

ICES (Instructor and Course Evaluation System) Implementation Committee
SUMMARY NOTE: Meeting #15 – Wednesday, April 20, 2005
www.wmich.edu/poapa/ICES

Present: DeWayne Anderson (Teaching, Learning, and Leadership/Education); Andy Brogowicz (Marketing/Business); Susan Brodasky (Institutional Effectiveness); David Burnie (Haworth College of Business/); Susan Caulfield (Sociology/Arts and Sciences); Linda Dannison (Family and Consumer Sciences/Education); Tom Deckard (Aviation); Wendy Ford (Arts and Sciences/Dean's Office); Marie Gates (Nursing/Health and Human Services); James Leja (College of Health and Human Services/Dean's Office); Deborah Newson (Muskegon/EUP); Richard O'Hearn (College of Fine Arts/School of Music); Tom VanValey (Sociology/Arts and Sciences); Jay Wood (Academic Collective Bargaining)

Absent: Eileen Evans (Institutional Effectiveness/Provost's Office); Shaila Rao (College of Education/Educational Studies Department); Edmund Tsang (Engineering and Applied Science/Dean's Office); Daniel Mihalko (Statistics/Arts and Sciences)

The meeting was called to order by J. Wood, in absence of E. Evans, at 10 a.m.

1. There was a motion by T. Deckard to approve the committee summary notes from meeting #14, seconded by L. Dannison. Motion approved.
2. Teleconference with John Ory, Chris Migotsky, Kathy Duvall of the University of Illinois Urbana Champaign.
 - a) C. Migotsky summarized the two-page overview he had provided which had been previously forwarded to the ICES committee members. He noted the move from a main frame computer to a server environment. UIUC deadline is June 25 for that migration to be completed followed by phase 2 which will consist of enhancements to ICES overall. Some of those expected enhancements include online ordering and online results; however those features will be accessible only by UIUC faculty. There will also be a revised catalog of ICES questions with new questions being added and some being removed. Some of the scales for questions will be revised and he anticipates the addition of technology questions. The new catalog is expected to be accessed only online, no hard copies will be produced. He reported that there will be revisions to the instructor reports in order to make them easier to interpret, but there will not be any changes to statistics included on those reports. Changes to the red form will include full first name of instructors, a different list of class types, and the addition of University ID numbers. He indicated that with the server system the data will be easier to access therefore enabling enhancement of ad-hoc capabilities thus providing broader reporting. W. Ford questioned how new questions being added to the catalog would be determined. C. Migotsky stated that there is a faculty review committee in place at UIUC for this purpose. Discussion was held regarding reliability and validity of the questions. In determining deletions of questions usage statistics will be used. W. Ford asked if WMU could submit questions for consideration to be added. C. Migotsky said yes, he went on to clarify that WMU has the option to create their own questions to be used as core question items; however, individual faculty questions must come from the catalog. S. Caulfield asked if question usage counts could be generated for WMU. C. Migotsky stated that is could be done but when asked for a timeline of completion J. Ory stated that they would not guarantee completion of any ad-hoc items at this time.
 - b) Discussion was held regarding changes from WMU during the phase 2 of the UIUC rewrite. W. Ford asked about revising the class types, and when UIUC would need out input. C. Migotsky said the deadline would be the end of August of this year. J. Leja asked about a Health & Human Services program being offered entirely through long distance learning, and is there a way to use ICES for those courses. C. Migotsky related that UIUC has faced the same situation and had an on-line system developed for them; unfortunately since they purchased that product from another vendor they are unable to share or sell it to WMU. Discussion was held regarding the comparison on that on-line system with ICES. J. Ory reported that at the time they had their on-line product developed they had been unable to find any commercial products for this purpose and opted to have one written for them. D. Newson asked about the distribution to extended university programs and some of the complications we have experienced. K. Duvall suggested ordering the evaluations for those courses as soon as possible, even if that means several months prior. J. Wood asked about the phase 2 changes to the red forms noting that WMU is in process of

implementing Banner and if UIUC moves that red form processing to an on-line system WMU would like to participate also. C. Migotsky noted that he had spoken to WMU SIS technician about this development and he is willing to share any knowledge and asked the same of us. He also noted that at such a time that we do make the red forms electronic within Banner they would be able to accept the data files to produce the evaluations in place of the red form. J. Wood asked if their on-line evaluation system interfaces with Banner to which J. Ory replied that it does not.

c) Timeline Questions:

2.c.1. K. Duvall reported that there is a three-week turnaround timeframe for production of forms, and while this typically proves to be sufficient they are unable to guarantee due to unforeseen complications in printing. W. Ford asked if extending the deadline would make a difference. K. Duvall noted that they are unable to control the printing department. Three weeks is reasonable even though they can't make a full commitment that it would not take longer than that on occasion.

2.c.2. K. Duval outlined some ideas she had for WMU to improve turn around of forms. She noted that the clerical staff in each department who are processing the forms are the people that have the most input for correction or detection of problems prior to them entering the system. She suggests further and more extensive training. Develop a better tracking system on deliveries on campus, as several times there have been questions if a shipment has gone out only to find out it was delivered and office staff are unaware of the delivery. She also suggested reviewing the use of section codes. Differentiation by section code it is not built into ICES. This process extends the time for forms to be generated. Finally, she noted the scanning process being out of order creates the instructor reports to be printing out of order thus creating extra sort time. She reported that the evaluations should be scanned in the order that the reports will be printed (i.e., alpha order by department, then by department code, then in alpha order by instructor name and so on). Sorting the order prior to scanning will produce the data file in the order of the report printing. Discussion was held regarding the scanning process.

2.c.3. J. Wood asked how early red forms for EUP or early ending courses could be turned in. K. Duvall replied that they can be submitted at any time as long as the semester for which they will be used is prominently noted.

2.c.4. K. Duvall stated the reports can be returned in four weeks. It was noted that this topic had been covered by the previous questions.

2.c.5. J. Wood asked for a timeline on production of the department summary reports. C. Migotsky explained that they would be delayed from the date of the instructor reports due to the fact that they can not be produced until UIUC closes down the run for that semester. He expects that for this spring they will be produced by the end of June and typically for fall semester they would be done by late February. S. Caulfield questioned if the semester close down is at the end of the WMU semester or the UIUC semester. K. Duvall replied that the close down does not include UIUC but it does include the other universities that they service. So due to different semester ending dates from one university to another it would follow the latest ending semester date. T. VanValey noted that as long as the department summary reports are provided during the following semester they will still be very useful.

2.c.6. W. Ford reiterated the question regarding separation of delivery of forms and reports. K. Duvall explained that UIUC returns all items as they are generated. Because of discrepancies with section numbers or errors, there are kick outs on runs. In order to not hold up the rest of the forms the kick outs are done at a later date resulting in separation of groupings and divided mailings. W. Ford noted that the committee should consider reviewing the section coding. She asked if there could be notification to the department when a kick out occurs so that the faculty member could be alerted that other forms are still pending. K. Duvall will try and notify when and which faculty have had a kick out.

d) J. Wood asked for the length of time recommended to compile comparison numbers. C. Migotsky stated it is two years of data collection. W. Ford asked if with each year of data collected the norm is updated. C. Migotsky stated yes, it will reflect the most recent two-year span. W. Ford asked if more specific norms could be collected (i.e., lecture vs. lab). C. Migotsky noted that it could not be done for the instructor reports but it could be written as an ad hoc report sometime in the future. T. VanValey asked if there could be a separation on the department summary reports for

graduate and undergraduate programs. C. Migotsky stated that there could be but it would have to part of the changes in phase two of the rewrite. Discussion was held regarding manipulation of the data file on site as WMU. S. Caulfield noted that the AAUP contract stipulates that evaluation of the data be done by UIUC.

e) Demographic Data Questions:

2.e.1. When questioned about the purpose for collection of demographic data C. Migotsky replied that it is reported on the instructor reports and it is available for ad-hoc reporting as it is done at UIUC.

2.e.2. Usage of demographic data at UIUC was previously explained.

2.e.3. C. Migotsky noted that WMU can make use of the demographic data in ad-hoc reports.

2.e.4. J. Wood asked if the demographic data could be used to analyze specific items. C. Migotsky replied that would be a research studies issue and not a data report. He did not feel comfortable doing that type of analysis as it is not what ICES is for.

f) J. Wood called for any final questions. J. Ory stated that he will add what was discussed to the phase two of the rewrite process and is optimistic that the items we suggested will be implemented over the next year.

g) Discussion was held following the teleconference summarizing what was learned. D. Burnie noted that the most significant theme expressed have to do with processing and ordering, that there seem to be some ways we will need to make improvements. Discussion was held regarding scanning services and processing. S. Brodasky was asked to invite Renee Smith, scanning services, to the next committee meeting. A. Brogowicz stated that we should be cautious not be become dependant on our supplier as J. Ory had pointed out they are suffering the same budgetary constraints as we are and their continuation could be jeopardized. Discussion was held.

3. Other:

a) A. Brogowicz noted that the University means were not to be calculated; however, they were included on the department summary reports. S. Caulfield responded that indeed the committee agreed to use them on the department summary reports but not on the instructor reports. Discussion was held regarding what norms are meaningful to WMU and what it would cost to have UIUC write specific ad-hoc reports.

b) W. Ford asked to have the composition of the committee reviewed to add college and department office staff who participate in the ICES process the most. S. Brodasky reported that the contacts have been made to those individuals who will need to recommend replacements for the members who will be leaving. J. Wood stated that it could be helpful to review the overall make up of the committee representation. T. VanValey and W. Ford expressed the need to include administrative staff and Renee Smith of scanning services. S. Caulfield suggested the addition of faculty members that are not representing the AAUP union. S. Brodasky was instructed to add this discussion item on the agenda for the next meeting.

c) W. Ford asked to add an agenda item for next month to open the discussion of changes to be suggested to UIUC for the inclusion of catalog items, different representation of class types, and faculty rankings.

d) S. Caulfield reported that the AAUP had responded that it will not agree to continue use of ICES through the negotiation process. She noted that there is a section of the faculty that does not support a Universitywide evaluation system. She expressed concern that this committee has not done anything to verify if ICES is working at WMU. She asked that the committee produce an evaluation report to be provided to WMU administration. It should include evidence-based data of ICES success as well as a cost comparison of ICES to the previous department based systems. Questions were raised if such a report would violate AAUP contract language. J. Wood noted the contract wording as "the chapter will consult with faculty to evaluate" the ICES system at the end of the current contract. L. Dannison expressed that she is in favor of producing a progress report as outlined by S. Caulfield. W. Ford expressed concern with the contract language limiting this committee in having that conversation. S. Caulfield noted that the contract does not forbid this committee of that process. Since the charge of the committee was to implement ICES across campus it is logical for the committee to provide a report of progress of implementation and success, therein we can summarize the pros and cons of ICES. T. VanValey reinforced the idea of producing a progress report to the administration and the union, as well as providing it to the

University community. S. Brodasky was instructed to add this discussion item to the next meeting agenda.

Next meeting: 1 PM – 3 PM Thursday, May 19, 2005 in room 3030 Schneider Hall and **1 PM – 3 PM Thursday, June 9, 2005** in room 3030 Schneider Hall.

Meeting adjourned by J. Wood at 11:58 a.m.