

CEPP Meeting Agenda
February 17, 2025 @10:10-11:10am
****Via Zoom****

Attendees: Adrian Bautista, Amy Frappier, Heather Hurst, Lisa Jackson-Schebetta, Nick Junkerman, Natalie Koegler, Trevor Lai, Dorothy Mosby, Kelly Sheppard; Jamin Totino, Joe Stankovich, Kerry Nelson

Scribe: Heather Hurst

Agenda items:

1. Revisions suggested for Minutes from 2/10; pending incorporation
2. Topic: moving to online evaluations
 - a. In this process, survey was sent to peer institutions regarding their transition and use of online evaluations; Joe is beginning to get responses
 - b. HHMI group representatives will meet with CEPP in future meeting to discuss their review of evaluations with focus on process over content
 - c. Joe Stankovich and Kerry Nelson, IR, discussed the greater context and process of possible move to online evaluations, with seven major items:
 - i. Currently the process requires a “triple check” of data cleaning and tailoring files to have highly accurate class rosters and address the range of class variations prior to generating and distributing evaluations.
 - ii. Our current practice is not to include students that withdraw from a course in evaluations, thereby delaying the start of the “triple check” above.
 - iii. There is significant workload for IR in our current practice that requires individual data editing of the master schedule courses in addition to the roster verification (e.g. variable end date, multi-classes evaluated as one). Skidmore has a high number of boutique requests and evaluations currently prioritize individual instructor / department practices. Part of this is complicated by the variable software systems used by administrative assistants, the registrar, and IR throughout the process of course creation, enrollment, drop/withdrawal, etc.
 - iv. Software: We are currently using Class Climate because this is the only vendor that can do paper evaluations. However, it has necessitated a cumbersome workflow around this (we do all our own scanning). Moving to online will provide greater choice in vendors and change this workflow. An item to consider in looking at vendors are the current variables for comparison (instructor to course / dept / college).
 - v. Response Rate: our 90% response rate is high. Yet from survey results, many school are also getting a high rate of return, particularly those that give time to do online evals in class.
 - vi. Delivery: as stated above, response rate increases depending on delivery method; via email is a poor method. Transition to online will require support on this process from IT, both to enable faculty to verify their evaluations are “there,” and for development of a Brightspace widget, etc.

- vii. Dept Evals: in survey of our peers, no other institutions (thus far) have a separate customized department evaluation instrument. Skidmore has approximately 40 different instruments at the dept/pgm level; we are outliers in this regard. In their present form, the departmental evaluations are too complex and variable to integrate into an online delivery system.
- d. Final discussion of this topic highlighted the inevitable reality that evaluations will need to move online, the cultural change that it will require, the opportunity to reduce and improve workload, as well as improve the instrument.
- e. CEPP Chair will draft a summary to share with faculty, targeted for April meeting.