

Faculty Senate Evaluation and Assessment Committee
Minutes
Oct. 20, 2017

Present: James Bisgard, Marty Blackson, Martin Kennedy, Greg Lyman, Bryan McGladrey, Terry Wilson
Absent: None
Guests: None

The meeting was called to order at 1:09 p.m.

Minutes of Oct. 6, 2017 were amended to list Marty Blackson as present. The amended minutes were approved.

- Discuss feedback from the Executive Committee on the fourth charge.

This is the charge regarding open access journals. Bryan reporting that Lizzie Brown from the library provided some clarification. Cost for supplying journals is the main issue as it comes at the library's expense; the library is moving away from the amount of journals they are willing to pay for. There is a question of how this might be a scholarship issue but really it's an issue of the rising cost of journals and whether we are doing what we can as an institution to allow students and faculty to gain access to open access journals. It sounds like it's an access issue.

Jim indicated that it seems EAC is not the right committee for this charge. The only issue of why it would come here is if faculty are not allowed to publish in open access journals, or allowed to publish only in certain journals. Terry added that publishing in open access journals should be encouraged. Jim suggested sending the charge back to the Executive Committee and asking for clarification as to why this charge has been given to EAC.

- Discuss Faculty SEOI Survey.

Last year's student representative brought this up. To improve response rates, SEOIs should be open during finals week to allow more student feedback. EAC was told to gather faculty opinions so we put together a survey. Jim will get feedback on the survey at the Nov. 1 Senate meeting and proceed from there with a timeline for distributing it.

- Discuss policy and procedures for removing students from SEOIs.

One main concern center on hardship withdrawals and regular course withdrawals—do (or should?) students still get to complete an SEOI? Another main concern is cases of plagiarism and/or academic misconduct.

Jim received an email from Tom Henderson that provided some clarification on course withdrawals. When a student withdraws from a course (has a +W) they do not get to do an SEOI. In cases of complete withdrawal or hardship withdrawals, students may get an SEOI depending on when they withdrew; if they withdrew before the deadline then they won't receive one. Students who have a no-show (NS) noted for a course do not complete an SEOI either. Professors are able to mark a no-show grade at any time during the quarter.

Terry questioned if there is some way to identify students in MyCWU who are failing for plagiarism or cheating as opposed to just cheating. It seems more like a management issue. Jim indicated that academic misconduct for a quiz worth 5% of the total grade is different than academic misconduct for a major paper or project worth substantially more—is there a threshold? If the student and professor have resolved the issue between themselves, does it still have to be pursued through Student Success? Martin pointed out that two students could be implicated when one cheated but no one knows who cheated off whom; there's no way around the issue of false accusations. He recommended leaving it as-is for now and later on add this to the list of reasons why SEOIs should not be relied on as they are when considering promotion and tenure.

Jim suggested asking for Fs to be added to the list of withdrawals (recorded after week 7) that do not get SEOIs, or asking Tom if that would be possible. Marty pointed out that adding Fs to the list takes care of academic dishonesty.

- How do we want to strengthen evaluation of administrators?

Jim suggested asking administrators for feedback. Questions were developed and Jim will draft a letter.

Intro statement: Given your experience in evaluating university personnel, we would like your feedback in order to strengthen the Biennial Assessment of Administrators.

Question 1: In evaluating personnel by means of surveys, what do you consider a sufficient response rate to generate an accurate response rate analysis of performances?

Question 2: Would a more frequent evaluation be helpful?

Question 3: Under what circumstances can individual responses provide a basis for meaningful feedback?

- Prepare report for November Faculty Senate meeting

Jim will be giving a committee report at the Nov. 1 Faculty Senate meeting. Bryan will discuss the status of the fourth charge. Jim will discuss the faculty survey about SEOIs and explain that the EAC will use some of the questions to come up with an evaluation of teaching that helps put evaluation of teaching in proper perspective; evaluation of teaching should not be based only on SEOIs. He will also mention that the EAC is investigating revisions to policy & procedure for removing students from SEOIs.

The meeting adjourned at 2:45 p.m.

**Next meeting:
Nov. 3, 2017**