

Evaluation & Assessment Committee
Minutes – April 19, 2019

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

Absent: None

Guests: Gary Bartlett

Meeting was called to order at 1:10 p.m. Minutes of April 5, 2019 were approved as written.

SEOI policy discussion

It's unclear if SEOIs are CBA/union issue, or a CWUP/Faculty Senate issue. If SEOIs are a working condition, then the policy language proposed will affect promotion, tenure, and reappointment. In this case, it would be better to have the language go in the CBA first. Currently the CBA only says SEOIs should be used to evaluate teaching but should not be the only means for evaluating teaching.

If a new policy is being created that relates to working conditions, whenever possible that policy should go into the CBA first and then into CWU policy and procedure. It is better if the CBA can be changed first, but that is a bargaining issue. Changes to the CBA have to be bargained, and the next bargaining isn't for another year. An alternative would be to create an MOU between the union and the university, and then when it is time for the next bargaining session, the language can go into the CBA. In the meantime, the MOU has the same power as the CBA and serves as an agreement between the union and the university. Faculty Senate would have to be the MOU forward to the union, and they would take care of the rest from there.

Proposed policy language will be sent to the EC for their feedback. The language may also be presented at the May 1 Faculty Senate meeting to get a sense of the senate. EAC and UFC can continue to work together next year.

Proposed policy language:

6. SEOIs are primarily intended for formative assessment. Limited summative conclusions may be based on SEOI data; any such conclusions should be based on long-term patterns and/or trends not rely on isolated examples.

Conclusions (formative or summative) based on SEOIs must be made with extreme care.

Summative assessment based on SEOI written comments to open-ended questions should reflect reoccurring ideas or themes present throughout the review period.

There are other concerns about removing students from SEOIs for attendance issues and/or academic misconduct. This has been discussed previously throughout the year and was also discussed last year. IS can run a query about attendance issues but the previous Dean of Student Success was not in support of the idea.

Administrator Evaluation Feedback

The Provost and the Associate Provost for Undergraduate & Faculty Affairs both responded with feedback to the draft evaluation questions. The Associate Provost for Extended

Learning & Outreach and the COTS Dean both responded to say they had no suggestions for changes.

For the provost questions: use suggested language for questions 1, 2, 3, 7, 8, 10, 12; rewrite 13.

For the Associate Provost for UFA: suggested language for questions 1; edit 2, 3, 4; remove 5.c.; edit 6; edit 8.

Summary of SEOI survey comments

Jim will put together a summary of everyone's summaries for the May 1 Faculty Senate meeting.

SEOI Listening sessions

Recently Amy asked if EAC would like to do an SEOI listening session. This is something to consider. Faculty and an administrator could attend; faculty could bring examples of their 2 or 3 worst SEOI comments to present. There are questions about logistics (where/when). One option is to hold an event on a Tuesday or Thursday afternoon. Another option is to open a regular EAC meeting. Either way, west-side faculty will need to be able to participate.

Meeting adjourned at 3:10 p.m.

Next meeting:
May 3, 2019