FACULTY SENATE
ANNUAL
STANDING COMMITTEE REPORT

2021/2022 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 Blackstone	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
Tyler Ou	Student	CWU	Student Representative
Andrea Eklund	Apparel, Textiles, and Merchandising	CEPS	Ex-Officio Member, Executive Comm. Member

Committee Charges:

- As per the Web

Report on the Activities of the Committee:

- Meeting Dates and Times – Every other Friday, 1-3pm, by Zoom

- Successes
  - Use of SEOIs During A Disruption of Instruction - The committee completed the language regarding SEOI use during a pandemic and was able to get the language successfully into policy.
  - The committee successfully developed, administered, and received data to address the impacts the pandemic and change in course delivery had on SEOIs.
  - Created a schedule which approved by the Faculty Senate to split the biennial academic administrator assessment to

annual assessments that occur on a rotating basis in order to level out the workload for EAC. The first phase of these assessments will be launched in AY22/23 with the assessments of the President, Vice Provost, and College Deans.

- Minutes (Should be posted to the Web and Teams)

- Items of Interest

  - EAC21-22.01 - The EAC reviewed the recommendations proposed by the CWU Equal Opportunity Committee to determine policy and/or procedure language language/modifications to the concerns about SEOIs and their use in faculty evaluations. While this was a large charge with many components the EAC was able to address two important issues on the determination of what impacts the pandemic and change in course delivery has had on SEOIs. The committee created a survey that was distributed to the faculty and received close to 200 responses from faculty. The EAC is in the process of reviewing the responses to provide a report during the AY 22/23. Due to the large amount of data received it will take time to provide a well-developed report.
    - Other discussions were held on strategies to support faculty on teaching improvement with student voice, addressing diversity and equity issues in SEOI responses with biases associated the use of SEOIs, and the possibility of replacing SEOIs in the promotion/merit/tenure/retention process.
    - Continued discussion was held over the response rates and policy on how to administer SEOIs.
  - EAC21-22.02 – Discussions were held on addressing diversity and inclusivity into the SEOI process. These discussions provided issues that would have to be addressed to include the number of questions on the SEOI and diversity and inclusivity questions could be problematic for some faculty during reviews. Recommendations were made to address diversity and inclusivity within a general education course all students would be required to take. Additional consultation would be required to address diversity and inclusivity with the President, Provost, and various task forces focusing on this subject.
  - EAC21-22.03 The committee discussed improving/modifying SEOI delivery systems, notifications, and form types. Different software systems were identified but the issue of cost was a consideration, this item will be further reviewed in the AY22/23.
  - EAC21-22.04 To develop a consistent process for inquiries regarding SEOIs, the committee reviewed this and suggestions were made to create a web form submitted by

faculty that would be reviewed by the EAC. This will be a future recommendation to be further addressed next year.

- o EAC21-22.05 Discussions were held on options for faculty developed OER and curriculum content to be included in faculty evaluations. Jim Bisgard was invited to a meeting to discuss this issue. The committee concluded that this should be addressed within each department to develop standards for review of OERs and curriculum content and their place in the review process.
- o EAC21-22.06 To address additional policy and/or procedure language regarding faculty evaluations, in our discussions we reviewed the "Guidelines for Evaluation of Teaching" as suggested. EAC committee discussed developing a framework for the review of teaching and creating policy in how we incorporated peer evaluations into the review process. A conclusion was made that many departments have a process and this charge could be left at the department level.
- o EAC21-22.07 This charge was similar to EAC21-22.04 by creating additional policy and/or procedure language on SEOI access levels and removal of SEOIs. A suggestion was made to create a web form to be reviewed by the EAC and policy on the procedures for access and the removal of SEOIs. This will be a recommendation for AY22/23 EAC committee to develop the procedures for this process.
- o EAC21-22.08 The EAC drafted language regarding SEOI policies during significant disruptions to instruction. This language was submitted and approved by the faculty senate and is now in policy.
- o EAC21-22.09 The academic administrators assessment survey was reviewed to resolve inconsistencies in the Likert scale. This issue was resolved by changing the Likert scale so the averages would better reflect the responses by the participants.
- o EAC21-22.10 An annual assessment of the Faculty Senate and Executive Committee will be held later in the Spring quarter.

- Recommendations
  - o The EAC has reviewed the usefulness of the SEOI over the course of several years and matured the conclusion that they can be good tools to measure student satisfaction, but they are extremely flawed instruments if used to evaluate teaching performance. Faculty members' concerns about receiving good SEOI must not be subordinated to pedagogical considerations in the way they design and conduct their courses. Therefore, the EAC recommends that the institution move away from employing SEOIs to help measure teaching performance and, instead, find ways to use them at different levels (Universities, colleges, departments, programs) to inform choice of teaching modalities, scheduling, instructional tools (i.e. learning management system, videos, etc.).

- Future Work
  - Information Systems – continue working with Information Systems to develop procedures to address access, removal of SEOIs, and inquiries regarding SEOIs to help prioritize the workload of Information Systems.
  - Explore the additional peer evaluation techniques in the review process.
  - Improve/Modify SEOI delivery systems, notifications, and form types.
  - Improve/Modify SEOI form types to better inform choice of teaching modalities, scheduling, instructional tools, etc.
  - Consider ways diversity and inclusivity can be addressed in teaching, see April 6, 2021 Memorandum.
  - Removal of SEOIs in the review process to only be used by faculty as a formative process to inform teaching.
  - Develop checklist for teaching effectiveness and excellence that recognizes different teaching modalities. Propose definitions for teaching effectiveness and excellence.

LEARN. DO. LIVE.

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Faculty Senate Executive Committee

FROM: Equal Opportunity Committee

DATE: April 6, 2021

RE: Faculty Evaluations

The purpose of the CWU Equal Opportunity Committee (EOC) is to:
- Regularly identify and review areas that may impact equal opportunity such as university waivers or promotion and tenure; and
- Review complaints, investigative reports and findings of the investigator and determine whether or not the allegations have been substantiated in accordance with the discrimination complaint and resolution policy and procedures for employees.
(See EOC website: http://www.cwu.edu/hr/equal-opportunity/committee)

Concerns about SEOIs and their use in faculty evaluations have been expressed to members of the committee. Over the last year, the EOC has educated itself on student course evaluations and their use at CWU. At our January 2021 meeting, Terry Wilson, Associate Professor in Management, and Chair of the Faculty Senate Evaluation and Assessment Committee and EOC members discussed the history of Faculty Senate examining the use of SEOIs. Members have educated themselves on a wide-variety of research associated with faculty evaluations including the *Report to the Faculty Senate on Peer Review of Teaching* (May 2012). This report was created by CWU's Faculty Senate Evaluation and Assessment Committee. The purpose of this report was:

> … not to establish university policy. Instead…on establishing a set of tools available for all academic units to enhance and guide their existing peer-evaluation mechanisms…FSEAC does not provide any specific recommendations in this report – rather, we provide, based on review of provided materials and published studies, an overview of existing procedures and Best Practices. (May, 2012, pg. 1) https://www.cwu.edu/faculty-senate/sites/cts.cwu.edu.faculty-senate/files/PETeach.pdf)

The Equal Opportunity Committee acknowledges research showing unequivocally that survey-based student evaluations are biased against faculty based on protected group status, including race, ethnicity, perception of race and ethnicity, sex, age…the list is long and extensive. Research also shows that using classroom observations formatively can better support pedagogical improvement (compared to evaluations), provide positive outcomes for faculty, and comprehensively support their success.

As stated in <u>Best Practices in the Evaluation of Teaching</u> (Benton & Young):

> "Effective evaluation is complex and requires the use of multiple measures—formal and informal, traditional and authentic—as part of a balanced evaluation system. The student voice, a critical element of that balanced system, is appropriately complemented by instructor self-assessment and the reasoned judgments of relevant other parties, such as peers and supervisors. Integrating all three elements allows instructors to take a mastery approach to formative evaluation, trying out new teaching strategies and remaining open to feedback that focuses on how they might improve. Such feedback is most useful when it occurs within an environment that fosters challenge, support, and growth. By taking these steps, evaluation of teaching becomes a rewarding process, not a dreaded event." (June 2018, Paper #69)

The Equal Opportunity Committee recommends the following:
- Explore alternative strategies to support faculty in improving their teaching while still allowing student voice.
- Examine how diversity and equity manifest in SEOI responses; examine bias that is discovered.
- Determine what impacts the pandemic and change in course delivery has had on SEOIs.
- Determine and execute strategies designed to hear from faculty who are also parents, or students who are parents, during COVID. How has the pandemic and change of course delivery affected SEOIs?
- Conduct institutional discussion on replacing SEOIs in promotion/merit/tenure/ retention with observation and using the qualitative component of the SEOI as a formative tool for department and college use.
- If SEOIs continue to be used, focus on an increased response rate and policy on how to administer.

Equal Opportunity Committee

Patty Chirco, Graduate Teaching Assistant, Psychology
Krissy Goecks, Program Coordinator, International
Veronica Gomez-Vilchis, Diversity Advocate & Outreach Specialist, Inclusivity and Diversity
Marc Haniuk, Associate Professor, Theatre Arts
Jonathon Henderson, Associate Director Research, Institutional Effectiveness
Jill Hernandez, Dean, College of Arts & Humanity
Wendy Holden, Manager, Student Disability Services
Henry Jennings, Graduate Teaching Assistant
Khodadad (Khodi) Kaviani, Professor, Education Development Teaching & Learning
Melody Madlem, Professor, Health Sciences
Casey Ross, Office Assistant Lead, Dean's Office
Astrid Vidalon Shields, Assistant Professor, Apparel
Staci Sleigh-Layman, Executive Director, Human Resources
Dayna Stuart, Office Assistant, Disability Services

Works Cited

Benton, S., & Young, S. (n.d.). Best Practices in the Evaluation of teaching. Manhattan, Kansas, USA: IDEA. Retrieved March 22, 2021, from https://www.ideaedu.org/Portals/0/Uploads/Documents/IDEA%20Papers/IDEA%20Papers/IDEA_Paper_69.pdf