

Faculty Senate Evaluation and Assessment Committee Minutes – April 6, 2018

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

Absent: None

Guests: None

The meeting was called to order at 4:09 p.m. Minutes of March 2, 2018 were approved as written. Jim moved to add to the end of Feb. 16, 2018 minutes: "Please see additional comments on April 6, 2018 minutes." Marty seconded; motion approved.

Draft questions for Executive Committee & Faculty Senate annual evaluation

Jim indicated he would be happy to use the same questions from last year unless EC has questions or issues they would like us to look into. There is also a question of timeline. Is there a period of time when EC gives feedback on the questions before the survey is released to faculty? Jim would like to start the survey in week 6 of the quarter and end in week 8. He will discuss the survey at the last Faculty Senate meeting on May 30, and make an initial announcement at the May 1 Senate meeting.

Discuss letter to President regarding Evaluation of Administrators

Brian addressed some feedback Cody and the EC. They are concerned that EAC is asking for feedback from the president on assessment from administrators and faculty, so should there be two letters instead of one? Are these two distinct things, or could it be reworded to be one letter? The issue is that the provost evaluates the faculty and the provost evaluates the provost. So there might be two different questions, one for the president and one for the provost. If one letter is sent, there needs to be a differentiation between questions that are explicit to faculty and those that are explicit to administrators. Cody is also interested in using friendlier language in the letter, for example, asking "what would be a little more helpful?"

Jim indicated he doesn't have a problem with sending two distinct letters, where the one that goes to the president removes certain specific language, omitting the words "faculty and." The letter to the provost would include the words "faculty and." Jim moved to split the letter into two letters as suggested; Greg seconded. Motion approved.

One question is, what is the typical response rate for the Evaluation of Faculty Administrators? Is it different than the response rate for SEOIs? Jim was thinking of sending the letter with the 7 questions to the college deans and college personnel committees. We could also send that to the provost. Brian can get feedback from Cody and/or the entire EC via email.

Removing students from SEOIs for academic misconduct

Jim recently talked with Lidia Anderson. One thing she can query is academic alerts through MyCWU. We would create a policy to state that it must be specified on course syllabi that every time a student misses five days (or ten days, etc), an academic alert will be triggered. From talking with Lidia, it sounds like it could be possible to remove students for excessive absences, for example, by running a query after two distinct academic alerts. There are questions as to how to go about doing this and how to notify students. Also, a situation could exist when a student is attending fairly well up to the sixth week of class but then disappears for two weeks, which means they are still there for the SEOIs even though they've missed an important part of the quarter. Brian indicated for absences, it's not the number or percentages of missed days but the reasoning behind it.

Another question is what avenue should be used for this. For example, should it be done through MyCWU or through EvalKit? EvalKit might be a better option because the people who do academic alerts could add academic misconduct so then that query could be run. We would like to remove students who are likely to provide bias in SEOI responses. We also need to find out from Faculty Senate where SEOIs are in policy, or if any policies actually exist.

a. What do we want such a policy to do?

Jim indicated would like to try to try to remove a source of directional bias In SEOI responses.

b. How can we construct it? How can we ensure there isn't abuse?

We have a rough idea but need to contact a couple people. To ensure there isn't abuse for the attendance part it's fairly clear; this could be done by ensuring something is specified in syllabi. However, this leads to a question of who would police it. Jim will check with Carolyn Thurston to find out if there is a deadline for submitting academic early alerts. Brian indicated it would be the chair's job to make sure faculty aren't abusing the system and trying to remove students for no reason. Faculty would have to submit requests for removing students to the chair, which could also be an additional evaluation point for the chair.

c. Process of notification for students?

David indicated it would be respectful to students to notify them and refer to a specific policy. It doesn't necessarily have to say "you will be removed" but something like "you may be removed pending...."

Discussion of alternative and/or additional tools for evaluation of teaching

a. Draft letter to deans and college personnel committee chairs

We are trying to give a statement that formative assessment and summative assessment are different, and that is something that needs to be considered. Jim will rewrite number 3 to make it easier to understand, and also add something to number 6 to suggest that faculty should always try to improve but failed attempts at improvement should not be held against people.

b. Draft statement on formative vs summative assessment

Our intent was to send the statement to college deans and college personnel committees, and possibly to the provost as well, and say it's coming from this committee. We can't assume that evaluations of teaching are a checkbox; it needs to be holistic and needs to look at broad trends. The statement will be sent to four deans and the chair of each college personnel committee. Brian suggested it might be easier to gather collect answers in Qualtrics.

Meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.

Next meeting:
April 27, 2018

Additional Comments to Feb. 16, 2018 minutes:

Minute Corrections:

- Joy Bensiger is not with IS.
 - Joy is under the Associate Provost
- SEOI's are not determined by enrollment in Canvas
 - Student information comes from MyCWU after the uncontested withdrawal period determined by the Registrar's office each quarter.
- Tom Henderson no longer sends email communications to students
 - This is done by Lidia or Rocky via Evaluation Kit
- SEOI's are populated through Canvas or MyCWU depending on what the class is using.
 - SEOI's are only populated with MyCWU course information.

Questions in the minutes:

- Terry asked if students who were enrolled by removed from a class still get evaluations.
 - Students must be officially withdrawn within MyCWU by uncontested withdrawal to not get an evaluation.
- Terry questioned if a script could be run in EvalKit to also drop those students who have an "F" grade before week 7
 - This would require approval from Faculty Senate and a process change would need to occur since student information isn't currently entered until after uncontested withdrawal.
 - Grades are not available to faculty until finals week, a change to this process would require approval and a change in business process.
- Can IS do anything to help make response rates higher
 - Yes, [IS] can customize the notification the student sees to clearly define expectations this isn't currently used.

Publication Language:

- Faculty Senate asked for a change in the language asking students to evaluate instructors vs. instruction. The only place [IS] saw this potentially being an issue is within the social media blubs being posted.
Currently approved language reads: *Please complete your SEOI's today! Faculty use SEOI results to improve their teaching, SEOI reports are part of regular reviews for faculty and instructors, and departments can use SEOI feedback to makes changes to curriculum. Please check your CWU email or Canvas. Your opinion matters.*
 - [IS] can make [the language] whatever [faculty and instructors] want but to address the instructor vs instruction concern it could be: Please complete your SEOI's today! Faculty use SEOI results to improve their teaching, SEOI reports are part of regular reviews for faculty and instruction, and departments can use SEOI feedback to makes changes to curriculum. Please check your CWU email or Canvas. Your opinion matters.