

Lehman College Senate
Committee on Admissions, Evaluations and Academic Standards

10/25/2010

Attendance:

Anne Rice, Chair
Robert Troy, V.P of Enrollment and Associate Provost
Penny Prince
David Rothchild
Brian Romero
Liliana Calvet
Xavier Totti

Visitor: Robert Whittaker

Meeting began at 2:15 p.m.

- A. Robert Whittaker began by speaking about a survey tool in which students evaluate courses. It will be more accessible for data and will change the 30 year old system. Professor Rothchild asked what was lacking, Mr. Whittaker said that statistical significance in 6 out of the 8 questions. A statistician looked at the survey and the conclusion was that there was no statistical significance to the two questions and that the results of the past 3-4 years could not be reviewed because they had been erased. This would be a time to re-examine whether there could be better instruments and distribution methods. The SET committee piloted the new form last spring in random courses, and it will be piloted again this fall. The sampling was about 1,000, and as a result some questions changed. The SET committee was made up of Deans, Departmental Chairs, and other faculty, but did not include student input, which commentary by CAEAS could provide.
- B. Students who took the pilot survey said it took longer, but provided a better measure of teacher performance. The committee determined that instructors would simply just have to be willing to take the time required for the new form.
- C. Prof. Whittaker explained that the paper forms were scanned via ScanTron software, which produced statistics by course. He also explained that the pilot SET was based on evaluation forms at colleges similar to Lehman, such as Montclair and Brooklyn

- D. The committee offered the following suggestions concerning the SET: Committee members felt the two-part Question 2 (“A syllabus was distributed” and “The syllabus was followed”) did not allow for spontaneity in pedagogy (i.e. a professor might want to bring in a book that recently came out concerning the subject matter). It did not take into account chronology or the instructional capacity that leads people to think another way about what is being taught.
- E. The committee felt Question 7, “the grade I expect to receive in this course” measured a student’s attitude as much as performance. The committee recommended changing this question to read “grade earned up to this point..”
- F. The committee debated what Question , “How many class meetings did you miss?” was designed to measure—would this question be used to gauge student level of interest or to indicate the reliability of student assessment based on attendance.
- G. The committee suggestion that Question 1 “Why did you choose this course?” should also have “instructor” as a reason for taking the course.
- H. The committee asked if the instrument being put online would allow for better accessing and administering. Prof. Whittaker indicated that no date had been established for .
- I. Robert expressed his interest in continuing the conversation for more input and concerns.
- J. Brian recommended that the students on CAEAS be contacted to attend the meetings as it would provide a more equal representation of the college community.
- K. Based on their cursory review of the SET form, the committee determined to meet again after taking time for more careful review.

Meeting ended at 3:30

Respectfully Submitted,

Brian Romero
-Secretary