Present: Miranda Anderson, Andrew Brewick, Shannon Gill, Michael Kyte, Steve Saladin, Karen Gillespie, Shenghan Xu, Bernhard Stumpf, Chris Lighty

Absent: Jeanne Christiansen, Jodie Nicotra, Kelli Schrand

The meeting commenced with the approval of the minutes from the October 18, 2012 meeting.

1. Discussion of Teaching and Advising Awards
   - The meeting notes from Miranda and Patti Heath were reviewed.
   - The Provost's office will host a website featuring all UI awards in an effort to align the processes for awards across campus. The site will include links to criteria and submission information. This site is scheduled to go live on Monday, Nov. 5, 2012 and currently the only deadline date mentioned is January 25, 2013.
   - Although there are benefits to aligning all UI awards through a web based submission process, the new process eliminates the formal nomination process and lacks a nomination deadline. The default deadline is January 25, 2013 which may not give nominees enough time to complete their packet.
   - Removing the formal nomination process creates a concern for those who may want to self-nominate. In this case the nominee would have to find someone willing to write a letter of nomination for them.
   - There is concern over how long some might wait to make a nomination without a deadline listed. Our nomination award packets are more rigorous than others and nominees need additional time to prepare their packets. The past deadline for submissions has been approximately the second week in December.
   - We need to pursue an idea to customize the process while complying with the new process.
   - Potential routing issue – when will the nominees be notified?
   - The committee would like to see an additional document/step added to the nomination process which clearly includes a nomination deadline. Is it possible to add this document to the web based submission process?
   - Miranda will talk to Patti to learn the best way to implement this process. It is unlikely to get a commitment with such short notice.

2. Discussion of Student Evaluation Review
   - Miranda - referred to handout on Policies addressing student evaluation of teaching document. Is there any contextual information that we need to know before we embark on this journey?
   - Re: B-7 of policy. Chris commented that access to evaluations from outside entities is minimal. It is unclear why students have to go to the Office of Institutional Research (IRA) and assessment to view these documents and why this information is not available on the web.
   - When is the best time for students to complete the evaluation to increase the submission rate? Moving the date to finals week to potentially increase submission
rates has been discussed in the Faculty Senate retreat, but nothing formal has gone forward.

- Andrew – if the evaluation form was available to students on web would it give students more incentive to complete evaluations? Chris will find out if it is possible to put the evaluation on their website.

- Would extra credit increase the response rates? There are different options for this method while maintaining anonymous submissions. Shenghan experimented with the extra credit method last semester and received a 97% completion rate. Currently the extra credit option is not part of the review.

- The previous policy using scantrons is no longer an option due lack of budget, staff and there is only one scantron machine on campus.

- What is the scope of what we need to look at? Biggest challenge is not getting bogged down in details too early, a lot of complexities. Where should we begin?

- The current evaluation form includes two common questions and an instructor can select up to an additional ten questions from a list of approximately 100. Chris will provide us with copies of the evaluations.

- Shannon volunteered to research evaluation information from other institutions. She will also review the student evaluation information on the IRA site.

- Shenghan has examples from other institutions to share.

- The committee will review section B of Policies & Procedures, write down notes, thoughts, ideas to be discussed in the future.

Meeting adjourned at 4:35.

Respectfully submitted by Karen Gillespie