

Evaluation & Assessment Committee Minutes - February 1, 2019

Present: Jim Bisgard, Marty Blackson, Martin Kennedy, Cody Stoddard, Terry Wilson

Absent: Greg Lyman

Guests: None

Meeting was called to order at 1:05 p.m. Minutes of January 18, 2019 were approved as written.

Chair Updates

Jim put together a draft summary of comments received in response to the letter to administrators regarding using SEOIs for evaluation. All deans indicated SEOIs are not the sole means of evaluation, but all pointed that out in response to different questions.

Amy talked with the president to get feedback on the Evaluation of Academic Administrator questions. Jim has a draft of a second letter for the president asking how feedback from the evaluations would be incorporated into the administrators' evaluations, and asking which questions the president would like to see added and/or removed. The end goal is to show how the two modes of assessment (SEOIs and the administrator reviews) are used and/or viewed differently by administration than by faculty. We would also like to know if the information from the administrator assessment surveys is used, and if so, how it is used. If the information from the surveys is not being used, it doesn't seem right to ask faculty to complete the assessments. A follow-up question to ask may be "Are the results of the evaluations of academic administrators used by [administrator's supervisor] to evaluate their performance?"

Jim and Amy may need to meet with the president together for a discussion. Cody indicated there has been some written miscommunication for a while and EC has been talking about these concerns as well. One idea is to triangulate the data and how it's being used. Regarding the responses to the administrator letter, the idea was to approach the president, provost, and deans and ask for permission to share responses beyond the committee. Administrators would be given the opportunity to confirm that their responses are what they intended to say. Feedback gathered in all the responses may then be incorporated into a report for future Faculty Senate chairs. Another possibility is to connect with someone on the BOT. EC is able to have an hour-long conversation with the BOT so it's possible this could be discussed at that time.

Jim will consult with Amy regarding sending a response to the administrators to ask permission to share responses. It's possible the response might need to come from Amy as senate chair. Jim will also talk with Jeff Snedeker, who was EAC chair when the committee put together a report on the use of SEOIs.

EC feedback on Faculty Senate assessments & EC assessments

Cody indicated no concerns were expressed regarding the Faculty Senate or EC assessments. Amy wanted to hold on to the administrator assessments and hasn't released them to EC yet. One idea from EC was to incorporate parallel questions from the deans' letters

into the SEOI survey for anyone who will be answering questions in the “I have evaluated faculty” section. The answers for these questions would be open-ended.

The survey will be open for two weeks with a reminder email sent after one week. A final question for the PC group will be added to ask in which role(s) they have evaluated faculty: only as chair, only as personnel committee member (college or department), as chair & personnel committee member (college or department), or prefer not to answer. Cody will contact Amy to find out if EC wants to view the SEOI survey before it's sent.

SEOI policy discussion

Lidia emailed a list of classes with no form assigned. These classes are not getting SEOIs. EAC needs to figure out what forms are needed and will divide up the list with 16 courses per committee member. Everyone will contact course instructors to find out how many students are in the class, and if the classes are team-taught. There are no forms that correspond to course “components” (e.g. standard lecture SEOI form for lecture courses). When writing policy language we will need to specifically state that all courses must be assigned a form or will be given a form for “lecture.” Courses numbered __90 wouldn't have SEOIs because those are internships. Jim and Terry will start working on contacting the departments.

Cody emailed ASCWU to find out about getting a student rep for EAC but received no response. He will follow up with the ASCWU president.

Meeting adjourned 2:54 p.m.