

**Lock Haven University of PA
Student Evaluation Instrument Committee**

Minutes

310 Sullivan hall – Wednesday October 22, 2008, 1:25 to 3:20 pm

Members: Troy Dermota, Jerry Eisley, Steven Rush, Andrew Talbot, Steven Guthrie

Not Present: Denise Shoemaker

Note Taker: Steve Guthrie

A) Approval of Agenda – Done

B) Approval of minutes from Oct 8 – Done, with additions. Additions include:

1) D. b. – related to outcomes

“Denise suggested moving the Outcomes related questions to the beginning of the survey form. “

2) D. d. “ We will table this until missing committee member can provide input.

2) D. e. – Regarding questions 1R/1/S [Editor – I need help with this one.]

“We agreed it (1R/1S) is unchanged.”

C) Future Committee Meetings -- Only two more meetings this semester. Nov. 5, and 19.

D) Reports and Updates

a. AT and SG progress on the “paper to online SOIS” literature review

No progress

b. DS conversation with Mansfield University – regards email of 10/15/08 from Mansfield, from Catherine Renner.

They are using an on-line evaluation. They have response rates – 65% (over 11 days). Next time they will have it open 17 days.

Catherine Renner reports that at a previous institution of hers, they received an 80% response rate (17 days) versus 50% response rate from paper.

i. Conference call? – We discussed having a conference call with Mansfield. Decided to have Troy Demota make the call.

ii. Question list – We approved a list of questions for Troy to ask.

- c. TD report about SCC student representative search
 - i. Meeting time conflict – Our meeting times conflict with the times of those students from the SCC who are available.
 - ii. **Decided to give up on getting a student rep this semester**, because only 2 more meetings. Will try again next semester.

C) Develop rationale for removing or revising existing instrument questions

Question 28R/ 28S – “Compared to other instructors, how effective has the instructor been in this course?”

We agreed learning outcomes are/ should be the most important.

Discussion of which outcomes to put into evaluation survey, and where overlay questions would be.

Brought SG up to speed about a decision made Fall 2007, before he was on the committee. Namely, the learning outcomes related to Gen Ed overlays would be supplemental.

Question: Do administrators value question 28R/28S? Troy and another were under impression that the Provost was more interested in outcomes.

Committee feels that too much bias is towards that one question. Committee feels that people need to look at the overall picture, rather than one question which doesn't address outcomes and is essentially a popularity contest. Also, our university is moving towards outcomes assessment, which was not important when the evaluation form was created.

DECISION -- Delete 28R/ 28S. We will create an outcomes section as a replacement for 28R/28S.

Discussion about creating an outcomes section as a replacement for 28R/28S.

We intend to do that (create an outcomes section), but will come back to that issue.

Question 4R/4S – “Your original motivation or desire to take this course was...”

DECISION – Delete this question.

Rationale:

- 1) Interest/ motivation is covered by R9/S22 “Did you interest in this subject matter increase or decrease...”
- 2) We have no means to correlate this with other motivation questions, so it does not serve as any form of check.

- 3) We are looking to delete questions, because we will be adding some questions.

Off-topic discussion: Do we want to have our survey cluster questions together, as other schools do? Or keep them unclustered as we do currently?

DECISION: Keeping them unclustered forces students to think more about the questions. **We will keep them unclustered.**

Meeting adjourned: 3:25 pm

Respectfully submitted.
Steve Guthrie