Evaluation & Assessment Committee
Minutes—November 1, 2019

Present: Marty Blackson, Madalyn Hughes, Martin Kennedy, Greg Lyman, Stephen Robison, Terry Wilson, Cynthia Zhang
Absent: None
Guests: None

Meeting was called to order at 1:12 p.m. Minutes of October 18, 2019 were approved as written.

Chair Updates & Changes to Agenda

Martin received an email from Lidia Anderson requesting EAC's input. A faculty member would like to only have SEOI Form A for a biology course but not include the SEOI Form D, which is used for the lab component of the course. Typically both forms are used for a single course with a lecture and lab component. Lidia requested guidance from the committee. Committee members felt that the lecture and lab components are two different things, and are being evaluated in different areas. Because of this, different forms are needed. Martin will follow up with Lidia to let her know about the committee's decision.

At the last meeting, the possibility was discussed of including a 15-second pop-up window in Canvas or MyCWU for SEOI reminders. Martin looked into this and learned that it can't be done.

A student representative has been appointed for EAC. Madalyn Hughes was appointed to the committee by ASCWU but is not part of the student government. Madalyn will regularly be attending committee meetings. Agenda was amended to allow for a discussion session with Madalyn in regards to student opinions and concerns surrounding SEOIs.

Discussion with Student Representative

Students have expressed complaints about completing SEOIs. Extra credit incentives do appear to work for students; however, most SEOIS seem to come from biases. Students who either loved the class or hated it are the ones who fill out the SEOIs. Students also seem to fill them out if they know they are getting an A. If students are not getting a high grade, then they either only fill out the SEOIs if they remember to do it, or if they have a complaint. Feedback may also differ among students in Gen Ed classes, and students who are taking classes that are part of their major. Offering students extra credit for completing SEOIs might not be unethical because doing so is also grading student participation and attendance in class.

The time involved with doing SEOIs is also a concern for students. Some classes with lab components include two forms. It typically takes about 10 minutes to complete a single online SEOI, and possibly a bit longer if students make an effort to provide effective feedback. If SEOIs were to be made mandatory for students, a university-wide policy would need to be put in place. Faculty could also provide time for students to complete the SEOIs during class, which would be almost as effective as offering extra credit. Faculty should also explain to students beforehand by talking what SEOIs are, why they are important, why they need to be done, as well as discussing why faculty use them and what they take from them. It may be more valuable to complete SEOIs during the middle of the quarter, followed by a shorter evaluation at the end. This would allow time to solve issues that come up rather than letter them go unresolved and letting students become more upset. However, one concern with making SEOIs mandatory would be potential negative feedback from students who don't want to be doing the SEOI and could use it as an opportunity to try to get the instructor in trouble.

SEOIs from students who are given an automatic F for plagiarism, but have gone through the hearing and been put back in the class are another concern. However, feedback from these students would still indicate that something went wrong somewhere. In this case, the bigger issue would be how the data would affect the instructor in regards to their career, so it really appears to be a question of how the SEOIs are being used overall. Another suggestion is for instructors to explain to students how the SEOIs are used, and possibly even discuss it at the beginning of the course so that students can keep it in mind throughout the quarter.

Review & revise draft SEOI policy language (Charges 01 & 02)
The draft SEOI policy language was reviewed and some revisions were made. CWUP 5-90-040 appears to be the best place to house the policy. The SEOI language will be proposed as a new section (43) of the existing CWUP 5-90-040 policy. Some initial procedure language will be drafted at a later time.
The following revisions were made:
In (1)(A)2., change the first sentence to read: "If a class has four (4) or fewer students, no SEOI is assigned except for classes that are combined for SEOI purposes.
In (1)(A)3, change the last two sentences to read: "Choosing no form is an option. If no response is received, the default form is A.
In (1)(A)4, strike the second sentence.
In (2)(A)1, change "Extra Credit" to "extra credit"
In (2)(A), add the following new language:
2. Direct or indirect grade inflation (e.g., extra credit, grade drops)
3. References/Recommendations
Strike (2)(C) and move to section (3) as a new part (D).
In (3), change the third sentence to read: Faculty should be encouraged to experiment with new teaching methods and should not be punished for methods that are in development.
In (3)(C), change "can" to "may" in the second sentence.
Combine (3)(C)(1) with (3)(C).
Numbering will be changed according to the placement in CWUP 5-90-040(43).
All changes were moved and approved.

Other items for discussion
EAC needs to provide a report at the Faculty Senate meeting on November 6. Greg will deliver the report at the meeting, and will ask for feedback as to what faculty would like to see in SEOI policy, especially relating to the incentive/extra credit idea. All feedback should be emailed to Martin.

Meeting adjourned at 2:55 p.m.

Next meeting:
Nov. 22, 2019
Barge 410