# 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
3. 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 $12: 45 \mathrm{pm}$.

Respectfully submitted,
Angela R. Lebbon

