

CEPP Meeting Notes
October 20, 2025 @10:10-11:10am Library 213

CEPP Members present: Amy Frappier (Chair), Lila Glanville (SGA), Heather Hurst (Faculty), Natalie Koegler (SGA), Ryan Overbey (Faculty), Robert ParkeHarrison (Faculty), Javier Perez-Moreno (Faculty), Kelly Sheppard (Assessment), Natalie Taylor (Interim DoF/VPAA)

Absent: Adrian Bautista (DoS/VPASA),

Scribe: Ryan Overbey

I. Approval of Minutes

Action: *Minutes for 29 September were approved by unanimous consent after some corrections by KS.*

II. Announcements

A. AF has requested meetings from chairs of ATC, PC, and NTT Union to talk about Online Evaluations.

B. AF met with Joe Stankovich and Kerry Nelson from Institutional Research to talk about Online Evaluations.

C. AF meeting with Corey Freeman-Gallant and Eric Morser about the Senior Coda on Thursday.

D. JPM and HH are meeting with the Working Group for Inclusive and Accessible Teaching and Learning today.

III. New Business: OCSE review of proposed new program

A. Discuss CEPP's role and initial document review

AF: If we need more information, Cori Filson willing to meet with us to talk further.

1. CEPP reviewed the Guidelines for Approval of Off-Campus Study Programs

a. Must ensure there's no duplication of what we are already doing.

b. Must ensure that the program is appropriate for our students

c. Must ensure that the program doesn't add any undue surprise costs.

2. CEPP discussed the Theater department proposal.

HH: Reminder: last year Cori Filson spoke to us, and because of the transition to more cost-effective programs, and we determined that as a group we would discuss *new* proposals but the chair will individually handle mere transfers of the vendors.

NT: Impressed with Cori's judgment in balancing cost and quality of programs.

AF: The benefit here is that there are non-Theater courses that allow students to take courses that advance their other majors/minors, etc.

NK: Having more abroad options for theater seems important!

AF: Also offers an internship in Theater, which is an exciting and unique opportunity. Students can choose different tracks (performance, theater studies, etc.) It seems broad, comprehensive and offers lots of individual choice for students.

JPM: I thought it would be scary that you don't get your housing resolved until the last minute!

LG: They have to give you housing, it's 2 weeks before arrival.

RRO: Makes sense to give oneself leeway with the 2-week window because they have a legal responsibility to accommodate students with health needs, etc. So they want to give themselves time to find accommodations for special cases.

AF: This company is a part of a successful umbrella program.

RPH: Where do I find the classes offered here?

NK: It's in the Proposal under Section III, academics.

HH: Theater approved?

AF: Both Theater and OCSE enthusiastically approve.

KS: This program run by CAPA, who runs our FYE program in London as well.

3. **Action:** *CEPP approved the proposal for the new Theater study abroad program by unanimous consent.* AF will inform Cori Filson of the decision.

IV. Move to online ratings

A. Updates from stakeholder groups

1. We will get an update from the Working Group Subcommittee next week.

2. AF met with Institutional Research. Takeaway messages. It became much more clear talking to Kerry and Joe that we can definitely decouple the QSET online transition from whatever happens with the long forms. This is because IR handles the QSETs and does not handle the long forms at all. Our AAs handle long forms. Right now they match up the envelopes and packets that they get from IR, and they create another copy of those with the long forms, and they prepare them separately.

B. Discussion on QSETs and longforms

HH: The curation of the list is the only thing IR needs for the longforms.

AF: If we move QSETs online, IR wouldn't need to be as involved in longforms. IR would really love for the faculty to change the ways we code courses, for example, it confuses things for an Econ Lecture + Lab to be configured differently from section to section. They would like a more standardized system.

HH: There could be multiple points for standardization to enter the system.

AF: There are a lot of people involved in the data entry for these things or the setup for them. There are ways that as a campus we could make it better, the path forward on standardization is a separate conversation. It's not critical that we deal with standardization right now. Right now people are doing an enormous amount of work *post hoc* to all these computer programs to give the faculty what they want.

JPM: We cannot move the online QSET ratings to an earlier date because of the withdrawal deadline. Talking with people in committees, if we are not going to have course releases for being on ATC etc., it will be impossible to have enough time to go over all the handwritten longform ratings. This might be another reason why the departmental long forms should be moved online.

AF: Current workflow with longforms is labor-intensive.

JPM: The workload for ATC, if we don't keep course releases, then we won't have time to review all those long forms. If we think it's a bad tool we may also have no time to use that tool.

AF: There is also the question of efficacy. It feels like busywork that doesn't get us what we need for decisionmaking.

HH: Logistically we can continue to have the longform the way they are?

AF: In theory we could do this.

KS: The reality of an online eval set and in-person eval set is hard to administer.

NT: I would love to hear NK's and LG's view on this.

HH: If you have higher participation in-class and less-online, it's reversing the efficacy, as longforms are more biased.

NK: I think it should be all online or all on paper. Having two sets of forms will get complicated. One will have more participation.

LG: I agree. I understand making a first step, we have to learn how bad it is as we go! Maybe this is a stepping-stone to get somewhere else.

RPH: Plan could be the online qset done first, then move to handwritten portion. Also, what if you forgot your computer?

KS: Loaner laptop

AF: Or you can do it on your phone.

JPM: CEPP would want to have a unified longform, but we may need to decouple if there is pushback from faculty on the departmental longforms.

AF: It makes sense to keep the questions to a small number. QSET has 26-27 questions. If you make the form have too many questions, it starts to lower the completion rates, quality of answers, etc.

JPM: We could have a summary, with biased/inappropriate comments weeded out! And would make ATC etc. work much easier.

RPH: Not having a longform, but having a QSET with open-ended question at the end does sound like a great solution.

JPM: And your department can still implement your own tools and measurements at the midterm as developmental feedback.

LG: In Academic Council, students were concerned with handwriting being recognized and breaking anonymity. That is another thing from the student side we've heard.

HH: In Working Group we also talked about what happens with greater anonymity? We might have more off-the-rails comment. You might want to bring this up to Academic Council for discussion.

KS: For the forms currently you have to sign off, so you'd need to sign in online as well.

HH: I strongly advocate for adding an open comment box when moving online. Students need a place where they can comment on what happened in the classroom. That is the strongest reason for having an open comment box included in the online QSETs while the longforms are debated at the departmental level. One of the outcomes of discussion last week is that it would be healthy and wise to take the temperature of Chairs and Program Directors to get a sense of where they stand. Is there an emergent consensus?

RRO: I can ask chairs at the November C/PD only meeting.

AF: We can send the proposal to chairs and ask for their feedback.

NT: And emphasize that we have been deliberating about this for some time

KS: and solicited feedback on it!

AF: Will draft an email to send thru DoF to all C/PDs.

C. Faculty meeting: Draft endorsement for move to online ratings

AF: Should we put out a resolution for the faculty meeting in November that says we will move the QSETs online?

CEPP committee had a robust discussion of the pros and cons of a faculty meeting resolution. The primary argument against such a resolution is that this decision is entirely in CEPP's purview and that as a governance committee CEPP members (whom are elected/appointed by the faculty) have full authority to make the change without a vote from the faculty meeting. The move to online ratings has been long in the making, faculty have been informed throughout the process, and we will continue to solicit feedback.

At this point CEPP moved to a discussion of the knock-on effects of adopting an online ratings system.

HH: At some point we will need to go through Faculty Handbook thoroughly to address any changes necessary for moving to online ratings and for any resulting changes to longforms that emerge.

AF: We would also need to make sure the model personnel policies are updated whenever they touch on the various forms.

KS: The FHB is clear about QSETs, the longform language is very ambiguous.

AF: IR has sometimes struggled to get forms back to faculty in time before classes start, the process is long, complicated, and labor-intensive.

AF: IR also mentioned that one of the vendors they are looking at can not only do the comparisons that we want, but it looks like they are able to let faculty add their own questions. There is flexibility in some of these software packages.

AF: In terms of implementation, IR can do pilots of software, with a subset of maybe 50 courses. IR would need lead time to put things together. IR is already talking to IT to lay groundwork. We would also want to talk about how to deliver evaluations and whether we make a rule about the administration of the online forms.

HH: The biggest issue is the deployment aspect: IT, Registrar, IR, etc. all have to move in unison. The barriers are technical once we decide. And it will require us to make guidelines and decisions.

JPM: We will want to educate students on the process, etc. and introduce a protocol for how they are delivered.

AF: You could pull data from same course over multiple years and see changes, create pivot tables etc. This for individual faculty could be quite useful, give faculty ability to work with data.

KS: This kind of flexibility was promised to us long ago, and our current vendor made it impossible. So perhaps this will actually happen this time.

AF: New vendor costs \$1800-2000 more than the original one, but this would save printer, paper, scanners, etc. So should be budget neutral in terms of the QSETs. If we stopped departmental longforms, there would also be savings perhaps.

D. Open forum: Develop presentation and organize event

AF: Will reach out to Kim Frederick to get the ball rolling on an open forum event to invite faculty discussion and feedback on online ratings.

RPH: Is it encouraged for departments to start thinking critically and seriously about their long forms?

CEPP broadly agreed that yes, departments and programs should start thinking about their long forms.

V. Other business

CEPP members briefly discussed whether CEPP would need to have any particular input or would need to form new subcommittees in light of Academic Affairs cost reduction initiatives. We determined that right now it is too early to move on anything because nothing concrete has been decided.

KG noted that Academic Council is currently working on an AI symposium with students and profs.
Right now in process of reaching to C/PDs to get a sense of departmental policy on AI.

Respectfully submitted,

Ryan Richard Overbey