

## Faculty Senate Evaluation and Assessment Committee

Jan. 5, 2018 - Minutes

Present: Jim Bisgard, Marty Blackson, Martin Kennedy, Greg Lyman, Terry Wilson, Brian McGladrey

Absent: David Yi

Guests: None

Meeting was called to order at 1:05 p.m.

Minutes of Dec. 1, 2017 were approved as amended.

### *Chair Updates*

Jim recently talked to Bernadette Jungblut, who had some suggestions for increasing SEOI online response rates. One of her suggestions was to provide devices for students to use if they don't want use their own. Jim relayed Terry's experience of taking a class into a computer lab to complete their SEOIs and it didn't make a difference. Bernadette might be attending the Jan. 19 meeting to talk about it some more.

Terry talked to people in her department about comments not being used, and about the suggestion of not releasing comments. They also had a discussion about SEOIs not meaning anything because the response rate is so low.

### *Evaluation of Administrators*

Terry suggested making a change in (2) so that "comments" is used in place of "individual written responses." email.

The end recipient is the president, but the letter will be run through the EC first and may come from them instead of from this committee. After making the change in (2), Jim will send the letter to Cody in an email.

### *Discussion about other means of assessing teaching*

Jim suggested putting together a form for a peer evaluation of colleagues. The intent would be that faculty could write a letter based on that form (or questionnaire) to provide context for SEOIs. This would help provide an explanation in situations where SEOI scores are lower and would be similar to a letter of recommendation or support. Doing an evaluation such as this for a colleague would not be mandatory but it would be another option for people to give more context to SEOIs and comments.

Discussion will continue and will start developing the form at the Jan. 19 meeting.

### *Faculty SEOI Survey*

Jim discussed the report for the Jan. 10 Faculty Senate meeting. He will send the survey graphs to Janet and say we are working on providing a summary of the comments, which will be

discussed at the Senate meeting in February. Questions, such as going back to paper SEOIs, etc., can be answered during the report.

Jim indicated there are a number of comments that mentioned studies suggesting racial and gender bias. Many also expressed concern about low response rates, and many suggested a return to paper. Faculty appear to find SEOIs useful for formative assessment, but it appears they are used as summative assessment at higher levels.

Greg indicated many comments suggested making SEOIs mandatory. Currently the students who fill them out are either the ones who love the class or hate it. Many comments mentioned “mandatory” and going back to paper in the same sentence. Terry pointed out that paper SEOIs were not mandatory, but because students were there in the classroom they tended to complete them.

Brian questioned how bias would manifest itself in SEOIs. Jim explained that women tend to get lower scores than men. One example is that CEPS faculty must score 4 or higher so there is concern as to where and how that bias plays out. Bryan questioned how use of SEOIs can still be justified if there is research to show that biases against women and minorities exist.

Jim indicated that, overall, there is a lack of transparency in how SEOIs are used, with different levels using them differently. There is concern that, at higher levels, comments form context for the numerical data and it is the opposite of how it was intended.

#### *Continue discussion on removing students from SEOIs*

Jim suggested that returning to paper SEOIs could solve the problem. One possible solution would be to have Scantrons for collecting the numerical data, and have comments done online but set up so that faculty can't see who the comments are coming from. This method would take less secretarial time and solves the problem of going back to paper SEOIs. Data comes from what students fill out in class and then the comments they do online. Jim will talk to Matt Altman and see if there could be a potential union issue. Bernadette should be able to attend the Jan. 19 meeting.

Additionally, for the Jan. 19 meeting, read peer review article and work on writing prompts.

From 12/1 minutes regarding suggestion for policy language to EC: "Faculty should not offer grade incentives to students, such as extra credit, for completing SEOIs." The suggestion for policy language was voted and approved, since this was not done during the Dec. 1 meeting. Jim will email the EC.

*Adjournment - 2:40 p.m.*

Next meeting:  
Jan. 19, 2018