

MINUTES
Student Evaluation of Teaching Ad Hoc Committee

Present: Professors Bryant, Doyran, Prohaska, Sailor, Valentine, Vogel, Waring, and VP & CIO Bergmann

- 1) The meeting was called to order at 3:40 p.m. on February 26, 2015
- 2) Discussion of the areas that need to be addressed/improved:
 - i. Access
 1. VP Bergmann suggested having Lehman Connect provide directions about student evaluations or a message about the importance of evaluations. He also suggested using an IPAD, mobile devices, and various other incentives (such as raffling off an IPAD!) to increase response rates. Most importantly, how can we create a “culture of incentives” to encourage students to fill out the survey?
 2. Members discussed the importance of having students look at the Lehman College website to see student evaluations rather than relying upon Internet sites (such as “Rate Your Professor.com”) for more reliable information.
 - ii. Content
 1. Provide key questions on the “experience of being a student in class”.
 2. We should get data that is relevant and remove complex questions that students are not equipped to answer.
 3. Provide narratives to the faculty
 4. Provide open-ended questions in the form of private feedback to the instructor (anonymously)
- 3) Members discussed various issues related to the student evaluation form, which included:
 - i. Discussion as to which questions should be retained and which questions should be removed. A suggestion to create a “Mock Survey” based on the current survey that includes a list of possible questions we would like to see on a new survey. For example, Professor Waring pointed out that some questions are good “consumer questions,” such as “Would you recommend the instructor to a friend?” or, “Is the Professor well prepared”?
 - ii. The need to communicate to students the importance of student evaluations (“Why are we doing this?”).
 - iii. Alyson Vogel shared a survey that showed a strong correlation between a professor’s “effort” and student participation in evaluations. This is something from which we can extract useful information/data.
 - iv. Members discussed the reasons for the change associated with the current survey format, which included small sample size and a significant drop in overall response rates. Professor Sailor looked at the data. He suggested that the distribution of responses hasn’t changed, therefore overall scores are not harming faculty in terms of tenure and promotion. Additionally, Professors Waring and Prohaska pointed out that the number of responses is improving over time and is not out of line with the rates for other institutions.
- 4) Recommendations/Conclusion:

- i. Discussion as to whether the SETL committee could become a standing committee of the Lehman College senate. Members recommended to leave it as “ad hoc” and to continue meeting as such.

5) The meeting adjourned around 4:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Mine A. Doyran