

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

**Minutes (Approved)**

**Sullivan 310**

**Friday, March 27, 2009 11:30 AM-1:10 PM**

Members Present : Troy Dermota, Jerry Eisley, Steven Guthrie, Denise Shoemaker, Andrew Talbot

Absent: Steven Rush

Minutes: Andrew Talbot

A) Approval of Agenda

B) Approval of minutes

The backlog of unapproved minutes from October 22, 2008; November 5, 2008; February 6, 2009; February 20, 2009; and March 20, 2009 were all discussed. Minor changes were noted, and the committee approved all of the minutes w/revisions on a motion from D.S., seconded by A.T. Steve Guthrie will execute the revisions of minutes and email them to the committee.

The minutes from November 19, 2008 were not in our possession. J.E. may have them and will conduct a search for them.

C) Reports and Updates

D.S. reported on the conflict between the administration of the SOIS and the date for the Celebration of Scholarship. Mark Cloud, as a member of the APSCUF Executive Council, requested that our committee propose a policy to be sent on to Meet and Discuss.

Some debate regarding the degree to which the date for COS could be constrained by the SEIC ensued. We discussed the current document which denotes the week in which the SOIS will be administered. The footnote to that document details a change in weeks according to when Easter occurs. Given the present calendar which includes no breaks around Easter, the committee discussed the need to strike said footnote. In its stead, there would be a new footnote denoting the movement of the SOIS to the 12<sup>th</sup> week when the COS falls on the 13<sup>th</sup> week. One problem with this is that we do not know if the COS will continually be in the 13<sup>th</sup> week, as has been the case for the past two years. If this is so, perhaps a more general policy of moving the SOIS into the 12<sup>th</sup> week would be in order. D.S will check with the registrar to find out if the elimination of the Spring Holiday (which had always fallen around Easter) was permanent. The committee would then propose an amendment to the scheduling document.

D) Question 28R rationale

The committee discussed the need for further rationale regarding our stance that this question was ineffectual and promoted invalid judgments of faculty work in the classroom. Some of the rationales discussed include:

S.G. noted other schools in the System have no such question. In addition, it is not among the Board of Governors recommended questions. Students' points of reference will change as they progress through college. As a result, the standards of judgment are not the same for each teacher being evaluated.

A.T. noted that we don't want a broad, poorly defined question to serve as the foundation for faculty judgment. Instead, the absence of such a question would promote the use of questions which tap specific faculty qualities and practices that are knowable to the students

**Decision:** To include the additional rationale into the committee's documentation.

E) Revision of questions to have a common format

The committee next discussed a decision to move the majority of questions on the instrument to a common answer format. T.D. noted that the committee had not made a formal decision to do this. As a result D.S moved and S.G. seconded the following approved motion.

**Decision:** The questions on the student evaluation instrument will be changed to a statement which can be responded to via a common answer format following the 5-pt Likert scale of 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*).

F) Discussion of survey questions.

1) New **question #1** (on Denise's Excel spreadsheet): "The course activities encourage you to make connections and see relationships between the course material and the world beyond the classroom"

There was little discussion regarding this question because we agreed that it was important and we liked the wording.

**Decision:** We agreed to adopt the new question as written above

2) **New question #2** (on Denise's Excel spreadsheet): "The course activities, presentations, and/or assignments enhance your learning and study skills."

The discussion centered on the original intent of the question. It was determined that the phraseology was incorrect as written. The question was not meant to gauge "study skills." Rather the learning of skill within skill-oriented instruction. The focus is on those courses that are primarily teaching students how to do things (i.e. rock climbing,

tennis, pottery, etc.). The goal would be to create a question that allows students to express the degree to which they feel they have learned new skills, not just knowledge.

**Decision:** Strike the current question and work on a new question that would fulfill our intentions.

Meeting adjourned 1:10

Respectfully,  
Andrew Talbot