

**REVISED PROPOSAL:** June 30, 2018; Adopted by a vote of the Curriculum Committee

### **ADDENDUM TO THE CVM ATTENDANCE POLICY: \***

CVM teaching faculty teaching in the DVM curriculum may choose to utilize low-stakes, in-class teaching activities that generate points for a particular course. These points may in turn count towards the final course grade and course/class ranking. Examples include “clicker” questions (student response systems), pre-session case preparation exercises, in class or online quizzes, etc.

However, these low-stakes learning activities must (a) have a valid pedagogical purpose that requires a student’s physical presence\*\* - see below, (b) not actually represent a surrogate system for required attendance, and (c) not amount to more than 10% of the total points for the course. It is also the instructor’s responsibility to clearly communicate to students at least 24 hours prior to a session if a low-stakes, in-class activity that generates points will be used so that students can make informed decisions. The schedule for these activities can also be communicated to students via the syllabus. This policy in no ways precludes the use of in-class activities that do not generate points.

Students who choose not to attend lectures, labs, and other educational events where these activities have been scheduled must accept that they are sacrificing any points that might be awarded. Although the effects are most likely to be minor considering the small number of points involved, students should understand that sacrificing these points has the potential to affect their grade and/or course rank. In the case of student illness or other unforeseen/unavoidable circumstances, the instructor has the option to provide a make-up assignment or accept a late submission of the activity or exercise.

This policy does not preclude instructors from also using higher points/higher stakes activities and/or exercises (i.e. greater than 5% of total points). However these types of learning exercises must be published in the course syllabus that is provided to enrolled students at the start of the semester. In accordance with [the CVM policy on scheduling exams](#), these scheduled activities should also (if at all possible) be included in [the semester exam/required activities calendar](#) that is published prior to the start of the semester. Again, the use of learning activities must not conflict with [the current CVM Policy on Student Attendance & Absences](#), e.g. represent a surrogate for required daily attendance.

\* See next page for a very brief background and description of the process.

\*\* NOTE: *A learning activity that is designed to keep students from falling behind may or may not also require students’ physical presence in class, depending on how that activity is used or built upon pedagogically during the session.*

\* **BACKGROUND:** During the 2016-17 year, a group of Pullman-based veterinary students approached the CVM Associate Dean for Student and Academic Affairs and voiced their objections to instructors using student response systems and other in-class activities that generated points. These points typically count toward a final course grade and/or have the potential to affect course rank. The student objection was that these practices conflicted with the [CVM Attendance Policy](#) and that some instructors were using them as a defacto substitute for required attendance.

Meanwhile, a number of CVM faculty began to express their own concerns regarding low student attendance for lecture and/or lab, especially for certain classes and at certain times in the semester. An increasing number of students were using the lecture recording system (Panopto) as a substitute for attending class, and a few were using Panopto as their primary strategy. Among the expressed faculty concerns regarding attendance was the potential impact on student learning.

\* **THE PROCESS:** Working from a preliminary draft of a curriculum committee proposal (Fall, 2017), student CC representatives conducted preliminary surveys of their respective class (Y1, Y2, and Y3). The survey requested student opinions on a policy that provided some limitations for the use of point-generating teaching practices. The goal was to find a reasonable compromise that addressed the concerns of both students and instructional faculty.

In the spring of 2018, each CC representative organized a class student focus group discussion. The three focus group discussions were facilitated by Dr. Steve Hines, Associate Dean for Teaching & Learning. Each consisted of a structured discussion in which key questions were posed and a wide ranging discussion was encouraged. Students were challenged to address concerns that had been expressed by faculty and asked to respond to the diverse set of opinions expressed in the room. The results of the surveys and a summary of the 3 focus group discussions (including attendance) are provided in a separate document. As a result of student input, the proposal was revised – in mostly small ways.

In May, 2018, the proposal and student input was shared with CVM faculty and discussed in an open town hall style meeting. As a result, the proposal was revised again and submitted to the Curriculum Committee for further discussion and a vote.