

Academic Quality Committee Meeting
April 8, 2022
MS Teams
10:00 AM

Present: Chris Tsavatewa, Scott Hinze, Karmen Lenz, Rod McRae, Randy Steinmann, Andrew Reeves, Stephen Fuller, Sandra Bevill, Liz Riley, Tammy Haislip, James McNeill, Christian Kim

Absent: Tamatha Lambert, Barry Monk, James Decker, Nancy Guyse, David Biek

This meeting is to address the sub-committee work.

1. One Sub-Committee has written the letter for the Executive Committee, but there are comments and issues that still need to be addressed
2. The other sub-committee was working on the actual evaluation instrument.

Response Rate Recommendations for Evaluations:

- Dr. Fuller asked a question about #6 on the letter for providing guidance on writing helpful feedback. Does this create a prejudice or violate the process prior to the actual evaluation?
- Dr. Hinze addressed this issue on the fact that many students are not qualified on how to give advice. Suggestion that the link on how to provide the information as a link in the e-mail for the evaluation.
- Dr. Tsavatewa mentioned that this is done outside of academia with explanation of the Likert scale, etc. He suggested that this information be added to the web page that will be built on evaluations.
- Dr. McRae gave an example of a comment that was not helpful along with follow up questions as to why that student felt that way, what happened, etc. Then, he explained that even if you say the class is awesome to explain why or what about the teaching made it awesome.
- Chris brought up that we need to be cautious with language between requiring and encouraging people to do so. Is it a shift for accountability for future? Make sure the language is clear.
- Liz made a motion to continue work on the recommendations to Fall 2022. Andrew Reeves seconded. Motion passed.

Evaluation Instrument:

- A sub-committee is currently looking at the language of the committee.
- This committee mentioned there is more feedback needed from faculty and students.

- Focus groups for language and feedback from Faculty about the questions for what will work and what does not.
- Looking for the best evaluation to improve teaching.
- Questions have been raised about the quality of the data collected from the focus groups.