

*Faculty Senate Evaluation and Assessment Committee
Minutes - Feb. 16, 2018*

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

Absent: David Yi

Guests: Joy Bensiger

The meeting was called to order at 1:10 p.m.

Minutes of Feb. 2, 2018 were amended to add “making” in the last paragraph. Terry moved to pass the amended minutes; Marty seconded. Minutes were approved as amended.

*Removing students from SEOIs for academic misconduct**

*(Please see additional comments included with April 6, 2018 minutes.)

Joy Bensiger from IS attended to address concerns related to online SEOIs. Typically SEOIs are populated the Monday after the uncontested withdrawal period. Jim indicated that when students drop a class they are immediately dropped from Canvas but still appear in MyCWU, where they have a +W or a HW, depending on the type of withdrawal. There are still questions and concerns surrounding who gets SEOIs and how that is being determined. Is it the enrollment in Canvas or the enrollment in MyCWU?

Another area of concern is whether or not the possibility exists that students who have been dropped from a class for academic misconduct may still receive a reminder notification with a link to complete an SEOI. If a professor gave a student an “F” grade for academic misconduct, the student would still be in Canvas.

Joy explained that students who receive SEOIs are determined by the enrollment in Canvas. There is no connection between Canvas and MyCWU for grades. When a student is removed from anywhere in Canvas they can still be manually enrolled in the course because the work they have done is still accessible. Tom Henderson also sends reminder emails, which contain links to the SEOI, to students. Terry questioned if those emails go to students who are enrolled by have been removed from the class, can those students still access the SEOI through the link in the email? Joy was unsure where Tom gets the information he uses for sending the emails.

Jim indicated he was under the impression that if a student withdraws they have a +W in MyCWU, and they are removed from Canvas. It sounds like something else is being used to send reminder emails to students. Joy clarified that only online classes use Canvas, but some face-to-face classes choose to use it as well. SEOIs are populated through Canvas or through MyCWU depending on what the class is using. Tom’s list drops everyone who has a +W in MyCWU. In classes that don’t use Canvas, the SEOIs are populated by Tom’s list. Some departments, including ITAM, receive an email from the registrar to notify them of inactive students so those students will not get an SEOI.

Terry questioned if a script could be run in EvalKit to also drop those students who have an “F” grade before Week 7. Academic misconduct is the only way someone would receive an “F” at that point the course. Greg indicated that discussions in past meetings suggested faculty could contact the registrar and assign an “F” if they caught someone for plagiarism, but can faculty also request that the student be removed from SEOIs? Where is the line for what we can

do? Jim indicated, as he originally understood it, the registrar has the final list and controls who gets to do SEOIs. He thought of suggesting a new grade, such as F-AM, which would indicate an “F” specifically for academic misconduct. This way, if a script is run it would remove anyone with +W and F-AM. This would alleviate the concern surrounding situations where a student is accused of some sort of academic misconduct and is upset, and says they’re going to “get back” at the instructor on the SEOI. The “AM” wouldn’t really be a grade, but a code to put in the “grade” slot so that the student could be removed. Terry questioned if instructors would be able to use that system as a way to weed out students who they think will give them negative SEOIs.

On the issue of response rates, Jim discussed an experiment during fall quarter where Tom sent notifications to students at the beginning and end of the first week SEOIs were open, then turned off the notifications in the second week. Students have reported that the notifications and reminders are nagging and make them not want to complete the SEOIs. Jim questioned if IS would be willing to do anything to help make response rates higher. The committee would be willing to explore a system of Scantron data and online comments, but still the question exists what comments be used for. Previously we were unaware that administration was concerned about response rates and thought the view was that SEOIs are a tool for evaluation.

Joy explained there are two options for which pop-up notifications to run. Tom has a special login with access to select which one to use. Another option now with EvalKit is when students click on "grades" there is also an option it also shows notification window reminding them to complete their SEOIs. Initially his response rates were low but now it's gone up to around 60%. He started sending his students an email reminding them to complete the SEOI. Joy will send a video with recordings of everything about EvalKit to Jim; Jim will share it with the committee and possibility with Faculty Senate.

Jim questioned if graphs for response rates can be added in EvalKit, based on the number of students who were enrolled and displaying the number of students who were enrolled, the number who actually were sent SEOIs, and the number who actually completed the. Joy indicated that he can only tell about Canvas but he will send the video about EvalKit to Jim and can get additional people to talk to the committee if needed.

Discussion at the next meeting will address what we would like to happen, and the type of policy we would like to see.

(3) Discussion of alternative (additional?) tools for evaluation of teaching

(a) Draft letter to deans/provost for information on how SEOIs and peer observations are used to evaluate faculty

To be discussed at next meeting

(b) questions/prompt for support letters

To be discussed at next meeting

(c) formative vs. summative assessment

To be discussed at next meeting

(4) Adjourn 2:55 p.m.

Next meeting:
March 2, 2018