Standing Committee: Student Affairs Committee
Date & Time: Feb. 14th, 2013, 11:00 AM
Location: Burnham 303
Attendees:
   Student Members: 6 student members
   Faculty Members: 4 faculty members

In Attendance: 6 students, 4 faculty
Meeting began at 11:00am

- Introductions
- Discussion of meeting times - still struggling to find times that students can meet. Ted will look at the Convo schedule and see if there are some Thursdays without Convo so that we can meet at least once a month.
- Communicated to the new student members that Trish Morris working on survey questions about IDEA evaluations
- Abbey Glenn presented the new student group proposals on hard copy and email - 5 to discuss at this meeting, there will be more at the next meeting
- Focus of today's meeting will be approval of these five groups
- Jacob Carlew guided us through the proposals for review

New Student Groups to be Reviewed Today

- Food for Thought: President submitted an email to Jacob Carlew with a more detailed description of the group's intent. Members of SAC were unsure of why there needed to be an official student group to do this, but that also a group like this couldn't hurt. Why isn't the university already doing these things in the commons? Would like to see an expanded mission including what is processed and what is not. Jen moved to approve, Kaitlin second, group was approved.

- Drury Improv Group: Listed that members would pay dues but did not indicate how much they would pay. Natalie moves to approve, Jacob second, the group was approved.

- Student Recruitment Team: Not sure why this group needs separate status and funding from SGA when they already get this from Admissions. Need more clarification as to why this needs to be a separate SGA student group. Group not approved - tabled for now.

- Panthers for Autism: Jacob met with Katie the president earlier. She provided updated documents. We suggest that the name be changed to "Panthers for Autism Awareness." They would like to host events
and do a Autism awareness week, etc. Suggest that this group partners with “Putting on the Lips” since this event benefits Autism awareness. Motion to approve by Erin, second by Lauren, this group was approved.

- CCH: The Underground: Affiliated with MSU’s group. Are they combining or separate chapters? How is this different from the Vine at Drury or Authentic Ministries? Do we need another group of this type on campus? Awkward wording such as "provide positive alternative to student life" should be changed or clarified. Said that dues are required but did not state how much. Group was tabled until we get more information.

Discussion about when we will approve groups in the future:

- should we only approve groups twice a year: fall/spring? There is no official outlined process for this - Jacob Carlew and Abbey Glenn looking to outline the process and will propose it to the group in the near future.

- Meeting adjourned at 11:48am

Dr. Natalie Wlodarczyk
Director & Assistant Professor, Music Therapy Drury University
Called to Order at 12:12

Old Business

1. **November 13th Minutes Approved.** Motion by Booker, 2nd by Shipman.
2. **Faculty/Course Evaluations.** The entire meeting was devoted to this topic. We discussed the committee members’ email votes on the questions we’d submitted to SAC for inclusion on an SGA survey in the spring. We noted overlap on some questions. We also noted few votes for a question regarding anonymity, which was a primary concern of the students last year. We realized it may be due to so few students on SAC voting this year. We chose to retain it as the topic for one of our questions based on our discussion at the meeting.

The top questions via email vote fell into these areas, but again, may have reflected concerns of the faculty more than the students.

a. Use and purpose of the evaluations (8 votes)
b. Burn-out by students due to multiple evaluations each term (6 votes)
c. Forms accurately express students’ assessment of course/faculty (4 votes)

The main areas of concern our questions will address are:

a. Anonymity
b. Use and purpose of the evaluations
c. Burn-out by students due to multiple evaluations each term
d. Open-ended box for comments
We discussed possible outcomes of the survey, and what might be included in our report to FAC based on the results. These included exploring ways for student comments to be provided to the faculty in a form that doesn’t reveal handwriting. Transcription of comments into typed form or online options were mentioned. One professor noted that at a prior institution that changed to online forms participation dropped to 12% and was mostly harsh. Transcription is already done in the evening college at Drury. Dr. Julian will query Aimee Hunter regarding any history or possibility of this for the day school.

Lack of continuity in evaluation implementation was discussed as a possible reason students may not know the purpose or use of the evaluations. Anecdotes were shared regarding experiences students have had prior to evaluations ranging from formal statements being read outlining the purpose and use of it, to (in one case) a professor stating that it didn’t matter because he/she already had tenure and that was its primary purpose. Gaining some sense of how many students know the purpose and use of the evaluations or have concerns about them may lead to some recommendations to FAC.

New Business
1. **New Student Groups:** No new student groups requested approval.

Meeting adjourned at 12:55

Next meeting is Tuesday, Jan. 29th at noon, in FSC 204.
Respectfully submitted, Jacqueline Tygart
MINUTES

Standing Committee: Student Affairs Committee
Date & Time: Tuesday, November 13th, 2012
Location: FSC 204
Attendees:

Student Members: Sharri Bell (Student Chair), Megan Green
Faculty Members: Ted Vaggalis (Faculty Chair), Jacqueline Tygart (Secretary), Gregory Booker, Mark Wood, Natalie Wlodarczyk, Erin Kineman, Brian Shipman
Ex-Officio Members: Tijuana Julian

Called to Order at 12:05

Old Business
1. October 16th Minutes Approved. Motion by Booker, 2nd by Bell
2. Faculty/Course Evaluations. We circulated the list of compiled questions for a future SGA survey and voted on which 3 we will include. Bell noted that multiple-choice, Likert scale, and yes/no questions solicit the most responses on SGA surveys. We reiterated earlier concerns including frequency, anonymity, use, and how well they apply (or don’t) to all disciplines. Wood also noted that our chosen questions should be run by a resident expert on survey phrasing to be sure the questions are clear and lack bias.

New Business
1. SAC Minutes. We discussed making the SAC minutes available in a forum to which students have access as well as under the Faculty tab on MyDrury. Sharri Bell suggested the SGA website and said to send minutes to her.
2. New Student Chair. Jacob Carlew was elected VP of Student Affairs by the SGA, which means he will replace Sharri Bell as student chair on SAC.
3. New Student Groups. Sharri Bell introduced four new student group applications for our consideration.
   a. “Food for Thought” was tabled pending more information.
   b. “Student Recruitment Team” was tabled pending more information.
   c. “Men on the Lane” was rejected because they are not open to all students.
   d. “Pink Panthers” was rejected because they are not open to all students.

Next meeting is Nov. 27th FSC President’s Dining Room. Meeting adjourned at 12:55
Respectfully submitted, Jacqueline Tygart
MINUTES

Standing Committee: Student Affairs Committee
Date & Time: Tuesday, October 16\textsuperscript{th}, 2012, Noon
Location: Hoblit Patio
Attendees: 
Student Members: Kate Elam, Megan Green
Faculty Members: Ted Vaggalis (Faculty Chair), Jacqueline Tygart (Secretary), Greg Booker, Trish Morris, Natalie Wlodarczyk
Ex-Officio Members: Tijuana Julian

Called to Order at 12:10

Old Business

1. Oct. 2\textsuperscript{nd} Minutes Approved. Motion by Wlodarczyk, 2\textsuperscript{nd} by Booker

New Business

1. **Student Chair.** Sharri Bell (SGA VP for Student Affairs) will be student chair of SAC.

2. **Student Groups.** There were no new student groups to approve. We agreed to meet extra if any do need approval, but we noted that the last chance to be awarded funding from SGA for this semester has passed so it is unlikely there will be any rush. Any new groups who come forward will have to wait until next semester to apply for funding but we can still approve them.

3. **Student Input – Faculty Evaluations.** We worked on questions regarding faculty evaluations to add to the next SGA student survey. From memory we discussed some of the questions we had submitted to Wood, but because he was unable to attend, we decided to wait until he had a chance to compile our question suggestions. Following is the compilation he submitted via email soon after the meeting. At our next meeting we will try to choose three questions from these and refine how we state them if necessary.
[From Mark Wood via email:] Several committee members submitted Likert scale items. Some liberty was taken in reconstructing the item to make it Likert scale friendly. These items have been arranged below. No scale has been agreed on by the committee, so for context assume a scale can be constructed and may have the following choices:

1. Strongly Agree
2. Agree
3. Neutral
4. Disagree
5. Strongly Disagree

**Likert scale items:**

1. I believe that these forms will actually be read and used to improve the class.
2. I take these evaluations and their responses to them seriously?
3. The evaluation form accurately expresses my assessment of the course.
4. The evaluation form accurately expresses my assessment of the faculty member who teaches this course.
5. I believe that my response on the survey will remain anonymous.
6. I feel that professors care about student evaluations (scale of agree to disagree)
7. I feel that professors use the results to make changes in the classroom (scale of agree to disagree)
8. I feel that tenured professors should not be evaluated every semester in order to cut down on how many evaluations students must fill out.
9. I feel that courses should be evaluated every semester regardless of the professor’s status.
10. I feel that there are some courses that do not need evaluated every semester.

**Likert scale items with a different scale:**

1. When I fill out the evaluation form, I read and answer each question as it applies to the course (never, rarely, sometimes, often, always)
2. When I fill out the evaluation form, I don’t think it is necessary to read all the questions (never, rarely, sometimes, often, always)**
3. Professors give adequate time for me to fill out the evaluations (never, rarely, sometimes, often, always)

**Yes or No question:**

Are you aware that these faculty evaluation forms are read by the dean, department chair, and faculty member? (Yes or No)

**Open-ended questions (optional)**

1. What suggestions do you have to improve this evaluation form so that it accurately conveys your assessment of the course and teacher?
2. If you rarely (or never) read and answer all the questions on the survey, please briefly explain why.
3. **Student Input – Faculty Evaluations Continued.** We also discussed ways to help educate students about how the evaluations are used if our data finds they don’t know. Ideas included creating a list of points for faculty to cover with their students before leaving the room so there is some level of consistency from class to class. The need for it to be non-scripted was noted so faculty can put it in their own words. Pros and cons of taking the evaluations online were discussed, as well as other ways to allow open ended answers to be typed before the instructor sees them. Other reasons for limited written responses were discussed, such as inconsistency between evaluations given at end of class vs. beginning, and the pressure felt when everyone seems to be waiting on one person to finish. We agreed that until we know what the students’ concerns are (if any), we should move on to choosing the questions. Ted noted that once we have results from the survey, we will formulate a recommendation to present to the Faculty Affairs Committee.

4. **Honor Code.** Saundra Weddle offered to come in and speak to us about the concept of an honor code and her work on academic honesty and integrity which can be found here: [http://www.drury.edu/multinl/story.cfm?ID=2214&NLID=98](http://www.drury.edu/multinl/story.cfm?ID=2214&NLID=98) Academic Affairs voted to let SAC handle the issue. Vaggalis will invite Weddle to speak. Vaggalis will also find out from Charles Taylor whether we have many cases of academic dishonesty each year to ascertain how much of a problem it is.

Next meeting is November 13th, noon, FSC 204
Meeting adjourned at 12:40

Respectfully submitted, Jacqueline Tygart
Standing Committee: Student Affairs Committee
Date & Time: October 2nd, 2012, Noon
Location: FSC 204
Attendees: Student Members: Nathan Rogers, Brittany Stockwell, Kate Elam, Megan Green
Faculty Members: Ted Vaggalis (Faculty Chair), Jacqueline Tygart (Secretary), Greg Booker, Erin Kineman, Mark D. Wood, Natalie Wlodarczyk, Trish Morris
Ex-Officio Members: Tijuana Julian

Called to Order at 12:05

Old Business
1. Minutes Approved. Motion by Booker, 2nd by Wood.
2. Student Chair. Student membership on the committee is still in question. Pending clarification from SGA, we will choose a Student Chair at our next meeting.
3. Meeting Times. Vaggalis distributed a list of future meetings at noon on the following Tuesdays. Locations follow. (Thanks to Joni Allison and Tammy Nilsen)
   - Oct. 16: Hoblit
   - Nov. 13: FSC 204
   - Nov. 27: FSC PDR
   - Dec. 11: FSC 204
   - Jan. 29: FSC 204

New Business
1. Student Input Regarding Faculty Evaluations. Vaggalis attended the 9/27 FAC meeting to coordinate our efforts with theirs to avoid duplication. FAC wants to know what the student concerns are with the evaluation process. We discussed what concerns were already voiced last year in SAC and possible solutions for them. Much of that seemed to be anecdotal so we will attempt to find out if a significant number of students have concerns and what they are before we proceed. To that end we discussed ways to gather student feedback so we have some data. Dean Julian pointed out that students are surveyed to death, so getting SGA to let us add a few questions to surveys they already do would be preferable to an isolated survey. We decided that we would each frame
one question to give to Wood, who will compile them and we’ll choose three that will most likely generate usable data. Members have one week to get their question to mwood@drury.edu

2 Student Honor Code. Following the Harvard cheating scandal in the news recently, the Drury Leadership Team thought SAC could review the issue. Dean Julian shared what documents already address student conduct such as the Student Code of Conduct and policies that outline graduated sanctions for violations of conduct. Academic integrity issues from Student Affairs go through Dean Taylor’s office. One question raised was whether we have a problem. Dean Taylor’s office will need to be consulted. Stockwell commented that if a student doesn’t cheat, it probably isn’t because he or she signed an honor code and that if he will cheat, signing a code probably won’t stop him. She made a good analogy to the DARE program in middle school in that the fact that she doesn’t do drugs has nothing to do with having signed a proclamation that she wouldn’t do drugs. Students questioned whether it would just be a paragraph they sign when they enroll. Julian asked whether we just need to add text about academics to the existing Code of Conduct. Wood spoke about West Point’s Honor Code, but noted their graduates may have to have each other’s backs on the battlefield. Wood questioned what other ways we could teach honesty. We came to no conclusions or recommendations.

3 Student Groups to Approve? There were no new student groups needing approval.

Meeting adjourned at 12:55

Respectfully submitted, Jacqueline Tygart
Standing Committee: Student Affairs Committee
Date & Time: Thursday, 9/13/2012, Noon
Location: FSC 204
Attendees: Student Members: Kate Elam, Nathan Rogers
Faculty Members: Gregory Booker, Jacque Tygart, Trish Morris, Erin Kineman, Brian Shipman, Natalie Wlodarczyk, Ted Vaggalis
Ex-Officio Members:

New Business

1. Setting a meeting time. We have still not reached consensus regarding when we can all meet. We will again try to meet at noon on Tuesday October 2nd. Joni Allison will try to reserve FSC 204. Joni will also email another Doodle to see when committee members can meet in mid-October. SAC plans to meet every 2 weeks.

   The Oct. 2nd meeting will be particularly important if there are any new student organizations that need to be approved so they can proceed to request funding from SGA.

2. Committee officers. Ted Vaggalis graciously agreed to be Co-chair for the faculty, and the students need to elect a co-chair from their ranks. Jacque Tygart agreed to be secretary but will relinquish the post if another committee member wishes to serve. All positions will need to be voted on when we have a quorum of student and faculty members present.

3. Possible agenda items.

   a. We briefly discussed faculty evaluations as an item under discussion in the last committee, and quickly identified the need to look over the minutes from those discussions so we don’t waste time reiterating and fully understand what concerns the students had that prompted the discussion.

   b. Brian shared a thought voiced by President Parnell regarding the establishment of an honor code at Drury in light of the cheating scandal at Harvard University recently. There was a brief discussion.

Meeting was adjourned at 12:50 PM