

*Evaluation & Assessment Committee
Minutes – May 4, 2018*

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

Absent: David Yi

Guests: Lidia Anderson

Meeting was called to order at 1:08 p.m. Minutes of April 27, 2018 were approved as written. Jim moved to change the last committee meeting of the year to May 25, instead of June 1. This will make it possible to review results of the EC & Faculty Senate Assessment surveys. Greg seconded; motion approved with 1 abstention.

EC feedback on survey questions

EC suggested getting rid of question 3 on the Senate assessment and rewording question 4 so that it is only asking for a rating of the live-stream accessibility. For question 12, delete “and meaningful” to avoid asking a double-barreled question. Jim moved to approve the changes; Terry seconded. Motion approved.

EC also indicated concerns with questions 5, 6, 7, and 10 on the Executive Committee assessment. These were also thought to be double-barreled questions, but Jim suggested leaving them as written since questions have been used for a number of years. Approved.

2018-19 meeting dates & chair election

Meeting dates are fine; 1:00 is ok for a meeting time. Everyone will check fall teaching schedules and confirm. Jim was selected as committee chair for a third term.

Review letters to President, Provost, and Deans

Jim questioned if the Dean of Library, and the Dean of Graduate Studies, evaluate faculty. Library faculty are faculty so that would apply. Graduate classes are a bigger question – do those classes have SEOs, and how are graduate faculty evaluated? Lidia indicated that international classes (for example, ESL) are excluded from SEOs.

Another question is this timeline for sending out the letters. If we send them out now (in May) they could be overlooked or forgotten. It might be better to start over in fall. Dean Martell and Dean Paveza will be gone after June 30, so it doesn't make sense to include their responses. We could, however, send it to the new deans instead. Are we are looking at this primarily as an informational thing with the intention of giving a report to Senate? Brian questioned if it's possible the information gathered from the letters could contribute to a new policy about SEOs. If so, the EC would like to have results this year so they can start working on a policy early into next year. It seems that the administrators and deans would have a responsibility to respond to these questions. Also, they are on 12-month contracts so they will be working over the summer.

Marty moved to send out the letters; Greg seconded. Motion approved.

Continue discussion on removing students from SEOIs for academic misconduct

Discussion will be saved for May 18 meeting.

Lidia shared some information on SEOIs and the emails that are sent out about the process. The first email goes out to departmental staff. Lidia tried to shorten it to include helpful tips, and also added explanations as to why they might not see something. The email also asks staff to type an "X" to indicate if they don't want SEOIs for a particular class. Jim suggested taking out that part and saying courses of 5 or more students are required to have SEOIs and must have a form assigned.

Lidia indicated that Form A is for lecture classes, Form B is for lab classes, and so on. A course can have an associated lab, or courses can be together at the scheduling level, which means two sections (lecture and lab) would need to be filling out two SEOI forms. Simplifying this would be good. Jim suggested, for anything having to do with combining courses, saying that anything left blank will be assigned Form A. Lidia also removed language in the email about how to download SEOI reports. Regarding popup messages, those can be customized to say it will go away when/if SEOIs are completed.

Lidia will send Jim a list of questions related to policy/procedure (an example would be allowing students to fill out the same form once for associated lecture & lab classes where the lab is associated with the lecture). Jim will take to Faculty Senate the issue of certain courses not having assigned SEOI forms.

Continue discussion of alternative and/or additional tools for evaluation of teaching

Jim suggested changing #3 on the first page of alternative/additional ways of evaluating teaching to more accurately address the eventual statement we would like Faculty Senate to endorse. In COTS the deans consistently send out the message to faculty that your personal statement should reflect you are aware and trying to change, meaning that you are using your formative assessment summatively. We would like to see consistent methods across the deans, but we could make a statement and send it to the EC, possibly as a follow-up to the material from 2013 about peer evaluation of teaching. Brian indicated it would be up to the EC to decide if it needs to go to the Provost's Office from there, or if it needs to result in a policy change. The real issue is SEOIs and how they are used so maybe there needs to be some sort of real policy developed to address that. This could be a starting point.

Jim asked everyone to look over the document and make suggestions for changes, which will be discussed at the next meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 2:50 p.m.