

Lock Haven University of Pennsylvania
Student Evaluation Instrument Committee
MINUTES: September 24, 2008, 1:25PM
310 Sullivan Hall

Members Present: T. Dermota, S. Guthrie, S. Rush, A. Talbot,
Members Absent: J. Easley, D. Shoemaker, student representative

- A. Motion to approve the agenda by SG seconded by SR; Approved.
- B. Motion to approve minutes from September 3, 2008 by AT seconded by SR; Approved
Motion to approve minutes from September 10, 2008 by AT seconded by SR; Approved with wording revisions under "h"
- C. Next two meetings slated for October 8 and October 22, 2008
- D. Reports and Updates
 - a. No update on obtaining SOIS documents from other PaSSHE school. We will look for more information when DS returns next meeting
 - b. TD submitted revisions to the Rationale document. The revisions included an inclusion of the current wording of items as well as tense changes made to relevant items. The questions were also put into numeric order according to their occurrence in the Report. A suggestion was made to put the rationale in italics so that it was easier to determine which questions the committee has already discussed and revised.
- E. Old business
 - a. AT had previously distributed several studies focused on the impact of switching from paper to online student evaluations of instruction. A short discussion of the consistency within the literature was undertaken. The literature was found to indicate that while response rates are consistently lower than face-to-face paper versions, this did not impact the quality of the evaluations.

Given the nature of the literature, the committee then charged AT and SG with the task of drafting a report for consideration by the whole committee. The purpose of this report is to represent the current literature to the Executive Council. Specifically, the committee desired the inclusion of the following items in the report:

- Information regarding the quality of the research on which the report is based—
 validity
- Indication of response rate differences
- Indication of mean differences in evaluation, or lack thereof
- Statistics regarding who typically responds to online evaluations
- Student perceptions of online vs paper evaluations
- Indication of potential incentives used within the literature, and their effects

AT will begin the draft and then discuss it with SG before submitting it to the entire committee.

- b. Discussions regarding the existing instrument items was continued. Specifically, we returned to item 27 from the Report (24 on the survey). After much discussion involving the intent of the question, the double-barreled nature of our earlier revision, and the ability of students to

judge fairness, the committee settled on a revision which reads, “The instructor provides clear grading standards (not hard or easy, but clear).”

The meeting adjourned at 3:00 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Andrew Talbot