

## Evaluation & Assessment Committee Minutes – Oct. 5, 2018

Present: Jim Bisgard, Marty Blackson, Martin Kennedy, Greg Lyman, Terry Wilson

Absent: None

Guests: None

Meeting was called to order at 1:10 p.m. Minutes of May 25, 2018 were approved.

### *Introductions and schedule for the year*

The last meeting in winter quarter falls on March 15, which is the last day of finals week. A decision will be made later on as to whether we will need to hold this meeting.

### *Discussion of charges*

This year some charges have to do required assessments of administrators in addition to the regular EC and Senate assessments.

Charges 01 and 06 appear to be linked; however, Charge 01 seems to be informational. Consultation with EC may be needed regarding priority ordering. Charges 05 and 06 appear to go together. Charges 07, 08, 09, 10, and 11 all appear to be of lowest priority, which does not make sense. Charges 01 and 03 are the only ones due this fall and those also seem to be linked. Some charges will require follow-up with other people. For Charge 03, we will need to follow up with EC. Michael might be able to help with this. For Charge 04, Jim will consult with Lidia Anderson. She emailed over the summer and mentioned that someone in CEPS requested information on response rates for their college, so making that change should be easy.

Confusion arose regarding Charges 10 and 11. These charges relate to the assessment of academic administrators and have a due date of early spring. Because of the amount of work involved, the timeline goes back into winter, or possibly even late fall. Administrators need to have time to review the draft questions and give feedback, and we need to have time to make revisions.

For Charge 01, Jim indicated it seems reasonable to give a survey to college personnel committees, or to the people who have been on those committees over the last two or three years, but not to the people who are on them this year. Questions should be general and broad-spectrum, for example: “what are you trying to get out of SEOIs?” Questions should also address whether more attention is paid to numerical data or to comments, as well as preferences for how data should be presented (e.g. in graphical format). Another question to address is whether they are looking for improvement over time. The other option would be to send the same survey to the college deans and to the provost, but there could be issues with getting responses from such a small group. Terry suggested inviting the deans and provost to a meeting to do a 5-minute interview. It would be helpful to have EC input for clarification as to what, exactly, is intended with this charge. At a minimum, we will need to generate a list of the people who were on DPCs and CPCs for the past 2-3 years. Bring ideas for 3-4 survey questions to the next meeting.

For Charge 02, it would be possible to write something into academic early alert based on specific attendance criteria. Academic dishonesty is a different story. Possibly something could be created where faculty are able to mark off to indicate if there has been academic dishonesty. An option already exists

for attendance, so one could be built for academic dishonesty. Jim will work with Lidia Anderson. Office of Student Success should be involved in the record-keeping aspect.

### *Evaluation of academic administrators*

#### a. Timeline

Confirmation is needed regarding the timeline for administrators to review the surveys and questions. Jim thought 30 days was allowed, but wanted to clarify this. It would be best to administer the survey at least halfway through winter quarter to allow time for EAC to review at the beginning of spring quarter. This would also allow time to share the numerical data and a summary of comments with Faculty Senate.

This year we may want to consider including an option for faculty to opt out of taking the survey, but they will have to give a reason; for example, if they don't feel comfortable taking the survey.

#### b. Who gets evaluated?

There have been requests to have Associate Deans evaluated in the past. Administrators must have been in the job for nine months; this will be confirmed with EC. Only COTS and CEPS have deans. CAH and CB have interim deans, but some are staying on for two or three years.

#### c. Questions

Questions for EC:

- Are interim administrators evaluated (e.g. library dean, who arrived this summer and will only be here for 6 months)?

- Concerns with asking faculty to complete a total of 9 different surveys. The committee agrees it would be good to evaluate all of these positions, but feels it could be problematic to do all the evaluations at the same time. Would it be better to stagger the evaluations over different years? For example: President, Provost, Associate Provosts during one year; college deans, library dean, and graduate studies dean during the following year.

- Related to the previous question, are the Associate Deans evaluated? Some colleges have multiple Associate Deans. Also, do the Associate Provosts want to be evaluated by faculty?

- Are EAC members allowed to share the questions from 2017 survey with faculty in their departments in order to ask for input as to they types of questions faculty would like to see included? Or can they just ask without sharing the questions?

Ideas for survey questions or changes to existing survey questions:

- Use the same questions but add one or two additional questions. For example: "the University (or ASL) has changed positively/changed negatively (zero scale) since the last survey was done."

- "Do you see any changes in how university business is run?"

- Move the budget question from the president's survey to the provost's survey instead. (Decision to leave as written.)

- "As the university grows, is the university making positive changes to meet the needs of the students"

- "(Administrator) demonstrates an ability to implement positive change to serve the educational needs of the university in the face of budgetary challenges." This question could be added to president and provost surveys with an agree/disagree ranking. The question could also be added to deans' surveys but change "university" to "college."

Meeting adjourned at 2:50 p.m.

Next meeting – Oct. 19, 1:00 p.m. Grupe Center