Faculty Senate Evaluation and Assessment Committee
Minutes - Jan. 19, 2018

Present: Jim Bisgard, Marty Blackson, Martin Kennedy, Greg Lyman, Brian McGladrey, Terry Wilson
Absent: David Yi
Guests: Bernadette Jungblut; Rebecca Pearson attended briefly

Meeting was called to order at 1:05 p.m. Minutes of Jan. 5, 2018 were amended to add Greg as present; amended minutes were approved.

Summary of written comments from SEOI survey

Jim asked for feedback on the summary of SEOI comments, which will be presented at the Faculty Senate meeting on Feb. 7. Terry pointed out one typo list item 2, where "comment" should be plural to maintain consistency. Jim will make the correction and send the letter to the Executive Committee and to Cody.

Suggestions for increasing SEOI response rates

Bernadette indicated that she has been working on trying to find a compromise with methods of completing SEOIs. There are strong feelings at administration levels about not going back to paper, but faculty would like to go back to doing SEOIs in the classroom. One possible option could be to go back to filling them out in class, but bring in a few devices for students to use if they don't want to use their own device. Possibly in winter or spring some faculty would be willing to consider trying this method in their classes.

In terms of confidence intervals, an appropriate statistical technique, which would explain how much confidence to have in someone's evaluation comments, could be used. This would give the deans more information to use when doing their evaluations, but one concern is that people could misinterpret what a confidence interval means in the same way they can misinterpret scores and comments.

Online SEOIs will never go away completely because of the hybrid courses, but this committee could make a recommendation for changes to the process of how SEOIs are done.

Jim questioned if the committee wants to continue with SEOIs as they are, or try to improve the response rate, try to make it more formalized as to how they are used, and try to make it more transparent and consistent as to how they are used. Another option would be making tools that faculty can use, such as guidelines, to demonstrate that they are a good teacher even if they receive a low SEOI score. An evaluation of teaching can't be a completely algorithmic thing. Classroom assessment is formative assessment, but formative assessment can't be used for summative assessment. Anything put into Faculty180 is viewed as summative assessment; Faculty180 should be used to show trends over time rather than individual snapshots of data. Bernadette indicated that EvalKit can be programed to run trends; a trend line over time

would be a helpful piece of information. It's the faculty member's willingness to make changes over time.

Bernadette suggested working on peer evaluations. Evaluations could be done by people in related disciplines or content areas (such as sociology and political science, or aviation and electrical engineering) but not necessarily in the same department. Terry indicated that making suggestions and providing incentives might be a way to encourage people to improve.

Jim questioned if it would be worthwhile to put together a statement for what we think should be in an evaluation of teaching, by saying something like: "The EAC takes the view that SEOIs are formative assessment and should not be used in isolation to make summative assessment." The statement would then be given to Senate. Bryan agreed and suggested getting a sense of the Senate before moving to have the statement endorsed. Bernadette suggested getting a sense from colleagues as to what we should be asking students to evaluate, and what we should be asking peers to evaluate. From an assessment perspective, you would want to be assessed by students, peers, chair/supervisor, and yourself, but all of those would speak to different areas.

Bryan questioned why we are spending so much time trying to increase response rates without finding out why response rates are low. If students do not put value on completing SEOIs, why are we putting value on what they are saying? Jim suggested running a survey of students to get their opinions. There are some theories about student opinions but no real data. Another option would be to attend a Student Academic Senate meeting and talk to them. Last year Jim attended a meeting, and students were adamant that SEOIs should be open during finals week since the course wasn't over yet—so students and faculty are on opposite sides with that. Also, students think of SEOIs as a chance to "get back" at their professors.

Next meeting: Feb. 2, 2018. Come up with ideas for how to create formative assessment over a period of time to make formative assessment. Also read letter from Becky and read first 6 pages of 2012 Peer Review of Teaching on Faculty Senate website.

Meeting adjourned at 3:08 p.m.