

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

Minutes

**Sullivan Board Room –
Scheduled Friday, March 20, 2009 11:10 AM-1:10 PM**

Actual: 11:35 to 1:10

Members Present : Troy Dermota, Jerry Eisley (Later) , Steven Rush, Steven Guthrie

Absent: Andrew Talbot, Denise Shoemaker

Minutes: Steve Guthrie

Meeting started late because originally were only 3 present. The 3 decided to do some housekeeping, and then Jerry arrived about 12:35

A) Approval of Agenda

B) Approval of minutes

Reviewed minutes of February 6.

Considerable discussion ensued about the question whether we should “look at a means to help eliminate data from students who clearly misread the forms [by putting in questions which would indicated the were blindly recording all one answer] .” Troy suggested two points: 1) No one is actually going to look at the forms to eliminate problem forms; 2) Having such questions might actually serve to confuse students.

Decision: to include those reservations in the minutes.

There was also discussion about making decisions we make more clearly emphasized in the minutes. The main point is that minutes serve as an important record for what we decide, and decisions should be easy to find.

Decision: In future minutes, have “Decision” or “It was decided that.” In addition, the **decision should be bolded [in minutes] so it can easily be found.**

It was also decided that, since not all were present, we would send out the revised Minutes of Feb. 6 by email, and members would vote on accepting these minutes by email.

[Follow-up. Denise, who was not present, made additional changes to the minutes.]

C) Reports and Updates

Steve Rush reported he is coming off the committee for next year, due to other obligations. His service will be missed.

D) Question 28R rationale

Although on the agenda, this was not discussed.

E) Revision of questions to have a common format (Strongly Agree – Strongly Disagree format)

This agenda item was discussed. Question was: did we agree to this format. We were not certain, and could not readily find in minutes [see discussion above about need for decisions to be clear in minutes].

Decision: We concluded that we would continue to change questions to that format, just to see what would happen. Then later make the decision on the format.

F) Discussion of survey questions. We are going through them and changing to the Strongly Agree – Strongly Disagree format

1) Review new content question we had begun to discuss on 12/20:

We **agreed** to word it as.

”Instructor explained or demonstrated how the skills or content taught in the course are of value.”

2) **15R/ 23 S** “The instructor talks in a way that is _____ my level of comprehension.”

Agreed to keep it this way, even though it does not meet the Strongly Agree – Strongly Disagree format. (In addition, this could indicate whether a student is reading the questions.)

3) **17R/ 7S** “~~In your opinion~~, how often does the instructor come well-prepared for class (e.g., activities planned, class notes in order, proper equipment, personally organized)?”

Agreed to keep, but to **delete “in your opinion”** as redundant

4) **18R/ 14S** “~~In your opinion~~, the instructor comes well-prepared for class (e.g., activities planned, class notes in order, proper equipment, personally organized)”

Agreed to keep, but to **delete “in your opinion”** as redundant.

- 5) **19R/ 20S** “You are you made aware of the objectives for classes, lessons, laboratories, activities, and units.”

Decision: Keep as is

- 6) **20R/16S** “The course activities, presentations, and/or assignments increase your knowledge and understanding of the subject.”

Decision: Keep as is

- 7) **New question #1** (on Denise Excel spreadsheet): “The course activities encourage you to make connections and see relationships between the course material and the world beyond the classroom.”

A question was raised: Is this related to learning outcomes? It seems this would have the same rationale as for an EE overlay.

Decision: Keep as is

- 8) **New question #2** (on Denise Excel spreadsheet): “The course activities, presentations, and/or assignments enhance your learning and study skills.”

These seems to related more to foundational courses, not upper level.

Decision: We need to relook at this with the whole committee.

- 9) **New question #3** (on Denise Excel spreadsheet): “The instructor makes it possible for me to increase my knowledge skills and understanding of the subject.”

Discussion about whether it should be “skills and understanding” or “skills or understanding.”

Reason for “or”: A course might not attempt to increase all those, but just one or two of them. This is a lower standard for the instructor

Reason for “and” : Students probably don’t make that sophisticated a decision. And hopefully, all three components are attained. This is a higher standard for the instructor

Decision: Keep with “and”

Meeting adjourned 1:15

Respectfully,
Steve Guthrie