

*Faculty Senate Evaluation and Assessment Committee*  
Minutes  
Nov. 17, 2017

Present: James Bisgard, Marty Blackson, Martin Kennedy, Greg Lyman, Brian McGladrey, Terry Wilson  
Absent: David Yi  
Guests: None

The meeting was called to order at 1:05 p.m.  
Marty moved, and Terry seconded, to approve the minutes of Nov. 3, 2017. Minutes were approved as written.

*Discuss additional feedback from the Executive Committee on the fourth charge.*

Brian talked with the Executive Committee about EAC developing a recommendation. There are two issues, one involving ethics. Does it make ethical sense for us to promote scholarly work in journals that all students can get access to, rather than only the ones that charge a fee? The other issue, which involves amending TPR requirements regarding publication, is at the college level.

Jim suggested that the EAC can do a couple things to indicate that open access does not mean predatory. Having a list of open access journals would be helpful. Marty indicated that the library has a list. He will start researching ways to tell if a journal is predatory or peer reviewed.

*Discuss preliminary results of Faculty SEOI Survey*

Jim indicated that his impression from looking at the survey results is that faculty feel SEOIs are not being used appropriately, but they are being used more appropriately among faculty than among administration. It's fairly clear faculty do not think SEOIs should be open during finals week. The survey data [minus comments] should probably be shared with the EC. Matt Altman, the head of the union, might also be interested. Comments should be kept confidential as much as possible. David (student rep) should be told that faculty do not want SEOIs to be open during finals week.

*Discussion about other means of assessing teaching*

The survey comments suggest faculty agree SEOIs are helpful for improving teaching; however, SEOIs should be one tool but not the only one. Jim suggested developing a rubric or something to help people read and interpret SEOIS properly and put them in context. General guidelines or a framework for evaluating teaching is another idea. Someone who has low SEOIs but is still a good teacher should have the opportunity to demonstrate their abilities. Greg indicated that in CEPS, SEOIs are supposed to be an average of 4 or better. People have been denied tenure or promotion based on that but it's unique only to that college. Jim suggested the EAC question why it is 4 and not something like 3.7, or why it isn't something more generic such as "excellent teaching." The committee has a certain amount of ability to change some hard-set types of things.

Jim and Greg asked colleagues for feedback on removing comments from SEOIs. People did not like the idea. Jim suggested putting comments only in Faculty180 so the department chair and department personnel committee can see them. Also give faculty the option of including

comments on their SEOIs for review. The main question is, what do faculty want to get out of SEOIs? Martin suggested highlighting some of the things mentioned in the survey comments. Many comments mention mid-quarter SEOIs, and many of them suggest it's pointless to make SEOIs mandatory. Greg suggested if SEOIs are going to be mandatory, it should be in some other way. If only the best and worst students are doing them, then the middle is being ignored. One comment on the survey says that students don't know about evaluating teaching methods, so that seems to suggest peer review. Jim indicated that Kate Reynolds in EDTL sent a report on peer observation. One suggestion is for pre- and post-evaluation meetings so the observer knows what to expect and what to look for. Kate is willing to come talk to the committee.

On the issue of formative vs. summative assessment, Brian questioned if we value formative assessment feedback provided by students, are we saying students are capable of providing that feedback? Jim indicated with formative assessment you're reading the comments with an inner editor and seeing how they apply to what goes on in class. Comments get taken out of context when people who don't know the classroom setting are reading them.

Marty indicated that for summative assessment from SEOIs to be meaningful, a bigger response rate is needed. Terry suggested that part of the issue is comments tend to vary widely from between positives and negatives and this tends to color perceptions of everything. From the survey, it appears faculty don't think SEOIs are being used appropriately at the dean and provost levels. Jim questioned if there is any way to find out for sure if administrators at the dean's level and higher are basing evaluations only SEOIs and comments.

Brian and Jim suggested letters from colleagues as another means of evaluating teaching. Peer observation gives one snapshot of 50 minutes but a letter from a colleague who has other opportunities to view interaction with students would be more like a letter of support. Jim suggested the possibility of going over SEOIs with colleagues or someone else in the department, which would be like an additional peer review. He suggested talking with colleagues to see if they would be willing to write an overarching peer review letter.

At the next meeting, will discuss the report from Kate Reynolds on peer evaluation and decide based on that discussion if Kate should come to talk to the committee during winter quarter.

#### *Continue discussion on removing students from SEOIs*

Jim found out that for a situation of academic misconduct, an instructor needs to tell the registrar the student has an F for academic misconduct. This will flag the student in the system so they won't be dropped from the course but they won't get an SEOI. So it's logistically doable but there are couple questions. First, what if faculty tend to overuse it? No evidence is needed and this can be done before the grade register is out. Second, there is no policy/procedure on academic misconduct. The closest thing is a procedure on the grade appeals process. Lack of policy is a concern and could make this difficult.

#### *Continue discussion on strengthening evaluation of administrators*

Jim will draft a letter with the questions that were decided at Oct. 20 meeting.

*Adjournment* - Meeting adjourned at 2:50 p.m.

Next meeting:  
Dec. 1, 2017