

**FACULTY SENATE
ANNUAL
STANDING COMMITTEE REPORT**

2022–2023 ACADEMIC YEAR

Prepared for the Central Washington University Faculty Senate

Faculty Senate Committee: Evaluation and Assessment Committee

Committee Chair

- Warren Plugge

Committee Representation

Name	Department	College	Affiliation
Warren Plugge	ETSC	CEPS	Chair
Maurice Blackson	Library Services	Library	Member
Francesco Somaini	Communication	CAH	Member
Sara Toto	Law & Justice	COTS	Member
Nancy Pigeon	Business	COB	Member
Lidia Anderson	Enterprise Applications		Guest
Hope Amason	Anthropology & Museum Studies	COTS	Ex-Officio Member, Executive Comm. Member

Committee Charges

Charge #	Charge Description	Progress	Status
EAC22–23.01	<i>Continue developing a consistent process for addressing faculty inquiries regarding SEOIs.</i>	Process was discussed and put forward to EC with questions on the process. Issues still remain to identify whether IS has power to remove SEOIs and tracking/auditing them. EC will need to provide direction as to whether IS and EAC has the authority to respond to inquiries from faculty regarding SEOIs and developing a procedure moving forward.	Pending
EAC22–23.02	<i>Consider ways to shorten the SEOI evaluation response forms and make recommendations as appropriate.</i>	EAC needed more clarification on purpose of the charge from EC and the number of questions asked and low student response rates, these assumptions were based on unproven information in the creation of the charge. The EAC reviewed and discussed all	Complete

		<p>forms of the SEOIs and their length with respect to the charge.</p> <p>Therefore, EAC created a survey to be sent to students via text messaging to address this and provide more information on how to move forward with reformatting the SEOIs. The survey was sent to students on 3/1/2023 and a short report will be presented at the last FS meeting.</p> <p>The findings of the report provided no evidence that the current format of the SEOIs are too long and ask too many questions resulting in low response rates. Therefore, the number of questions asked within the SEOIs seems to be appropriate and there is no need to shorten the SEOI. The EAC has identified that the SEOI forms provide useful information and shortening the forms will likely reduce the quality of information.</p> <p>See additional information in charge EAC22-23.03.</p>	
<p>EAC22–23.03</p>	<p><i>Investigate if pop-up notifications for students have an effect on response rates and make recommendations as appropriate.</i></p>	<p>EAC is investigated on the information related to pop-ups from Lidia Anderson, will have to discuss how to get information to make decisions on the effect of response rates. Since there is no data to support the effect of pop-up notifications on response rates the EAC cannot make further recommendations.</p> <p>A survey was created addressing this issue and a report was given at the last Senate meeting. Results of the survey concluded that removing pop-up notifications is unlikely to increase SEOI response rates and data suggested that students are more likely to complete SEOIs when prompted by pop-ups.</p> <p>It should be noted that pop-ups have been in place since the electronic SEOI system was initiated from the paper version and there is no information as to</p>	<p>Complete</p>

		whether the pop-ups affect response rates. Data from the survey suggested that students are more likely to complete SEOIs when prompted by a pop-up.	
EAC22– 23.04	<i>Consider additional policy and procedure to determine who has access to SEOIs.</i>	Access to SEOIs has been discussed: There is still some question as to where this policy would reside within the University system.	Pending
EAC22– 23.05	<i>Identify best practices for avoiding bias in student evaluations and make recommendations as appropriate.</i>	More information is needed from the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) committee before information can be assembled to address diversity of course environment and content to develop best practices. This charge is closely related to EAC22-23.10 and could be addressed with this charge.	Pending
EAC22– 23.06	<i>Explore whether or not faculty peer evaluations should be addressed in policy.</i>	EAC is reviewing this charge, members from the committee brought forward their dept. handbooks to identify how faculty peer evaluations are handled within the department and standards associated with peer evaluations.	In Progress
EAC22– 23.07	<i>Conduct annual assessment of Faculty Senate and Faculty Senate Executive Committee.</i>	Survey questionnaires have been reviewed and edited. Questionnaires have been sent to EC.	In Progress
EAC22– 23.08	<i>Conduct biennial assessment of administrators as described in Faculty Code.</i>	Survey questionnaires have been reviewed and edited. Questionnaires have been sent to EC.	In Progress
EAC22– 23.09	<i>Consider developing an SEOI form for hybrid courses and make recommendations as appropriate.</i>	Hybrid form H was developed by combining some questions from existing online form to the Main form A. Suggested changes to the form were made and are in for review by the committee. EAC also discussed the process to add an additional form with Lidia Anderson and discovered that there are additional procedures and decisions that are needed to add more forms to the existing options. It was also discussed that a more general set of questions could be created focusing on learning instead of instructor qualities for a more formative assessment. This charge will be moved to	In Progress

		the next year for follow-up and identify the issues for creating new forms or reducing the total numbers of forms and the challenges with this process.	
EAC22–23.10	<i>Review best practices for SEOI questions that address inclusivity and diversity of course environment and content and make recommendations as appropriate.</i>	More information is needed from the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) committee before information can be assembled to address diversity of course environment and content to develop best practices.	On Hold
EAC22–23.11	<i>Review committee procedures manual and update as required.</i>	Procedures were presented for review. The EAC will review and edit at the last meeting.	Working
Added Charge: EAC22-23.12	<i>Analyze results from the AY21-22 survey regarding faculty perception of how the pandemic impacted SEOIs, and summarize findings for Faculty Senate.</i>	Survey data has been acquired and is being reviewed and a report will be provided at the last Senate meeting	Pending
No Charge	<i>Associate Dean Reviews</i>	EAC discussed the addition of reviewing Associate Deans: Further information is needed to get clarification on whether Associate Deans may be reviewed. An amendment to the current policy will be made during the AY23/24.	In-Process - EC
No Charge	<i>Removal of SEOI from PSY 101 Course</i>	EAC discussed request to remove an SEOI from faculty members course due to academic dishonesty. The EAC requested the faculty member to follow policy on acquiring appropriated approvals from different levels to remove SEOI. Faculty member requested not to pursue the matter due to the lengthy process required to remove SEOI from course. Result – need to review process for the removal of SEOIs due to academic dishonesty so there is a process that can be completed in an efficient manner to remove SEOIs where a faculty member has identified academic dishonesty.	Closed

		The EAC recommended to the EC that the policy language indicating that students found to have committed academic dishonesty are prevented from completing SEOIs for the course in which they were found to have committed academic dishonesty be removed from CWUP 5-90-040(25)(C) because the language may not be translated into practice. Additionally, the removal of the SEOI could compromise anonymity and confidentiality.	
No Charge	<i>View of F180 Files</i>	The issue that all F180 files can be viewed by other faculty within a department beyond the select reviewers. EAC is pursuing this to get more information on whom can review or view F180 files. This issue has been identified in faculty senate and EAC will follow after more information has come out from FS and EC. EAC will wait for a charge FS.	This has been proposed by an individual faculty and will consider the concern within the UFC bargaining unit during their session. Pending

Report on the Activities of the Committee

- 10/7/2022 Discussed charges and set priorities.
- 10/14/2022 No meeting, meeting moved to 10/28/2022
- 10/28/2022 Discussed charges, most of the discussion centered on academic dishonesty issue and removal of student SEOI from overall course SEOI.
- 11/04/2022 Discussed listed charges, an issue was brought to the EAC attention about who can view F180 files. EAC discussed the assessment of Associate Deans related to why they are not assessed and to identify a survey to review Associate Deans.
- 11/18/2022 EAC did not reach quorum. All agenda items will be moved to the next planned meeting. Communication was made from the EC representative to the EAC on outstanding issues.

12/2/2022	Discussed listed charges. Most of the discussion was centered on SEOIs and response rates falling due to pandemic.
1/13/2023	Discussed the availability of faculty F180 files to be reviewed by others, associated dean assessment timeline, addressing pop-ups with SEOIs, and inquiries on removing SEOIs for student misconduct.
1/27/2023	Discussed F180 files and ethical issues surrounding open files, associate dean review, updated on SEOI pop-ups, peer evaluations,
2/3/2023	Discussed shortening SEOI evaluation process, forms, and general management of SEOIs. Created SEOI survey language to get a sense from the students on SEOIs and the management of SEOIs.
2/24/2023	Discussed SEOI survey response rates, approved and edited SEOI survey to students, and updated on F18 files with UFC.
3/10/2023	Discuss review of 2014 teaching document as a charge for next year.
4/7/2023	Reviewed remaining charges and status of them. Discussed issue identified by Gary Bartlett with Withdrawn students. Continue to address issues with F180 file accessibility.
4/21/2023	Reviewed and edited assessment tools for administrators to include President, Vice Provost, Library Dean, Dean of Graduate Studies, EC and FS. Analyzed data and developed report for addressing SEOI forms and SEOI pop-up reminders.
5/05/2023	Updated committee on actions to be taken by EAC. EAC Chair is scheduled to present findings from SEOI survey and SEOI pandemic study on 5/31 at faculty senate meeting. Discussed administrator, EC, FAS, survey duration time period. EAC procedures provided to committee to review. Access to SEOIs was discussed and to suggest policy on access to SEOIs. SEOI form created for Hybrid course and will be proposed to EC. Suggestion made to incorporate EAC chair into creation of EAC charges.

Minutes

See EAC Teams file.

Items of Interest – See comments in report above and recommendations below.

Recommendations for next year's committee

- This committee will be losing two members, the committee needs to recruit additional members.
- When developing charges for the next committee, include the chair of the committee to help frame the charges.
- The committee should continue to focus on efforts to improve course feedback tools for instructors and use of the feedback during reviews.

Recommendations for future charges

- Consider the use of SEOIs in the review process by reviewers for tenure, promotion, and post-tenure review. Develop policy to eliminate the use of SEOIs during the review and to focus more on instructors' approach to addressing SEOIs and feedback from students.
- Continue work on identifying who should have access to SEOIs and define where this would live within policy.
- Continue work and discussion on best practices with respect to avoiding bias in student evaluations. Work with DEIB committees to understand the issues on bias associated with instruction.
- Review peer evaluation process and consider where peer evaluations would live in policy.
- Review the number and types of SEOIs and consider reducing the types of SEOIs to a standard format for all classes. Then identify a standard set of questions that could be incorporated as additional questions for in-depth feedback on a specific course instruction.
- Identify ways in which different course modalities can be addressed within a standard SEOI form. Explore the potential to reduce the number of SEOI forms to a more general form that focuses on student learning instead of instructor qualities.