

Evaluation & Assessment Committee  
Minutes – Feb. 15, 2019

Present: Jim Bisgard, Marty Blackson, Greg Lyman, Cody Stoddard, Terry Wilson

Absent: Martin Kennedy

Guests: Lidia Anderson

Meeting was called to order at 1:04 p.m. Minutes of February 1, 2019 were approved as amended.

*SEOI Policy Discussion*

Lidia's office has been asked to start providing and managing SEOIs for College in the High School courses. College in the High School is different from Running Start because instructors are adjuncts and the classes are held on the high school campuses. Any SEOIs would be given on the high schools' schedules, and these do not line up with the current CWU schedule for SEOIs. An alternative is to create a form that is specifically geared toward College in the High School. This would involve creating a decentralized account in EvalKit. A major concern is how staffing and funding from Student Life may eventually be affected.

SEOI policy will be broad, and will include language stating that faculty should not offer extra credit as an incentive for completing SEOIs. The issue of excluding some student responses for misconduct is still up in the air. Revision of the academic dishonesty/misconduct policy is on AAC's list of charges for this year. It would be easier, and more doable, to create a policy to address lack of attendance. Last year a previous Dean of Student Success indicated that office would not support a policy about attendance because there are students who don't attend classes due to feelings of discrimination, and the SEOI is the only opportunity for those students to give feedback.

*Appropriate form for different types of instruction*

Something to consider would be putting together a form for internships/service learning (e.g. \_\_90 courses). This form could include questions about alignment between what the faculty advisor and the job site both wanted the student to do. Currently \_\_90 courses can be excluded from queries. Another option is to have \_\_90 courses evaluated by using the assessment from Career Services, rather than using SEOIs. Policy language should be added to read: "\_\_90 courses should use the assessment available through Career Services in place of SEOIs."

A number of classes did not have SEOI forms associated with them. The following forms were assigned to these classes:

- Form A – ART end of program assessment
- Form A – COM end of program assessment
- Form A – ENG 302 & 303
- Form A – SCM 429 (two sections w/same instructor)
- Form C – CS 481
- Form C – FCL 495/595 (layered courses)

Form D – RTE 292

Form F – FCL 492/592 (layered courses)

Form F – SCM 492

No form – EDAD 596 (Independent Study graded S/U, but from the syllabus looks more like an internship)

No form – ACCT 492 & 496 (same instructor; service learning type of course where students assist low-income families with filing income tax forms)

EXSC 495 – 3 sections with same instructor, but the instructor doesn't appear on the department website and might be a TA rather than a faculty member; this leads to another question about evaluating TAs.

There are also questions about how many of the independent study courses are really service learning. Jim will need to talk with someone in Career Services who does the evaluations for the \_\_90 courses, and also talk with Teri Walker.

One suggestion is to add something to scheduling so that faculty have an option to assign an SEOI form when scheduling their classes. This would also create an opportunity to state that a certain form will be assigned unless faculty specify one to use. Lidia can talk with scheduling.

In regards to \_\_90 courses, and other courses with small classes (e.g. 5 or 6 students) could be problematic if only one student responds, but that is a problem with sample size rather than response rate. Raising the minimum number of students could be something to consider, so for any class number 490 or higher, the threshold would be 7 students. However, a form for service learning courses would be a discussion for the union and for Faculty Senate, and possibly for administration, too.

Greg and Terry will consult with departments about Form F for \_\_90 courses. Jim will follow up with Lidia about the maximum enrollment numbers noted on the spreadsheet, and also about \_\_92 through \_\_96, and \_\_98 courses.

Suggested policy language: "Classes with 5 or more students should provide an opportunity for students to provide anonymous feedback on instruction."

### *SEOI Survey*

Demographic questions will be reordered. The survey will be sent out next week and will be open for two weeks, with a reminder sent at the start of the second week.

### *EC responses to administrator administrators*

Amy followed up with the president and learned the data from the assessments aren't being used in administrators' evaluation. Jim followed up with Jeff Snedeker. The previous report from EAC states the data from reports is supposed to be used administrators' 360-Review.

### *Follow-up questions for president/provost*

Suggested questions for the BOT, the president and the provost:

1. How do you incorporate results of the faculty assessment of academic administrators into your evaluation?

2. How do you incorporate results of the faculty assessment of academic administrators into evaluation of direct reports?

Jim will consult with Amy before moving forward with this.

All deans gave permission for sharing their responses to the questions in the letter, so a summary does not have to be written. Deans be notified that responses are going to will be shared with Faculty Senate; this will give them the opportunity respond and update and/or edit responses beforehand.

Meeting adjourned at 2:59 p.m.

Next meeting:  
March 1, 2019  
Grupe Center