Evaluation & Assessment Committee
Minutes - April 5, 2019

Present: Jim Bisgard, Marty Blackson, Martin Kennedy, Greg Lyman, Cody Stoddard
Absent: Terry Wilson
Guests: Gary Bartlett

Meeting was called to order at 1:06 p.m. Minutes of March 15, 2019 were approved as written.

SEOI Policy Discussion
EAC would like to create policy language to be endorsed by Faculty Senate stating how SEOIs are used. The language would essentially codify that SEOIs are formative assessments, and the only thing that can and should be answered by SEOIs is whether or not faculty members are using the information gathered in the evaluation to improve their teaching. One goal is to be sure faculty aren't punished for trying something new.

Gary Bartlett, Vice President of UFC, attended the meeting to address any concerns about potential SEOI policy language. The CBA addresses SEOIs only twice; first is to give the definition of the acronym. Faculty often come to the union with complaints about SEOIs and how they are used. There is no context for SEOI comments, but context should be specified if they are going to be used for assessment of faculty.

Concerns exist as to what types of classes should be evaluated and get SEOIs. Proposed policy language states that classes with 5 or more students must get SEOIs. It is unclear if any current policy exists. Every quarter, IS sends out a spreadsheet to academic departments; the departments are supposed to assign an SEOI form for every class, but they don't always do that. IS has requested input from EAC regarding which forms should be assigned for each class. These issues typically apply to independent study classes. Faculty should be able to choose which form is relevant, or choose if no form is relevant, but there is the potential for problems if a faculty from one 490 class chooses to do an SEOI and a faculty from a different 490 classes chooses not to. There is a default form, but faculty still get to choose. If they don't choose, Form A is assigned, even to Independent Study classes. Form A is the standard form for lecture classes. No one knows how SEOIs are used, which is one of the primary reasons people are unhappy with the process. However, developing forms for the independent study classes could lead to formalizing these classes by requiring syllabi.

EAC is concerned this may lead to grievances being filed with the faculty union because it seems like it could fall under working conditions. Also, faculty are not at fault if the department never shares the information about selecting the forms with faculty. Gary indicated that as long as everything is formally stated in a policy, there would be no grounds for filing a grievance. No formal language exists stating that UFC has any required role in the process of approving a new SEOI form.

Proposed policy language:
1. It is the department's responsibility to pick an appropriate form for each course with 5 or more students enrolled. If no form is chosen, the default for non-online courses will be Form A. Online courses will default to _____.

2. If a class has 4 or fewer students, no SEOI is assigned except for classes that are amalgamated. If a class has 5 or more students enrolled and the class is numbered x9x, the department must choose a form type. An option is no form. If no option is picked, the default form is form A

3. If a class has 5 or more students enrolled, & the class is not X9X, the department must choose

a form type. No form is not an option. The default form is form A.

4. SEOIs will be available one week after grades are due.

5. It is inappropriate for any department or unit to specify a numerical threshold that determines effective or excellent teaching.

6. SEOIs are intended as formative assessment. The only substantive summative assessment that can be drawn from SEOIs is to determine whether or not a faculty member is using information from SEOIs to try to improve their teaching.

7. Faculty should be encouraged to experiment with new teaching methods and shouldn't be punished for things that didn't work, unless they persist with methods that don't work with no change. Faculty are encouraged include in their personal statement examples of actions taken based on their SEOIs.

EC input will be needed regarding the timeline for when SEOIs will be available after grades are do. The final draft of the policy will be shared with UFC.

Other?
Jim yielded his time to present at the April 3 Faculty Senate meeting. The SEOI survey will be discussed at next senate meeting on May 1. Prior to that time, EAC will review the survey comments and write their own summaries, and then compare them all. There are some questions about intended meaning or usages of the terms "peer observation" and "peer observation" in the comments. One college is in the process of rewriting their policies to include "peer evaluation."

Meeting adjourned at 3:02 p.m.

Next Meeting:
April 19, 2019
1:00 p.m. Grupe Center