Evaluation & Assessment Committee
1:00 – 3:00 p.m.   Zoom
January 14, 2022
Minutes

Present: Warren Plugge (chair), Maurice Blackson, Sara Toto, Andrea Eklund (FSEC liaison)

Guest: Gary Bartlett (UFC President), Lidia Anderson (SEOI, IT App Development)

1. **Call meeting to order, 1:04 pm. Agenda approved.**

2. Approval of November 12, 2021 and December 3, 2021 minutes

    a. **11/12/21 and 12/3/21 meeting minutes approved as presented 1:29 pm**

3. Review of Winter FS Charges

4. **EAC21-22.05** Meet with UFC (Gary Bartlett) about OER standards

    a. **Talked with Gary about the concerns raised by James Bisgard (professor of mathematics) regarding how OER's could potentially be included as Category A rather than Category B products when they make substantial contributions to the field. This includes procedures and policies on how and to include a review process of OER and what impacts it can have on PTR. Gary's role is to explain how OER relates to the CBA. Gary suggests we need to determine whether OER falls under scholar, teaching, or service. If it does fall into scholarship, then it would need to be determined whether it is category A or B work. The distinction of Category A v. B is determined by the University Faculty Criteria Guidelines, not the CBA. CBA does provide information on scholarship/creative activity under 17.3.2 that could include OER products given the broad definition under 17.3.2. Given the discussion of category A v. B products is at the college level, this discussion/charge needs to occur at that level given the consideration of peer-review and whether an OER makes a relevant contribution to a specific field. To complete this charge, a recommendation will be made to Faculty Senate to have colleges discuss and determine criteria for OER use in evaluation.**

5. **EAC21-22.04** Create SEOI procedures for Lidia to follow
    a. **This is an ongoing discussion. This is referring to people asking Lidia to remove SEOIs or adding questions to SEOIs. She would like procedures in place to provide guidance on what to do when she gets requests. The committee had**

mentioned the idea that we could review requests through an online portal to determine if requests were relevant and necessary to send to Lidia. However, after Lidia joined the meeting and we discussed this option with her, she suggested that the online portal process was unnecessary for removing SEOIs for students caught cheating. She suggested the removal of SEOIs from students caught cheating could be done via Academic Affairs emailing a reply to both the faculty member of the student and Lidia (at SEOI@cwu.edu) to say the student was found guilty of cheating. Lidia/the committee will reach out to Academic Affairs to ensure they are amenable to including Lidia in email replies regarding if a student is found guilty of cheating to help begin the process of removing a student's SEOI. Lidia mentioned that SEOIs outside the normal period are difficult to change due to the timing of the quarter system (e.g., must allow faculty to have the option to review different SEOI forms prior to SEOI opening for the term). Summer terms are especially difficult to change SEOI dates for individual classes because the review time for forms/questions occurs twice in a shorter time frame. Decided that date change requests/exceptions to SEOI time frame are granted if time allows based on Lidia's discretion.

6. **EAC21-22.02** How do we want to approach faculty listening sessions D&I questions, experts?
   a. **Will reach out to D&I and ADI university-wide committees/groups to see if they will meet with us at our next meeting. Andrea suggested potentially creating some standard D&I questions as optional additions to the SEOI. Identification of what questions to create/provide could be best identified by ADI and D&I committees/groups. Have those committees create questions and we as a committee could then assess and approve them. Then we could present them to the president and provost.**

7. **EAC21-22.06** Review Appendix B to incorporate additional policy and/or procedure language for faculty evaluation of teaching
   a. **Appendix B was not previously seen by some members of the committee. Discussion of how feasible it is to have a supervisor/department chair regularly evaluating faculty teaching (one of the suggested evaluations). The discussion that requiring Appendix B to be included in college or department-level documents on reviews might be too complex and not fit with current review procedures. Table charge and discuss with Greg where charge emerged/goal of charge.**

8. **EAC21.22.01** Update on survey in Qualtrics
   a. **Skipped this because Francesco is not here. The committee can review the survey on their own time and mention feedback via email.**

9. Discussion – Future meetings 2/11 – can we move
    a. **Discussion of moving 2/11 meeting to 2/4. Warren will check with Francesco to see if that date works and have Janet change the meeting.**

10. EC Updates (5 min)
    a. **No updates.**

11. Adjourn
    a. **Approved to adjourn at 2:49pm**