University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

4-2-2002

Assessment of Student Learning minutes 04/02/2002

Assessment of Student Learning Committee

Follow this and additional works at:

Assessment of Student Learning

University of Minnesota, Morris

DATE: April 2, 2002

SUBJECT: Assessment of Student Learning Committee Minutes

PRESENT: Dian Lopez (Chair), Edith Borchardt, Stephen Burks, Tim O'Keefe, Nancy Mooney, Tim Soderberg, and Nick Maxwell.

GUEST: Bert Ahern

ABSENT: Tom Johnson, John Schwaller, Michelle Page, and Grant Noland.

Lopez called the meeting to order at 8:15 AM. Copies, which included the Policy on Evaluation of Teaching Contributions, Required Questions for the Student Opinion Survey, and the Additional questions for Inclusion on Student Evaluation Forms were distributed to the committee members.

Lopez said she had contacted Gary Engstrand, and was told that re-ordering the questions on the Student Evaluation of Teaching Survey could be done. Bert Ahern gave the committee some background and history of the Student Evaluation Forms. Ahern said that the Senate adopted the policy, which applies to all campuses. He said that the policy does allow some open-ended questions that can be different from campus to campus.Discussion included:

1. The date of revision should be added to the survey that our committee has modified.
2. It was questioned if the survey could be administered over a longer period of time? Ahern said that the policy states that it must be administered near the end of the semester.
3. Borchardt questioned what type of security measure is used for the survey administered on the web. Lopez said that the student will sign in with their X500 username and password. The student ID number is not used.
4. O'Keefe said that we should try again with the survey. Lopez said that a short e-mail could be sent back to the instructor when the student has completed and submitted the survey.
5. Maxwell said that he had discussed with the MSA, students would like the comments typed. Soderberg said that the comments are the most valuable to the instructor, but students are afraid of being identified.

The committee discussed the required questions on the Student Opinion Survey, and how they would best be re-ordered. The questions that are currently numbered 5, 2, 3, 1, 4 will be re-numbered to 1,2,3,4, 5. Pederson will update the change to the survey.

O'Keefe proposed that the web-based Student Opinion of Teaching survey be administered again. His suggestions included:

- Administered by the same faculty or similar faculty.

The students would be notified beforehand about the survey.

- Faculty would dismiss students from class early to fill out survey.
- The instructor would be notified when the student has completed the survey.
- E-mail would be generated automatically to the students who have not completed the survey, which would include a link to the survey.
- O'Keefe said the survey should be administered again, encouraging the same faculty to do it again. Lopez suggested that instructions to the survey could be distributed to the students during class like an assignment. Borchardt suggested that the set of instructions for the survey should be formulated the same for all classes.

O'Keefe made a motion that a formal recommendation for the Student Opinion Survey be written up and submitted to John Schwaller, seconded by Burks, unanimously approved.

The Additional Questions for Inclusion on Student Evaluation Forms was discussed. Lopez said that 1) the additional questions can be changed but need to be asked, 2) it can be done electronically, 3) the faculty has the choice if they want it published, and 4) it is optional if faculty want to release their results. Other ques-tions were discussed, noting that the wording in question #6 is vague, and question #10 could be misinter-preted. It was suggested that the wording should be changed on the questions. Burks suggested adding 3 additional questions to the survey. Mooney said that an appeal could be made to SCEP for a different mechanism and different questions for the survey. Soderberg said that the questions should be more specific, indicating such items as time spent on lecture, discussion, and etc. Maxwell suggested writing a set of questions and appeal to SCEP, he also said that there are interested students who are willing to serve on a sub-committee.

Maxwell proposed to form a sub-committee to write the questions for the survey, and to have campus wide participation, not limiting it to the ASL committee, and that students should be involved. Burks said that this is something we should propose for next year, he suggested having a cross-community working group to work on the survey. The working group would include 6 people, 2 representatives from the ASL Committee, 2 representatives from the FDC committee, and 2 student representatives; all Divisions would be represented. Lopez said that the ASL could oversee the working group, but that an endorsement from the FDC committee would be requested. Lopez said that Page had discussed with the FDC committee on March 26 the Student Opinion Survey, and had received a good response from the committee.

O'Keefe said that the Assembly would need information for the docket. It was decided that this informa-tion should include:

1. Present SOT form
2. Proposed SOT form
3. Policy for additional questions
4. Present additional questions passed by Senate
5. Proposal for a working group to formulate UMM additional questions.

It was decided to cancel the April 9th meeting, a later meeting date will be scheduled, probably at 8 am on a Thursday.

Meeting adjourned at 9:32 AM.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda Pederson

URL: http://www.morris.umn.edu/committees/asl/minutes.04.02.02.html