

ACADEMIC LEADERSHIP COUNCIL

February 11th, 2014
West Commons Community Center
8:30 am – 10:00 am

Agenda

1. Review of Previous Meeting Minutes – Andy Karafa (3 min.)
2. Student Evaluations and Campus Labs – Robbie Teahen (40 min.)
3. Follow-Up Discussion regarding ALC Structure – Andy Karafa (30 min.)
4. Open Forum
5. Updates from Colleges, Schools, & Departments

Future Agenda Item(s):

- Inclusion Advocate Training for Advancing Equity– Matt Olovson
- HR Discussion— Tamie Grunow & Steve Stratton

ALC MEETING MINUTES
February 11, 2014

Membership: Andrea Wirgau, Anne Marie Gillespie, Brian Bouwman, Brian Craig, Cambria DeHoag, Cheryl Cluchey, David Darrow, David Frank, Debra Curtiss, Deborah Dawson, Deborah Thalner, Debra Cox, Deedee Stakley, Glen Okonoski, Gregory Zimmerman, Helen Woodman, James Powell, Janelle Hemingway, Jeffrey Ek, Jim Woolen, John Schmidt, Jon Sprague, Joseph Karafa, Joseph Lipar, Julie Coon, Kirk Weller, Larry L Schult, Leah Monger, Lianne Briggs, Lucian Leone, Michael Bouthillier, Peter Bradley, Piram Prakasam, Robert Buckingham, Ron McKean, Sharon George, Shelly VandePanne, Steven Reifert, Susan Owens, Tami Wolverton, Theresa Raglin, Todd A Stanislaw, Tracy Powers, Trinity Williams, William Smith

Regular Guests: Paul Blake, William Potter, Robbie Teahen

Guests: -

AGENDA

1. Review of Previous Meeting Minutes – Andy Karafa
2. Student Evaluations and Campus Labs – Robbie Teahen
3. Follow-Up Discussion regarding ALC Structure – Andy Karafa
4. Open Forum
5. Updates from Colleges/Schools/Departments

MINUTES

1. Review of Previous Meeting Minutes
 - ❖ Minutes from 01-12-13 meeting approved.
2. Student Evaluations and Campus Labs – Slide Presentation
 - ❖ Robbie Teahen reported nothing in the faculty contract specifies the use of a particular evaluation form. The SAI form hasn't been validated; this causes a concern. Two things needed to be solved in 2011 – 1) the use of the form by administrators and 2) the timeliness of the return of the evaluations.
 - ❖ With the new system we can literally return them the next day. Data will not go out to faculty until grades are posted. Even short session courses that end in March won't release results until the end of the semester.
 - ❖ Which students fill out the evaluations? In spring it was all students who were officially registered after count day. "If you fix the system, we'll be willing to move to a better form" (Senate). There are instances where the paper form was compromised.
 - ❖ Administrators cannot look at the results until faculty receive them first. Reports are not sent to faculty or administrators. You go online and review the results. Additional questions can be added at university, college or course level but timeline is tight. Student names are not loaded until after the formal withdraw date. Faculty encouraged to have their extra questions saved in a word document so they can be added quickly.
 - ❖ DCCL evaluates every course every semester, but used neither the SAI nor IDEA. Should have some common questions about the overall effectiveness of the quality of the instructor and the course. Did we realize these benefits? In my opinion we have. We have not had a complaint about the technology. There have been some complains that the students wanted to evaluate more courses. Reports that faculty have chosen days when few students are present to conduct survey. We can only progress as institution if we know where we are.
 - ❖ Concern over response rates. 8 – 10 messages are sent to students reminding them to complete the survey. "If you don't want repeated reminders, fill out the form now!" We need faculty to encourage student participation. High response rates result from: incentives (points, food), allowing class time to complete survey via labs, ipads, smartphones, letting students know you value their input, multiple reminders.
 - ❖ *Facts about evaluation.* No research to support that only the students who don't like you respond. Research shows that student evaluations are highly reliable and at least moderately valid. Midterm evaluations lead to higher student achievement and higher final evaluations.
 - ❖ We need aggregate data at the university level for accreditation. Student feedback on instruction is one measure out of many. According to research, student evaluations do not reliably or validly measure student achievement.

3. Follow-Up Discussion Regarding ALC Structure

- ❖ Andy Karafa shared that he received mixed feedback from members but basically the consensus was “if it’s not broken, don’t fix it”. If sub-groups need to meet they can arrange meeting times. If members are not coming after reviewing agenda there may be a diversity issue.
- ❖ We are moving toward accessibility in everything we do. This should become a regular priority item for ALC.
- ❖ The University needs a sharper focus on assessment as we prepare for the next HLC evaluation, and the ALC should make this a regular priority item for group discussion. Will ask college to share different assessment methods being used.
- ❖ Need to connect assessment to strategic plan/values – appropriately develop and move forward in a meaningful way.

4. Open Forum

- ❖ Todd Stanislav shared that if areas for improvement are identified he is available to offer sessions. Look at Bright IDEAS under The IDEA Center.

5. Updates from Colleges/Departments

- ❖ Please email Andy if you have a topic of interest.

Adjourn: 9:45 am

DRAFT