

## Evaluation & Assessment Committee Minutes – May 18, 2018

Present: Jim Bisgard, Martin Kennedy, Greg Lyman, Brian McGladrey, Terry Wilson, David Yi

Absent: Marty Blackson

Guests: Lidia Anderson, Joey Bryant

Meeting was called to order at 1:15 p.m. Minutes of May 4, 2018 were approved as written.

### *Language for SEOI Pop-up Reminders*

Lidia made some edits to the language used in the SEOI pop-up reminders. The new language reads:

“Course evaluations are currently being conducted. Your feedback is important. Please take a moment to fill out the course evaluations. This pop-up will continue to display until all SEOIs are completed.”

Students won't get a pop-up message in MyCWU but they will get a notification on the side upon login. The pop-up reminder message will only display in Canvas, but all students will get an initial email to say SEOIs are open. After a week, the email will go out twice but only to students who haven't completed SEOIs yet.

Regarding the discussion at the last meeting about assigning SEOI forms to departments, when Lidia did the forms this quarter and sent them off to the departments, the only ones left blank were labs or thesis classes. If departments did not indicate a form, Lidia assigned form A as was previously discussed.

### *Removing Students from SEOIs/removing responses from SEOIs*

Joey Bryant, Executive Director of Student Rights & Responsibilities, attended address situations when student responses can be removed from SEOIs due to academic misconduct. Specifically, can responses be removed when cases of plagiarism/academic misconduct are still pending, or the investigation process is not yet completed? Another issue is that of attendance: can responses be removed when a student has missed a considerable percentage (for example, 20%) of class due to unexcused absences?

Regarding attendance, anytime a faculty member submits an early alert on a student, the faculty member receives an email to confirm they actually submitted the alert. The student receives an email, too, and the student's advisors are notified. Joey's office is also notified. Lidia can run a query based on attendance. Jim indicated there are issues about taking attendance, especially in large lecture classes and online classes. Another concern is when to tell students; for example, would they be removed from SEOIs after missing 20% of class days? Would they receive a warning after missing 5%, 10%, etc.?

Most faculty consider “academic misconduct” to mean cheating in some way. In this regard, “academic misconduct” is something larger than being disruptive and we are talking about two separate things. Concerns have come up during Faculty Senate meetings as to whether students can be removed from class for behavioral issues and/or being disruptive. Joey indicated students can be removed for the day, but not for the remainder of the quarter.

Jim questioned if it would be possible for the Student Rights & Responsibilities Office to maintain a list of students who are reported and/or investigated for academic misconduct. The

list would then be sent to Lidia's office, and if students are reported they don't get to do an SEOI. One downside is that instructors could potentially use this as a way of making it so that no SEOIs are done for the quarter, or use it as a way of selectively removing students. Terry indicated another concern would be if students aren't being notified they are being reported for plagiarism, then there isn't due process.

Joey's office (Student Rights & Responsibilities) has to give students one-week notice and ability to respond after they are accused of plagiarism. His office marks cases already resolved between the faculty member and the student as an informational item in the system, but it will be used for showing patterns of behavior. Another subcommittee is working on policies related to academic dishonesty. Currently, the only way faculty are supposed to be able to take action is to go through the Dean of Student Success, but the subcommittee is looking at the policy and discussing if it needs to be changed, and if so, how to change it. Jim suggested students should be made aware that they are being accused of plagiarism and it will result in not being able to do an SEOI, or their SEOI results not counting; David indicated if students are bold enough to plagiarize, then not being able to do an SEOI probably won't matter much to them.

#### *Committee Report*

Terry indicated she read the report and thought it was pretty good. Jim will add something to mention the preliminary results of the Senate and EC assessment surveys. The meeting guests listed in the report need to be edited; Andreas Bohman attended a meeting toward the end of last year but is mentioned in this year's report. Joy Bensiger attended the Feb. 16, 2018 meeting but is not mentioned. All committee charges are addressed, but we did fail to bring up SEOI response rates so we will continue to work on that next year.

#### *Plan for next year*

The plan for removing students from SEOIs is coming together in a reasonable fashion. Assessments of administrators are the big thing for next year. Questions will need to be reviewed. Also, we now have three associate provosts. Last year there were questions about whether assessments should be conducted on the associate deans. We will have fewer deans next year; College of Business is getting an interim dean. The library dean will be starting, or expecting to be start, this summer. The time-frame for being before doing an assessment is 9-months.

Charge 2 from this year was addressed with Lidia, and will continue to be addressed next year, especially after getting more information about the process. Terry indicated working on the language for emails should be mentioned on the year-end report.

Meeting adjourned at 2:15 p.m.