it by the due date for the Senate agenda items. The Committee members agreed that the report should be submitted as is, but that Nan should have the Executive Summary ready for the compilation of the Senate meeting minutes. Nan said that she would complete the Executive Summary this weekend and would put it in the google drive folder.

5. Committee members commended Trent for the effort, time, enthusiasm, expertise, and leadership he demonstrated throughout the work of this Committee, especially during the composition of this impressive report.

Respectfully submitted,

Nan LoBue