

# Revision of the SETL Survey

Lehman College

Report

November 23, 2016

## Content

1. Revised SETL Survey .....	2
2. Purpose of SETL Surveys at Lehman College.....	4
3. Contributors .....	4
4. Process and Campus Feedback .....	5
5. Recommendations .....	6

## 1. Revised SETL Survey

Dear Students,

This 5 to 10-minute survey gives you the opportunity to evaluate your course and instructor. We assure you that preserving the confidentiality of your evaluation is a priority. No one, including the instructor, is able to see the evaluations until after grades have been submitted and finalized for the course. Unless a student identifies herself or himself in the written comments sections, no instructor is able to connect any response in any part of the evaluation with any individual student. Your responses and written comments will help your instructors and departments understand what you appreciate or what you are concerned about.

Course

1. I learned a lot in this course.
  - A) Strongly agree
  - B) Agree
  - C) Neither agree nor disagree
  - D) Disagree
  - E) Strongly disagree

Please comment: \_\_\_\_\_

2. The pacing, content, and materials were \_\_\_\_
  - A) Not at all challenging
  - B) Slightly challenging
  - C) Somewhat challenging
  - D) Moderately challenging
  - E) Extremely challenging

Please comment: \_\_\_\_\_

3. On average, I have spent \_\_\_\_ hours per week doing work for this course outside of class.
  - A) 0-2
  - B) 2-4
  - C) 4-6
  - D) 6-8
  - E) 8-10
  - F) 10-12
  - G) > 12

Please comment: \_\_\_\_\_

Instructor

4. The instructor was effective in teaching this course.
  - A) Strongly agree
  - B) Agree

- C) Neither agree nor disagree
- D) Disagree
- E) Strongly disagree

Please comment: \_\_\_\_\_

5. The instructor was available and responsive to my learning needs.
- A) Strongly agree
  - B) Agree
  - C) Neither agree nor disagree
  - D) Disagree
  - E) Strongly disagree

Please comment: \_\_\_\_\_

6. The instructor created a dynamic and engaging learning environment.
- A) Strongly agree
  - B) Agree
  - C) Neither agree nor disagree
  - D) Disagree
  - E) Strongly disagree

The instructor used the following methods (check all that apply):

- ☐ Lecture
- ☐ Discussion
- ☐ Presentations
- ☐ Group work
- ☐ Individual work
- ☐ Lab
- ☐ Blackboard
- ☐ Technology
- ☐ Experiential learning
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Please comment: \_\_\_\_\_

Overall

7. Do you have any further comments or observations about the course or instructor you consider to be helpful? \_\_\_\_\_

## 2. Purpose of SETL Surveys at Lehman College

The committee defined the purpose of the Student Evaluation of Teaching and Learning (SETL) at Lehman College as follows:

- A) It provides feedback for instructors to continuously improve their teaching
- B) It provides students views on the instructor's teaching effectiveness to be considered for re-employment, tenure, and promotion
- C) It enables students to make informed choices of courses and instructors
- D) It provides departments with students' feedback about courses

The purpose of the revision of the current instrument was:

- A) to include important questions and eliminate potentially redundant or less relevant questions
- B) to shorten the questionnaire
- C) to elicit higher student response rates

## 3. Contributors

Faculty elected to the committee on the General Faculty meeting on 9/21/16:

- Anne Rothstein, ECCE
- Carl Mazza, SWK
- Deirdre O'Boy, ENG

Students nominated following a request of the General Faculty assembly:

- Lilian Yang
- Sabrina Ramsundar

Administrative representative:

- Stefan Becker, Vice Provost

Volunteers:

- Christina Sormani, MAT, NSS
- James Mahon, PHL, A&H
- Jennifer Mackenzie, JCT, A&H
- Olena Zhadko, Online Education
- Salita Bryant, ENG, Interim Associate Dean, A&H

## 4. Process and Campus Feedback

The members of the ad-hoc committee met with available volunteers to discuss and revise the survey. After developing a draft, the group requested a focus group of faculty members, administrators, and students who did not contribute to the redesign of the survey to provide a feedback on the revised survey draft which yielded the following results:

Number of responses: 45

18 Faculty (40%)

21 Students (46.7%)

6 Other (13.3%)

Reaction to the survey draft:

Nothing is perfect but it works for me: 33 (73.3%)

I think that it needs to be changed: 12 (26.7%)

The committee and volunteers discussed and addressed concerns voiced by members of the focus group. Several faculty concerns focused on the fact that the proposed survey addresses more than one item in one question; however, the committee maintains that students do have the opportunity to address which particular item(s) they would like to highlight in their written comments. The issue did not appear to be of concern for students.

The committee and volunteers agreed that students' written comments will be the main source of valuable information for instructors, departments, and reviewers while the multiple-choice answers will mainly serve as general indicators.

## 5. Recommendations

### Sharing of results:

- All members of the Lehman College Community should be able to view the numerical, course-aggregated evaluations on Lehman's Intranet.
- Course-aggregated numerical evaluations and students' comments should be made available to the instructor, department heads and program administrators, and select faculty members or administrators for personnel decisions.
- The question of whether students' comments should also be made available to the Lehman College Community if Lehman can find a feasible way to eliminate inappropriate responses should be discussed by the campus community. One option would be to give faculty the opportunity to delete any comments they prefer not to see published.

### Campus Approval:

- The decision about adopting the revised survey should be separated from the decision about sharing the results.
- The vote on the revised survey and the vote on publishing aggregate numbers should be taken at the earliest opportunity; the vote on the posting of comments should be taken later.

### Methods to increase student response rates:

- Only new students and students who have submitted their responses should get access to the evaluation results.
- Students should be able to access the surveys by following the email links or by signing in to Lehman Connect.
- Instructors should be encouraged to allocate class time for students to do the evaluations.
- A PDF with instructions (including screenshots) for students should be distributed to all instructors.