DRAFT

MINUTES Student Evaluation of Teaching Ad Hoc Committee

Present: Professors Jervis, Lebbon, Doyran, Valentine, Deveaux, Prohaska, Waring, Feinerman, Prohaska, Akan, Bryant, and Sailor

- 1) The meeting was called to order at 11:10 a.m. on September 9th, 2014
- 2) Summary of the areas that need to be addressed/improved:
 - i. Delivery
 - ii. Content * we have the most control over this
 - iii. Purpose
 - 1. Need agreement on what we are really using the survey for
 - 2. How do we make the survey more helpful beyond tenure, reappointments, and promotions
- 3) Members discussed various issues related to the student evaluation form, which include:
 - i. Access, given that response rates differ between semesters
 - 1. Analysis of recent SET data suggests that the main change associated with the electronic distribution format is a significant reduction in overall response rates.
 - 2. The average rating and distribution of response alternatives appear to be relatively unaffected.
 - ii. Small sample size
 - 1. For untenured professors and professors applying for promotion, one could combine all course evaluations for an aggregate analysis to address
 - iii. Explicit instructions may help as it has in the past
 - iv. Potential to group all class evaluations in one email moving forward, instead of separate emails per class
 - v. Reduce numerical questions and increase open-ended questions
 - vi. Response rate and effects of piloting a new survey
- 4) Survey faculty and students to ask them what they want us to change, in order to build employee and student buy-in
 - i. Create a list of possible questions we'd like to see on a new survey
 - ii. Self-reflective questions for students
 - 1. For example, "What could you have done to better prepare for the course?"
- 5) Ask FP&B what they would like to see out of a new survey
 - i. What is useful and what is not useful;
 - ii. Might think of including student representative on this.
- 6) The meeting adjourned around 12:45pm.