

**Evaluation and Assessment
October 6, 2017
Draft Minutes**

Present: Greg Lyman, Brian McGladrey, Terry Wilson, James Bisgard, and Martin Kennedy

Absent: None

Guest(s): None

Meeting was called to order at 1:04 p.m.

Terry nominated Jim for chair. Martin seconded and motion was approved.

Terry moved to approve the May 19, 2017 minutes and Marty seconded. Minutes were approved as read.

Committee charges - 17-18.01 This was an issue last year at the end of spring quarter. A student was removed from a course for academic misconduct and faculty member felt it was unfair to have them fill out SEOs. Also, there was a question about a student who hadn't shown up, but was felt they should be allowed to do SEOs. It was decided last year that if the faculty has gone through Student Success and followed the process the student should be removed from taking SEOs. The committee felt there needs to be a student representative for that discussion. The committee will need to work with AAC to find a home for such a policy and/or procedure.

17-18.02 - Committee may want to look at Guidelines for the Evaluation of Teaching and potentially updating it. This might help with putting SEOs in context for faculty evaluation of teaching. The committee needs to identify what some of those issues or problems are. The committee may want to steer away from SEOs but provide more of a wholistic view of evaluation of teaching. There could be a peer review a letter from faculty within department based on written material versus observing in the classroom. Last year the committee had a year-long discussion about increasing SEOs. There doesn't seem to be a lot the committee was comfortable recommending to faculty to help increase the response rates. Some of the pilots of having faculty providing technology in the classroom and time to do the SEOs did not appear to help with response rates.

17-18.04 open access charge – The committee asked Brian to have the Executive Committee provide more of an idea why this is a concern and why this committee should be looking at. Is this about teaching or is this about scholarship? Is this part of CWUs part to the common good? Is this to reward faculty for publishing in open access to make sure that faculty get credit for these publications. There is some concern whether publishing in open access counts as research, what about peer review. Marty will also ask Lizzie for clarification.

17-18.03 The committee talked about ways to get additional feedback from administrators. What does the BOT want and what do they really want to know what faculty think? Maybe the assessments should be staggered throughout the year. There was some discussion about whether they should be done every year. There was discussion about inviting someone from BOT to an EAC meeting. Maybe invite the Provost/President to talk about what they are wanting to see. What percentage would be considered a valid survey? Look at language for

what faculty should do for plagiarism, where is this language. Have for next meeting.

EAC17-18.05- The instrument seems to be working. May need to ask the EC if they have any changes they want to make for the instruments.

The committee decided to start looking at charge #5. The committee needs to look at the questions and verify that they will be using these questions. Then they need to let the Executive Committee know and ask for any changes.

Charge #1 will be second.

Charge #3 third. How does the committee ask for input? What are the concerns about this is being done. What are ways to strengthen it for the President and Provost.

Charge #2 will be done fourth.

Faculty SEOI survey - The committee will discuss this at the next meeting. Committee members are encouraged to review this prior to the meeting.

Meeting was adjourned at 3:00 p.m.