

*Evaluation & Assessment Committee
Minutes – April 27, 2018*

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

Absent: Marty Blackson, David Yi

Guests: Lidia Anderson, Cody Stoddard

The meeting was called to order at 1:03 p.m. Minutes of April 6, 2018 were approved.

Review questions for EC & Faculty Senate Assessment

No concerns were indicated for the EC assessment. Jim moved to approve and Marty seconded. Questions for the EC assessment were approved.

For the Faculty Senate Assessment:

- add a separate comment area on page 5 to provide comments not related to budgeting; change the existing comment area to address issues specific to ABB/RCM
- add a new question on page 2 to ask “Are you aware that the full Faculty Senate meetings are live-streamed?” with a yes/no answer, and followed by a Likert scale about how easily accessible the live stream has been (1, not accessible – 5, always accessible).

Changes were seconded, voted, and approved.

Feedback on letter to President/Provost

Cody indicated that EC originally was thinking of sending two distinct letters but he would suggest three letters, including one to the deans. The president’s version should address evaluating academic administrators. The provost’s version should address two questions, one about evaluating academic administrators, and one about evaluating faculty. For the deans, there should be a single question about evaluating faculty. Possibly the letters about the faculty could be sent now and then send another in the fall asking about evaluating academic administrators.

Terry questioned why we would not ask the same questions in each letter. Jim indicated keeping the letters separate would show the different responses. In the letters for the college personnel committees and deans, we are asking for general pointers. At the last meeting, there were some suggestions about turning it into a Qualtrics survey, but questions remain as to the best way to do that.

Removing students from SEOIs for academic misconduct

Jim has been talking with Lidia Anderson. She can run queries for specific criteria, so we could set a threshold where SEOI comments are removed from students who are absent for more than 20% of the class days. This would have to be noted in the instructor’s syllabus, and “absences” would have to be clearly defined. However, we have this system so faculty should be using it.

There are concerns about what counts as “academic misconduct.” One person might consider it to be students copying on one assignment, but someone else might consider it as students missing 20% or more of class.

Lidia has been talking with Gail Mackin about different ways of taking attendance. One option is a check box in Academic Early Alert but it doesn't tell you how many days the student has missed. A query could be written for that, and it could also be sent to EvalKit to remove responses when deemed appropriate. EvalKit knows with whom the responses are associated. It might not be possible to do multiple Academic Early Alerts in the same quarter (for example, for attendance after 5% missed days, 10% missed days, etc.). Multiple people are notified when an Academic Early Alert goes out. Terry indicated that taking attendance in large classes is a concern. Many classes in the College of Business have 70 – 90 students. Jim questioned if “academic misconduct” can be a query in “behaviors of concern.” Lidia indicated “behaviors of concern” is separate and is through Student Success. Students have the right to appeal, and this goes beyond the available timeline to load things into EvalKit. The only way Lidia would know if someone was removed would be if they have a W grade. The query doesn't look for F grade, but it is possible to remove individual names if notified by student success.

Jim addressed another issue, which is that faculty have no idea what counts as “academic misconduct.” Is it plagiarism, misbehavior in class, or...? A major concern is retribution on SEOIs after reporting students for academic misconduct, whatever it may be. Cody indicated the Academic Affairs Committee will be discussing this next year.

Terry questioned, if a student has been reported for plagiarism and decide to appeal it, would the student be removed from SEOIs before they've been due process. Lidia indicated once an SEOI response has been deleted, it's deleted; the data can be downloaded in a spreadsheet before it's deleted. Jim suggested faculty could figure out who wrote the comment if it's there and then deleted, but it's not appropriate to remove students if they are just under suspicion for plagiarism. In these situations, a note from the Student Success office could be added to the instructor's SEOIs to clarify that someone in the course was investigated for academic misconduct. Hopefully the people reading the evaluations would take that into consideration, especially if the responses or comments are not positive. Going too far in creating policy is one concern. Cody indicated that any policy we create can serve as a starting point. Brian suggested that it comes down to an issue of good data; under what conditions should data not be included, and who should be providing the SEOI data?

Jim will talk with Joey Bryant in Student Success to find out if he can attend a future meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 2:45 p.m.

Next meeting:
May 4, 2018