Faculty Senate Evaluation and Assessment Committee
Minutes
Nov. 3, 2017

Present: All committee members were present.
Absent: None
Guests: Warren Plugge

The meeting was called to order at 1:05 p.m.
Minutes of Oct. 20, 2017 were approved as written.

Discuss additional feedback from the Executive Committee on the fourth charge

Two library personnel gave a presentation at the Nov. 1 Senate meeting to discuss open access journals—open access does not always mean predatory.

Bryan indicated that there are really two issues. One is whether or not CWU is doing everything it can as an institution to make sure that students have access to everything possible including work from our own faculty. The second issue is whether we are doing enough to address how faculty publication in open access journals relates or affects tenure and promotion. Marty questioned if faculty are aware that CWU has an open access repository retained through the library.

Jim suggested that the Eval & Assessment committee could come up with additional language to say that publications in open access journals should not be dismissed if the journals are not predatory. Papers and articles shouldn't be dismissed simply because they are in an open access journal. The EAC can work on that if the Executive Committee would like.

Discuss Senate feedback on the Faculty SEOI Survey

Jim gave a report during the Nov. 1 Faculty Senate meeting. We will be sending out the Faculty SEOI survey to get more than anecdotal evidence. During the Senate meeting Matt Altman indicated that evaluation of teaching is not to be done solely on SEOIs; if someone is being assessed only based on data from SEOIs they have reason for filing a grievance through the union. Jim clarified that the reason for doing the survey is to gather feedback on other ways teaching should be assessed.

Greg questioned if the EAC's task would be to develop another tool to utilize for evaluating instruction. The Guidelines for Evaluation of Teaching from 2014 says it is endorsed by Faculty Senate, and administration is looking at it but we still don't know what administration is looking at when evaluating teaching other than SEOIs. Jim indicated that EAC can make recommendations as to what should be done but the committee doesn't have the power to implement anything or say that it has to be followed.

A decision was made to split question 6 on the Faculty SEOI survey into two separate questions – one about faculty using SEOIs appropriately and one about administration using

SEOIs appropriately. The survey will be open from Monday, Nov. 6 through Friday of the following week (Nov. 17 at midnight) with one reminder email sent on Nov. 13.

Discuss feedback on removing students from SEOIs

Last year a few faculty members had students who were accused of academic misconduct and the student threatened to "Get them" on the SEOI. The faculty was NTT and was afraid for their job; they wondered if there was a way to remove students from SEOIs due to academic misconduct. There are two questions here: one is whether students should or shouldn't be removed from SEOIs due to academic misconduct. Another is how to implement the process of removing them. Other situations do arise where students may not get to complete an SEOI, such as hardship withdrawals, no-shows, etc. That decision is made when an audit is run at the seven week in the course. The EAC thought of adding an "F" for a course grade at that point because the only way someone could have an "F" a month before the end of the quarter would be for academic misconduct. Students would have the ability to contest that but it would probably be a grade appeal and the timeline for that is longer than a quarter.

Jim indicated that the EAC would like feedback from the Student Academic Senate as to whether students who have an F prior to the hardship withdrawal deadline should be excluded from SEOIs. The committee still needs to find out if it's possible to do this logistically but would like to get feedback regardless.

David suggested that students who have been caught cheating or plagiarizing should not be allowed to do SEOIs, but the caveat is they should be given an opportunity for rebuttal. If they are appealing their grade there should be a process where students are still allowed to do an SEOI but not in situations such as cheating/plagiarism, withdrawals, etc. There should be a way to identify the students and pull the ones who would need to be pulled.

David suggested removing the comment section from SEOIs, but only from the portion that is reviewed by administrators so that they are only seeing data points. Professors can have their own form to give out in class to gather feedback for personal use. Removing the comment form from the actual review process gives the reviewer only that data points and that way they can look at overall trends and patterns; this would make them look at what professors have done over the time period.

The committee will be discussing this idea further at a later date.

Next meeting on Nov. 17 – will try to come up with ways to assess evaluating teaching, or evidence that comments should be removed from SEOIs.

Adjournment – meeting adjourned at 2:59 p.m.

Next meeting:
Nov. 17, 2017