

**FACULTY SENATE
ANNUAL
STANDING COMMITTEE REPORT**

2018-2019 ACADEMIC YEAR

Prepared for the Central Washington University Faculty Senate

Faculty Senate Committee: Evaluation and Assessment

Committee Chair: James Bisgard (COTS)

Committee Representation:

- Members: Maurice Blackson (Library), Martin Kennedy (CAH), Greg Lyman (CEPS), Terry Wilson (COB)
- Ex Officio Members: Cody Stoddard (EC Rep)
- Student Representatives none
- Guests: Lidia Anderson (IS), Gary Bartlett (representing UFC)

Committee Charges:

- As per the Web

Report on the Activities of the Committee:

- First and third Fridays of each month, 1-3 pm, Grupe Center
- Minutes: posted to the Web
- Motions (Motion No. and Current Status)
- The academics deans (COTS, CAH, COB, and CEPS) were asked the following questions
 1. In evaluating faculty by means of online SEOIs, what is considered a sufficient response rate to generate an accurate analysis of performance?
 2. Under what circumstances (if any) can individual written comments provide a basis for meaningful feedback?
 3. Should context be provided for evaluation of written comments? Why or why not?

Answers were provided by all deans, and their verbatim answers were provided to faculty senators in the revised agenda to the March 6, 2019 meeting, which was sent out on March 5 2019.

- The committee wrote and administered a survey on faculty attitudes towards SEOIs. This was done to gain some information into how faculty viewed SEOIs. We emphasized the distinction between viewing SEOIs as summative instruments vs viewing them as formative instruments. The numerical data summary was provided to faculty senate during the May 1, 2019 meeting, and this data was provided to faculty senators via email on May 2, 2019.
- A summary of the comments received is appended to this report. The short version: nobody knows how evaluators use SEOIs to come to conclusions, and faculty suspect that SEOIs are simply mined for evidence to reinforce a decision arrived at in some other fashion.
- The committee held two listening sessions on SEOIs, to give faculty more opportunities to share their concerns/issues with SEOIs.
- A summary of major common themes from listening sessions
 - SEOI response rates are too low for any evaluative purpose by administrators.
 - There can be useful information in the SEOIs that faculty can use to improve their teaching.
 - Faculty are afraid of how individual, one-off comments get focused on and weaponized by upper levels of review.
 - There is no attempt at validation of comments – the comments are accepted as the gospel truth of what happened in a class.
 - Racial, gender, and other biases are a serious problem that needs to be addressed. Thus concern manifests in several significant ways:
 - How can CWU implement SEOIs to minimize [eliminate] the occurrence of bias?
 - How are evaluations with biased statements assessed for promotion, tenure, retention and other decisions, especially when such statements indicate a bias against the faculty member?
 - Must faculty 'constructively' respond to racist, sexist, or other derogatory statements in their documentation (e.g. female faculty responding to comments reference them as a 'bitch')?
 - How should SEOIs be utilized when biases exist but the indicators are not as obvious?
 - SEOIs are being used in such a way that customer satisfaction is rewarded, while academic rigor is punished.

In addition, faculty are afraid to try new and innovative teaching methods.

- Something needs to be done about how SEOIs are abused, and it must be done soon!
 - Many other themes were expressed, and some of those may warrant future consideration.
- The committee drafted a policy on SEOIs. It touches on areas such as what classes get SEOIs, how faculty can choose their forms, and makes some suggestions on how SEOIs can be used, emphasizing their formative role in helping faculty try to improve their teaching. The draft is appended to this report.
 - The committee conducted an assessment of the faculty senate and the faculty senate executive committee.
 - The committee conducted the bi-annual assessment of academic administrators. That included the President, the Provost, the three Associate Provosts, the Dean of COTS, and the Dean of CEPS. Numerical data from these assessments will be available to faculty, and can be compared to the previous assessment conducted in spring of 2017.
 - Concerns:
 - There was some concern about how (if at all) academic administrators use the information from the assessment of academic administrators. Some comments from the president suggested that administrators make no use of this information (similar to what faculty are regularly accused of with respect to SEOIs). Previous E&A chair Jeff Snedeker provided some documents suggesting that the president and provost are supposed to address their assessment results (just as faculty are required to address areas/patterns of substandard results in their personal statements when up for RTP). The Faculty Senate Meeting minutes from January 9, 2013 also suggest that academic administrators' 360 evaluations are supposed to take into account the results of the assessment of academic administrators. (The committee report from the January 2013 senate meeting, as well as a report on faculty assessment of academic administrators by the E&A committee from March 2009 may be found at <https://www.cwu.edu/faculty-senate/evaluation-assessment-committee>)
 - Recommendations

- The committee will need to work on policy and procedures regarding clarifying how and when faculty are able to choose SEOI forms. This would need to be done in conjunction with IS, who now administers SEOIs. One facet of this is making sure that faculty senate is made aware of the windows in which faculty can change their forms.
- The committee considered including a policy on removing student responses on SEOIs (before faculty ever see them) due to misconduct and/or low attendance. The corresponding procedure will be of utmost importance, and this may be a longer term item.