

## **Faculty Senate**

**Monday, October 1, 2007**

### **Birkeland Lounge**

Secretary of the Faculty Cathy McMullen presided over this meeting, in the absence of Dean Mark Krejci.

1. Minutes of September 17, 2007 were approved.
2. Chair McMullen noted that the agenda did not need to be approved, as this is a continuation of the agenda of the previous Faculty Senate meeting, with no additions to that meeting's agenda.
3. Student Zack Kenz noted that students would appreciate notice to student evaluators that their comments might be seen by faculty evaluators.

Sue Pierson Ellingson asked for clarification of the policy for destruction of evaluations after transcription.

McMullen noted that there is still an amendment to the motion on the floor, which should be the item for discussion before other topics are raised.

Cindy Carver expressed concern about possible inconsistency in the wording of the amendment, in that it implies that only some faculty might see summaries of student evaluations.

Hank Tkachuk expressed openness to an amendment to the amendment, to change the word "may" to "shall" and to delete "at the discretion of the evaluation committee" at the end of the amendment. Such an amendment was made and seconded.

Gay Rawson asked for comments from people who had expressed concerns in the previous Senate meeting about sharing student comments from the evaluations.

Heidi Manning asked for clarification of the meaning of "summary". Jonathan Steinwand said that he had recently read the definition, for faculty evaluations, and that "summary" means a compilation of quantitative information plus transcription of each student comment.

The amendment to the amendment was changed, to add the phrase "along with the committee report" to the end of the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment passed by voice vote.

The amendment also passed by voice vote.

David Sprunger asked if the evaluation form task force intended that faculty should never see original evaluation forms. He noted that he had spoken to a number of faculty who said that they use the original forms, sometimes without transcription or processing, in semesters when they are

not subject to formal review. Their intention is to collect feedback to use in considering course or teaching changes.

Roy Hammerling said that he uses the evaluation form in the informal manner described by David. He noted that it would cause a lot of work for departmental office staff to transcribe the evaluations if done for each course offered by the department each semester.

Susan Larson said that it may be a good idea to have all evaluations transcribed, to protect the identity of students.

Mary Rice noted that differing practices in handling evaluations may hinder the comparability of evaluations during a formal evaluation semester to evaluations from previous semesters. For this reason, it would be helpful to require uniformity in handling evaluations.

Mark Covey said that Rice's comments captured the task force's intent for the use of the instrument.

Tkachuk noted that data should also be uniformly handled in order to provide meaningful college averages in quantitative categories.

Polly Fassinger said that she values seeing each student's comments in all categories, as opposed to seeing a listing of all comments organized by each question on the form.

Covey said that his department's practice has been to assign each evaluation form a number, and to identify each comment by the number of the form it came from. This would allow the analysis Fassinger described.

Sue Pierson Ellingson asked if it would still be possible for faculty to use a different form to ask for student input.

Cindy Carver noted that, if the evaluations aren't available to faculty until sometime in the following semester, those faculty will not be able to consider evaluation comments when preparing to teach a course in consecutive semesters. Was this the intention of the task force?

Connie Peterson asked if it would be helpful to have evaluations done the semester preceding formal evaluation, to avoid this sort of timing issue.

Michelle Lelwica said that may not be optimal, since it can be helpful to have evaluation committee members visiting a class to put the evaluation responses from that class into context.

Doug Anderson proposed an amendment to the motion, to change the wording of the second-to-last sentence of the motion by removing the words "either" and "or summaries of the evaluations". The amendment was seconded and discussed, then defeated by voice vote.

Cindy Carver proposed an amendment to change the two sentences preceding the last sentence of the last paragraph of the motion, so it would read "The evaluation forms should then be destroyed, because faculty are not permitted to examine their individual evaluation forms. Summaries of the evaluations can be evaluated after grades have been posted." There was a second.

This amendment passed by voice vote.

Zack Kenz proposed an amendment, to add to the motion “The formal evaluation given to students shall include a written notice on the form that comments will be provided to faculty members verbatim.” There was a second.

Max Richardson said that, if students would like this statement to be there, it is OK with him. But would this have a dampening effect? Would students be less candid?

Kenz replied that students may be more careful in their comments, but he thinks it is worth it to be sure students are fully aware of how their comments will be used.

Jim Aageson asked if it is the task force’s intent that faculty may use other evaluation instruments, in addition to the formal instrument we are discussing at this meeting.

Mark Covey said that the task force did not intend to preclude any other instruments.

The amendment failed by voice vote.

Gay Rawson proposed an amendment to add “, with the following exception:” to the end of the second-to-last sentence of the last paragraph of the motion. There was a second.

This amendment passed by voice vote.

At this time, the last three sentences of the last paragraph of the motion read as follows:

“The evaluation forms should then be destroyed, because faculty are not permitted to examine their individual evaluation forms. Summaries of the evaluations can be evaluated after grades have been posted, with the following exception: Summaries of evaluations shall be provided to faculty who are the subject of regular, formal evaluation, along with the committee report.”

The meeting adjourned at 5:00.

Respectfully submitted,

Ron Twedt  
Acting Secretary