Present: Jim Bisgard, Marty Blackson, Martin Kennedy, Greg Lyman, Terry Wilson, David Yi
Absent: Brian McGladrey
Guests: None

Meeting was called to order at 1:03 p.m.
Minutes of Nov. 17, 2017 were approved as written.

Chair Updates
      - Concerns from Faculty Senate regarding extra credit & SEOIs
      An announcement came out in Central Today asking students to do SEOIs, but the last few sentences indicated that offering extra credit was not an unreasonable incentive for doing the evaluations. Jim first heard about the announcement at the Faculty Senate meeting on Wednesday; following that he asked Tom Henderson who sent it out. Tom told him it was IS but they told him it was a different committee. The main problem is that policy/procedure was not followed but it's not clear who didn't follow it and still not clear who put out the announcement.
      Last year a discussion revealed anecdotal evidence that faculty who get high response rates are those who offer students extra credit for doing SEOIs. There isn't a policy against this but is it appropriate for EAC to endorse something and offer it to faculty in general? Faculty get to have a say as to the advertising that goes out about SEOIs. This came about last year after the SURC Publicity Committee put out the "Empire Strikes Back"-themed advertising poster.
      Regarding extra credit for SEOIs, the announcement is gone from Central Today, and the issue got back to union rep Matt Altman and to Assoc. Provost Bernadette Jungblut who apologized and said it won't happen again. At the Senate meeting someone pointed out that faculty giving students extra credit does have an effect because it skews responses—if only one person in the department doesn't do it but everyone else does, it makes that one person look below average.
      David questioned if the EAC can create a policy; Greg questioned how such a policy would be enforced. Terry suggested doing research as to how denying extra credit would skew things. Previously it was discussed that is was mostly people in specific colleges who were doing it.
      Jim suggested saying "Faculty should not offer grade incentives such as extra credit for completing SEOIs."

List of open access journals
      Marty discussed the directory of open access journals, or DOAJ, which is based in Europe, and Beall's List. Beall's is a librarian that calls of predatory journals. Journals have to apply to be included in the DOAJ so for the most part they are legitimate, but there is always the

risk that a predatory one could sneak through. Marty emailed out a document to the committee to review and included several tips for beginning academics to use to help identify legitimate journals.

Jim questioned who is responsible for the cost of legitimate journals or for providing journals that are legitimate. Marty indicated that in his college, it's the personnel committee, but he would encourage faculty to look at traditional publishers too.

Final results of Faculty SEOI Survey

Jim indicated that last year Student Academic Senate asked if SEOIs should be open during finals week so that was the reason for the first two questions on the survey. Data show that faculty don't want SEOIs open during finals. Jim will used the data to give a report during the January 10 Faculty Senate meeting. Based on the survey comments, it sounds like one consensus is that faculty want to go back to the paper version of SEOIs. Response rates were better with the paper version.

Questions for evaluation of administrators

Jim composed a draft letter for the evaluation of administrators. The letter should most likely go to the EC for review first. A third question has been added regarding context for comments on SEOIs. Professors understand what happens in class but administrators don't have that same context when looking at the comments.

Marty suggested adding more clarification for the third question. Terry agreed; it sounds like the point for number 3 is that context should be reviewed and taken into account. Jim indicated that the idea is, for the evaluators, what type of context should be evaluated? Martin suggested rephrasing the question as it seems too open-ended. Jim suggested rewriting it to read: "Should context be provided for evaluation of written comments; why or why not?"

Discussion about other means of assessing teaching

- Article from UW-Eau Claire on peer evaluation of teaching

Jim suggested using ideas from the document as a way of presenting ways for faculty members to get the most out of their evaluations. The article had some good forms to use for doing observations. The article also had some good suggestions, such as meeting ahead of time with the person who will be observing you to discuss what you want students to get from the class. Syllabi and assessments were also discussed in the article, but is that a good way of evaluating teaching?

Something to work on during winter quarter might be a document for peer assessment of teaching, which would include forms to use during and following observation, and for evaluation of materials. Also included would be guidelines for how to do a reasonable peer assessment of teaching that would count more toward PTR based on the Faculty Senate document from 2014. Feedback from faculty is needed before starting work on this.

Terry agreed with peer evaluation and assessment materials. Regarding comments on SEOIs, it's not that faculty don't want the comments, but the comments get used inappropriately.

Comments are better for formative assessment than summative. Jim indicated that it could be an issue where faculty use comments in formative ways but then the comments get used in summative ways elsewhere. Comments should be available to the college personnel committee and college dean but where should it go from there? David suggested having comments available up to the department chair, who would then summarize the overall trends of the comments.

Terry suggested making a reasonable request that the comment section of SEOIs go only to faculty members, and can be seen by the department chair and department personnel committee. Jim indicated that the suggestion we would like to make is that comments on SEOIs should only be available to department personnel committees and department chairs, and higher levels only as requested. For the last sentence this should be clearly stated as "SEOI comments will be available to higher levels of review only upon request."

Continue discussion on removing students from SEOIs
     - Academic misconduct policy
     To be discussed at next meeting

Adjournment
     Meeting adjourned at 2:55 p.m.

Next meeting:
Jan. 5, 2018