

**ICES (Instructor and Course Evaluation System) Implementation Committee**  
**SUMMARY NOTE: Meeting #3, Wednesday, August 13, 2003**

Present: Andy Brogowicz (Marketing/Business), Susan Caulfield (Sociology/Arts and Sciences), Linda Dannison (Family and Consumer Sciences/Education), Linda Delene (Provost's Office), Wendy Ford (Arts and Sciences/Dean's Office), Marie Gates (Nursing/Health and Human Services), Parviz Merati (Mechanical and Aeronautical Engineering/Engineering and Applied Sciences), Daniel Mihalko (Statistics/Arts and Sciences), Bill Rantz (Aviation), David Sheldon (College of Fine Arts/Dean's Office), Tom VanValey (Sociology/Arts and Sciences) and Jay Wood (Mathematics/Arts and Sciences). Absent: Dewayne Anderson (Teaching, Learning, and Leadership/Education).

The meeting began at 1:30 PM with approval of the committee's second meeting summary note of 7/15/03. With brief discussion, it was agreed that copies of the *ICES Catalog* will be made available to all ranked faculty; and that committee representatives from each college will advise Delene of the number needed; and subsequent distribution will then occur through the respective departmental chairs. The next item of business was the review of comments received about preliminary core institutional questions. After review of comments and further committee discussion, a motion was made to recommend six questions for the institutional core during the trial years: the two mandated system questions ("Rate the instructor's overall teaching effectiveness" Exceptionally high, Exceptionally low; and "Rate the overall quality of the course" Exceptionally High, Exceptionally low), # 104 ("Was the grading system explained?" Yes, very well; No, not at all), # 162 ("How much have you learned in this course?" A great deal, Very little), # 248 ("The instructor seemed well prepared for class" Yes, always, No, seldom), and #392 ("The instructor promoted an atmosphere conducive to work and learning" Strongly agree, strongly disagree). The motion made by Ford and seconded by Caulfield was unanimously approved.

Delene indicated that in response to a suggestion, a mini-feasibility test was done to determine if scanning of the individual rating forms on WMU's campus, the creating a data file to be then sent to UIUC for processing and analyses, and then with the reports sent to WMU was possible. The advantages of such a hybrid system include fewer logistical problems associated with the US postal system especially at the holiday season, fairly similar campus handling of rating forms by faculty and departments, and slightly less cost to the University. The mini-feasibility test for scanning the UIUC forms at WMU went well with a couple of technical issues that are being addressed. The motion made by VanValey and seconded by Sheldon to pursue the hybrid processing system was adopted unanimously. The committee further agreed that faculty colleagues' selection of individual questions is important and should be accommodated during the trial period if at all possible. UIUC advised that variation among rating forms due to the selection of different questions by individual faculty colleagues is not an issue for processing the requests for forms.

Wood then presented an overview of how student comments are currently handled within the Department of Mathematics. All agreed that individual student comments (signed or unsigned) must be separated from the standardized rating form itself. Brogowicz and Gates presented a form patterned on the UIUC reverse side rating form that could be used for student comment, and which reflects the material and procedure now used in Mathematics. A discussion about signed student comments reflected different interpretations as to whether signed comments were automatically provided to departmental chairs. [Delene consulted with Chet Rogers, who indicated that all signed comments will automatically be provided to department chairs and, after their review, are subsequently returned to faculty colleagues with the rating forms and any unsigned comments. Rogers also noted that if a faculty colleague chooses to include unsigned student comments for their performance reviews, then all such comments must be included in the file (WMU-AAUP Contract, Section 16.4.6.3).]

Discussion then turned to the operational and logistical considerations for the rating system. It was agreed that a standard, written protocol for the handling/transmission of rating forms, signed comments, and unsigned comments should be drafted for on and off campus instructional adoption. Wood, Gates, and Rantz will draft a protocol that will be considered at the committee's next meeting. Upon approval of such a protocol by all parties, it will form the basis of a professional training seminar for departmental chairs and their respective administrative assistants to insure that the appropriate handling of forms and comments occurs across the campus. The committee is targeting completion of its work by mid-September with a brief set of implementation recommendations. Delene was asked to develop a timetable for the requesting and processing of forms by the committee's next meeting. The meeting was adjourned at 3:20 PM.

**NEXT MEETING: 9:00 – 10:30AM, Thursday, September 4, 2003**