

## Faculty Senate Evaluation and Assessment Committee Minutes—March 2, 2018

Present: James Bisgard, Marty Blackson, Martin Kennedy, Greg Lyman, Terry Wilson, David Yi

Absent: Brian McGladrey

Guests: Lidia Anderson, Rocky Hively

The meeting was called to order at 1:05 p.m. Minutes of Feb. 16, 2018 were approved.

Jim moved to change the agenda to include a short discussion of Brian's email regarding the letter to the president. The EC feels the letter addresses subject-matter that would be more appropriate for the provost; Eval & Assessment feels the questions apply to the provost as well as faculty. Jim will reiterate that we would like answers to the questions, but we would like those answers to apply to the provost as well as faculty. That was one reason the letter was addressed to the president. If it was addressed to the provost, it suggests that the answers don't apply to the provost. Another reason was because this committee is in charge of administration evaluation as well as faculty evaluation.

Lidia Anderson and Rocky Hively from IS attended to discuss the process of administering SEOIs. Lidia's understanding has been to follow EvalKit and administer then as told, but was recently asked by a faculty member not to administer an SEOI to a student. Lidia is not authorized to do that, and is seeking input from the committee as to how they would like these types of situations to be handled. Currently there are no guidelines, so anyone can say that something is or isn't true. Lidia would like to have something written out so IS can be sure they are administering SEOIs the way EAC and faculty would like them to be administered.

Jim indicated there are still a lot of questions based on the previous meeting. It sounds like EAC is being asked to come up with guidelines. IS is providing the medium, but not saying how the process should be done, as there is no actual policy and nothing in union guidelines. For faculty who are asking that individual students be dropped, a manager should be consulted.

IS uses the data from MyCWU to determine which students receive SEOIS, but does not use the feed directly from Canvas. If courses are combined in MyCWU, IS has to be able to identify that in EvalKit and be able to download a list of forms that all departments are using in order to confirm the correct SEOI form is being used for each class. If a department doesn't confirm a form, then students in that class don't get an SEOI. Currently courses must have a minimum of five students in order to receive SEOIs. Courses listed as "discussion" for course-type do not receive SEOIs. If someone wants to combine two sections of the same course, they have to go through the registrar's office. Recently Lidia received a request from a faculty member to give an SEOI to a class, but the class is set as a discussion class and shouldn't be assigned a form. Can a department request their own survey in place of the standard form? This department wants to use a custom form, not just custom questions. Jim talked with someone from the union and learned there are no rules that govern what type of form has to be used, and no rules that specifically state having to use the university's form.

Jim suggested creating a policy to state that "null" is not acceptable to come back from a department. It sounds like there are two different issues, one being that departments can set the SEOI

forms to null. What should be the minimum number of students in a class to get SEOIs, and how should that number be determined? Another issue is combining of courses. Some courses aren't combined in the registrar's office so they exist as separate sections in MyCWU, but if faculty combine them in Canvas then they exist as one section.

Terry questioned the multiple ways students can access SEOIs. Since students can access them from Canvas and from MyCWU, would that be the place to remove students for academic misconduct? Also, there was a discussion at the previous meeting about the possibility of having a dashboard and incorporating it into Faculty180. Lidia will look into making a graph but is unsure if it can be put into Faculty180. For accessing SEOIs, there is a single-sign-on from MyCWU, but students also receive an email with a link and can access the link through Canvas. Lidia can pull raw data as to who students are; responses from individual students can be removed but she would prefer to focus on what the policy would be to get that point.

During the last academic year (2016-17) EAC requested pop-ups not automatically turn on when SEOIs are accessible by students. This is a cause for concern because IS has to go in a week later and turn the pop-ups back on. The pop-up doesn't give any specific information but can be customized with text (e.g. "pop-up will appear until you complete your SEOIs). Lidia would like permission from the committee to let the pop-ups start when SEOIs start.

#### *Discussion of alternative (additional?) tools for evaluation of teaching*

Jim put together a sample peer evaluation forms from COTS and the math department. One suggestion for peer evaluation is to talk with the person who will be doing the evaluation and discuss what you plan to do for the lesson, and what you expect students to learn. Then meet again with the evaluator to discuss how it went. Another suggestion is to add to existing guidelines for peer evaluation, but clarity from administration is needed as to how evaluations should be used. Jim will talk with Cody and Brian.

(a) Draft letter to deans/provost for information on how SEOIs and peer observations are used to evaluate faculty

One concern is how SEOIs are being weighted compared to peer observations and other tools. In situations where one is good and the other is not, which overrules? How are they weighted, and which is more important? Are there other parameters (such as data or tools) that would be helpful? Having a numerical cut-off is problematic as well. Another concern is the question of what administration are looking for in SEOIs.

(b) Questions/prompt for support letters

To be discussed at next meeting

(c) Formative vs. summative assessment statement

A statement needs to address two parts: part one would address formative vs. summative assessment. Part two would address intended uses of SEOIs, including formative assessment, and emphasis on trends rather than snapshots. The only summative assessment that can be made from formative assessment data is whether or not someone is trying to use that formative data to inform

attempts to improve. Jim will try to draft a statement over the weekend and send it out to the committee.

*Removing students from SEOIs for academic misconduct: what would we want such a policy to do? How should it be structured? What process would we want?*

Jim suggested doing another survey for faculty to gather opinions as to what is more important: peer observation, or SEOI data. The survey could also be used to gather faculty opinions on returning to paper SEOIs, or using Scantrons for numerical data while completing comments online.

Meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

Next meeting:  
April 6, 2018