

**ICES (Instructor and Course Evaluation System) Implementation Committee**  
**SUMMARY NOTE: Meeting #12 – Thursday, January 13, 2005**  
[www.wmich.edu/poapa/ICES](http://www.wmich.edu/poapa/ICES)

**Present:** DeWayne Anderson (Teaching, Learning, and Leadership/Education), David Burnie (Haworth College of Business/); Susan Brodasky (Institutional Effectiveness), Andy Brogowicz (Marketing/Business), Susan Caulfield (Sociology/Arts and Sciences), Linda Dannison (Family and Consumer Sciences/Education), Tom Deckard (Aviation), Eileen Evans (Institutional Effectiveness/Provost's Office), Wendy Ford (Arts and Sciences/Dean's Office), Marie Gates (Nursing/Health and Human Services), James Gilchrist (Director of SIS Project), James Leja (College of Health and Human Services/Dean's Office), Daniel Mihalko (Statistics/Arts and Sciences), Deborah Newson (Muskegon/EUP), Richard O'Hearn (College of Fine Arts/School of Music), Shaila Rao (College of Education/Educational Studies Department), Edmund Tsang (Engineering and Applied Science/Dean's Office), Jay Wood (Academic Collective Bargaining)

**Absent:** Tom VanValey (Sociology/Arts and Sciences)

The meeting was called to order by Chair, E. Evans at 1 PM

1. Introduction of new members David Burnie, Richard O'Hearn, Shaila Rao
2. There was a motion to approve the committee summary notes from meeting #11. Motion seconded and approved.
3. J. Gilchrist updated the committee on the progress of converting the ICES Red Form into an online system within SIS. He noted that it is not a small programming task, since there are University core questions, College core questions, and Department core questions to establish. UIUC is currently reprogramming its systems and cannot advise WMU as of yet what it will entail. Discussion held. J. Gilchrist also updated the committee on the course registration going live as of February 14<sup>th</sup>. He noted that there will be a data store training at the end of March. D. Newson asked about data migration, will data be removed from the old ISIS system? J. Gilchrist responded that a duplicate will be kept running into the Fall 2005 semester, after which it will be turned off. J. Gilchrist also reported that the accounts receivable system will be up and running in April. The committee requested further updates from J. Gilchrist at the May meeting.
4. S. Caulfield reported that when she provided an ICES update to the AAUP Executive Council several questions were raised.
  - a) *"When and how, will comparisons be made?"* W. Ford reminded the group that L. Delene had said at a prior meeting that WMU will need a couple of years of data for comparisons to be included on the semester reports. Discussion was held. The committee asked S. Caulfield to notify AAUP Exec Council that the ICES Committee will open the discussion, at the next meeting, on inclusion of norms. Ford identified that question one through four all refer to comparisons. Questions were raised regarding the norms being mean or median or could both be provided. The committee asked that UIUC be contacted to verify the specifics of the norms prior to next meeting.
  - b) *"Pedagogy?"* The committee was in consensus that the instructor should have discussions regarding pedagogy with students at the beginning of the semester and such discussion would therefore not be appropriate during ICES evaluations the last week prior to exams. S. Caulfield noted that the question could be in reference to the point at which the instructor is identifying their individual ICES questions. Should they be picking questions that will link directly to learning objectives? J. Wood suggested that a column in the AAUP newsletter could address the value and logic of choosing individual questions. He also suggested having the Center for Teaching and Learning, P. Saunders, provide a session on question selection and evaluation development. A motion was made to request the Center for Teaching and Learning provide a seminar on "using the student rating system for instructional improvement." Motion supported and approved.
  - c) *"Evaluation of system?"* J. Wood reiterated the AAUP contract language regarding evaluation of the ICES system. He stated that he anticipates that ICES will be part of the contract negotiation this year. Questions were raised if the committee should begin a review process versus AAUP doing a review. It was acknowledged that it should be a joint review committee. Discussion was

- held. A. Brogowicz reported that an extensive evaluation was done prior to selecting ICES. It was determined at that time an important aspect was to maintain a singular evaluation system campus wide. Evaluation of the ICES system is two fold, one being the evaluation of the ICES product and the second being the evaluation of campus wide evaluating system. S. Caulfield asked the committee if they would be interested in establishing a joint committee to evaluate. It was noted that this committee already has AAUP representation and would be considered a joint committee. Discussion was held. E. Evans stated that until the issue of norm comparisons has been decided it is premature to evaluate the system as a whole. A motion was made to devote the next meeting to the topic of comparisons. Motion supported and approved. The issue of system evaluation was tabled until that there is a decision on norm comparisons.
- d) *“Comment research proposal?”* E. Evans reported that the funds once offered by the Provost office for the student comment research are no longer available.
5. S. Brodasky presented the Fall 2004–“What We Have Learned” list, which summarized issues arising during the fall’s campus wide implementation. It was noted for number two that it was all non-EUP early ending courses that did not receive their evaluations on time. Discussion was held regarding if blank evaluations should be produced and at what level, (i.e. Campus Coordinator, College Coordinator, Department) and where they would be held. Discussion was held. The committee determined that blank evaluations were not needed and would not be done at any level. Discussion was held regarding the last item, collection of completed evaluations after business hours. Several options were suggested and discussed. A motion was made to have each department develop a system, in consultation with the college coordinators, for collection and return of ICES materials. Motion supported and approved with one abstention by D. Burnie.
6. S. Brodasky presented the FAQ list for publication on the website. An additional question was suggested “Must instructors select individual questions for inclusion on the evaluations?” E. Evans asked the committee to provide any additional suggestions or variations by January 21, 2005 for inclusion on the list. At that time S. Brodasky will proceed with posting it on line.
7. E. Evans asked that since only one testimonial has been collected thus far this item be tabled. She asked for the committees help in soliciting others. It was suggested to ask for short quotes explaining “why it works for me.”
8. Other Business:
- a) M. Gates asked if the time line for the reports being returned to WMU could be moved up. Faculty have noted that it would help in their selection of individual questions for the next semester if they were able to review the previous semesters responses
- b) T. Deckard reported that faculty raised the question if there is flexibility in the time line of when the evaluations are administered in the class. Does it have to be the last week of class prior to exams? W. Ford indicated that while it should be close to the end of the semester and definitely not during exam week, beyond that it is to the discretion of the instructor.
- c) S. Caulfield asked if the problem with Summer I and Summer II reports being labeled Spring had been looked into. S. Brodasky reported that it was a clerical error by UIUC where as they were unaware of the separate semesters and is now resolved.
- d) E. Tsang noted that due to the majority of engineering students being male the faculty questioned why gender was identified on the evaluations. M. Gates also noted that the nursing department faces the same issue with the majority of nursing students being female. In doing so it raises concerns about recognition of the student completing the evaluation. J. Wood noted that UIUC does track survey outcomes by gender. E. Evans will discuss the issue with UIUC and it will be on the agenda for the March meeting.
- e) In preparation for the comparison discussion S. Brodasky will schedule a meeting with S. Caulfield, D. Anderson and E. Evans.
9. **Next two meetings: 1 PM – 3 PM Thursday, February 24, 2005 and 1 PM – 3 PM Thursday, March 24, 2005** (Room 3030 Schneider Hall was requested). April – S. Brodasky will survey the committee members for their finals week schedules.

Meeting adjourned by Chair, E. Evans at 2:55 PM