Pew Faculty Teaching and Learning Center Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes
January 30, 2012


Meeting called to order: 1:00pm

Approval of Agenda: The committee voted to approve the agenda. Joy Washburn moved, Vijay Gondhalekar seconded. Approved.

Approval of Meeting Minutes: The committee voted to approve the minutes of November 28, 2011. Joy Washburn moved, Laurie Stickler seconded. Approved.

Announcements:
The Grants subcommittee will be meeting on Feb 13th from 11 - 1 PM to review proposals so members of the subcommittee will be absent from our FTLCAC meeting.

1. Old Business

A. Consistent Student Evaluation Tool
The committee discussed 3 different course evaluation tools, with the discussion lead by those select FTLCAC members that were assigned to examine them in detail. We plan to further develop a list of characteristics and criteria to help in our assessment and characterization of the survey tools.

IAS (Instructional Assessment System)
Used at 61 colleges since 1972 and is available from the University of Washington. Customizable survey with stock formats for labs, small and large classes etc. Cannot modify form itself but can add questions to a separate questionnaire. Some concern with survey length and focus. It may be too long with too many questions that focus more on the instructor than whether on learning in the course. Survey tool merits future discussion. More info at http://www.washington.edu/oea/services/course_eval/about.html

TCE (Teacher-Course Evaluations)
Used mainly (only?) at the University of Arizona. Paper based only survey (with long and short forms) that is research supported and contains validated questions. At Arizona students can access results. We are unsure about whether results can be compared to schools other than Arizona. Not sure on who administers the survey and analyzes results for non U of Arizona schools. More info at http://aer.arizona.edu/aer/teaching/Guide/TCEGuide.asp

SEEQ (Students’ Evaluation of Educational Quality)
An established survey tool with detailed manuals available that is free but seemingly unsupported. We would have to do the scoring and analysis (comparison to norms?) as it is not a commercial product. We had some comments on the wording of some of the questions. From the University of Saskatchewan, eh, but also administered at other (U.S) universities. More info at http://www.usask.ca/ip/assessment/seeq/what_is_seeq.php

Meeting adjourned: 2:00 p.m.
Respectfully submitted by, Peter Riemersma, Vice Chair