<p style="text-align:center">Faculty Senate Evaluation and Assessment Committee
Feb. 2, 2018 - Minutes</p>

Present: All committee members were present.
Absent: None
Guests: Rebecca Pearson

The meeting was called to order at 1:08 p.m. Minutes of Jan. 19, 2018 were approved as written.

Discussion of letter from Dr. Rebecca Pearson

Rebecca would like to offer input regarding SEOIs; they are an obvious issue at CWU and she is willing to work on that. She suggested coming up with ways to get students involved in creating something new. This might help to alleviate the adversarial attitude that exists and does not make sense. Students, faculty and administrators should be communicating together positively to create something to benefit everyone. In her classes, Rebecca asks students for feedback as to what was and was not beneficial for them for their learning.

David indicated he likes the idea of instructors having their own type of SEOI that they can do only for their classes, which would stay internal so that only instructors see it and they can use it to improve. The current SEOI system is time-consuming. Many students would prefer an SEOI system that could be completed in class. Also, the current system has approximately a 10-15% turnout, and statistically there is no way that can be 100% representative of the entire population.

Jim indicated there is only so much EAC can do in terms of changing things. Some areas are possible union issues. The committee has been trying to put together some suggestions faculty can use to show that they are doing a good job of teaching even if their SEOI scores are low. There is concern about comments being cherry-picked. When Bernadette attended the last meeting, she mentioned that she had heard from faculty about comments being taken out of context. Previously a suggestion was made to not use comments. There is also an idea of not using isolated comments to make a summative assessment. An evaluator would need to demonstrate a consistent pattern over time, but that would also apply to faculty. Comments should be used formatively, meaning that they can't be used in isolation but instead to look for patterns. Doing this would show who is using their formative assessment to improve and who isn't. A trend that came out of the recent survey comments showed that overall there is a lack of transparency surrounding SEOIs and it seems no one knows how they are being used.

Terry mentioned that the issues addressed in Rebecca's letter are the same issues the EAC has been addressing. The recent survey was never intended to be comprehensive. Originally it came up because Student Academic Senate had asked about having SEOIs open during finals; we were asked to gather data as to professors' opinions so we decided to add some additional questions.

Jim reiterated EAC can't decide to change anything as that is not the committee's purview; however, we can make suggestions. It could be a union issue if evaluation of teaching is based solely on SEOIs because then someone has grounds for a grievance. There are some things EAC can do; those include creating guidelines, suggestions, and writing prompts for people to use when doing peer evaluation, and developing writing prompts for letters of support/evaluation to help provide context for comments.

Rebecca suggested putting together a working group or a task force that is focused on working with students and getting their feedback. The group could also work on peer evaluation and providing evaluations for colleagues across the university, not necessarily in the same discipline.

Discussion of alternative tools for evaluating teaching
        (a) suggestions for questions/prompts for support letters in regards to teaching
        To be discussed at next meeting

        (b) suggestions for a statement on formative vs. summative assessment, especially in regards to peer evaluation and SEOIs
        David suggested having new faculty members do some of the peer evaluations. The Chemistry department has a system for TAs where they are evaluated by their instructor by also by someone who is new to being a TA. SEOIs are done for TAs as well, but more emphasis is placed on the instructor's evaluation and the other TA's evaluation than on the SEOI. If that same system were used for faculty, new faculty wouldn't be as mired down with the system.
        Marty shared some forms that are used for peer evaluation in the library. The evaluator observes and takes notes, and then writes a letter that goes in Faculty180. Jim indicated the committee could make a suggestion for a procedure on peer observation of teaching. Faculty would first find someone to do the peer observation but indicate if it will be formative or summative; a specific form would be used for each. Prior to the class being observed, the instructor and evaluator should meet, and the instructor identify what they intend to focus on, what they want to improve, etc. They should also identify what they want their students to get from the class. Then the instructor and evaluator should have another meeting after the observation to discuss how it went. These pre- and post-observation meetings wouldn't have to be long but it's the instructor's responsibility to prepare what want and expect students to learn. However, summative assessment for a peer observation of teaching doesn't necessitate having someone in your classroom. Instead instructors should hold onto all written formative assessments, give them to the observer, and have them write a summative assessment based on that.
        Greg liked the idea of making peer observations happen, and making pre- and post-observation meetings happen, as well as providing suggestions for how often it should be done. Terry suggested making it outside the department and the college, or give instructors the option of having an observer from outside their department. Also, university service credit should be given for doing peer observations, or make a system where the people who are observing/evaluating someone are not on the department personnel committee.
        Jim suggested drafting a procedure but may need to do some focus groups and faculty forums. The first step would be coming up with a draft outline for peer evaluation; this should include language to go with formative vs. summative. Another thing would be language regarding SEOI comments being cherry-picked. We would want to get an endorsement from Faculty Senate that SEOI comments should not be cherry picked or used against faculty, but consistence says individual comments should also not be used by faculty; formative works both ways. Instead of using individual comments against an instructor, evaluations should focus on consistent themes and trends over time.

Meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.