Faculty Senate Evaluation and Assessment Committee
December 2, 2016
Minutes

Present: Jim Bisgard, John Hudleson, Maurice Blackson, Martin Kennedy, Terry Wilson, Michael Johnson

Absent: None

Guests: None

The meeting was called to order at 1:05 p.m.

Minutes of Nov. 18, 2016 were approved.

Items of discussion:

1. Plans for winter quarter meetings

Jim reported that Bernadette is not able to attend this meeting; however, she will be able to attend the Jan. 27th meeting. He would like to ask her about switching back to paper SEOIs – is this plausible, and what would be the ramifications?

2. Review of President and Provost Evaluation questions

A number of concerns arose. Jim said that there has to be a certain amount of reliability for the people who will be reading these evaluations, in order to make sure they don't avoid reading the questions and just fill them in with all 1's. For that reason, the evaluation questions were redone, but now they seem too sophisticated. Suggestions were made to change the questions, but other committee members pointed out that we might be considering changing them preemptively. The main concern is how the data gets tabulated, as well as who is tabulating the data.

The decision was made to leave everything as is, for both the President and Provost Evaluation questions.

Terry suggested making one wording change to question 6 of the President Evaluation questions: change "local/community" to "local community."

3. Review of Associate Provost Questions

Suggested Evaluation Questions for Associate Provost of Accreditation & Academic Planning & Assessment included:

1) I understand the duties and responsibilities of the Associate Provost of Accreditation.

2) Associate Provost Jungblut is doing an excellent job fulfilling the responsibilities.

3) Associate Provost Jungblut effectively provides support and feedback to academic programs.
4) Associate Provost Jungblut helps develop feasibility of new programs.

Additional ideas involved taking the points from the job descriptions and putting them in question-form. John volunteered to go through the job descriptions and develop 3-4 questions based on the 5 most salient points. He will them send them to the committee for them for review and further development.

A suggestion was made to develop questions specific to each Associate Provost position: the Associate Provost of Accreditation & Academic Planning & Assessment (Bernadette Jungblut), and the Associate Provost of Faculty Affairs and Extended Learning (Anne Cubilie)

Michael asked if it possible to find out if we really need to do this for the Associate Provost. Anne Cubilie will be leaving the position and it will be changing significantly. If she will be in the post when the assessment is to be done, will we still need to do it? Because the position is changing, the assessment questions we put together would not apply anymore. Terry agreed – coming up with assessment questions for Anne Cubilie would be a waste of time if she will not be in the position anymore. Martin pointed out that having the assessment done could be helpful for the two people who are getting the position after it is split. Jim agreed that we need to find out if we need to do the assessment before we work on the questions.

Terry suggested, if the assessment of Anne Cubilie does have to be done, using a question such as "I understand the duties and responsibilities of…" as the first question, followed by "Assoc. Provost Cubilie is doing an excellent job fulfilling the responsibilities." The original questions 1, 2, 10, and 11 should be stricken out.

John volunteered to rework questions for the Associate Provost of Accreditation & Academic Planning & Assessment. The committee agreed - Terry suggested waiting to get the questions from John before making any changes.

4. Other - questions about SEOIs
Jim said that he would like to ask Bernadette if there is an option with more flexibility that can be used instead of SEOIs. He would also like to ask Tom Henderson what happens if a student only answers 2 questions and leaves comments. What counts as a completed SEOI; how many questions have to be done?
Switching back to use of paper SEOIs, instead of online, was discussed. Everyone agreed that the online SEOI response rate is much lower than was the case with paper. Jim said that he can possibly email Bernadette and ask what costs would be associated with switching back to paper. He would also like to see a change in the order in which questions appear so that they are more aligned with departments' interests, but that would be a question for Tom Henderson.
John pointed out that one reason students completed the paper SEOIs was because they were handed out in class, so they felt forced to do them. Could someone take a class to

a computer lab and make them do the online ones in class for 15 minutes? Terry and Jim said that wouldn't work. Labs are too small for larger class sections. Terry wondered if it could be possible to keep the paper Scantron SEOIs but switch the comment section so only it is online – if the biggest problem with paper was with illegible handwriting that would solve both problems.

The meeting adjourned at 2:30 p.m.