In attendance: Mack Brandon, Jeff Cate, Joe De Vol, Avery Fouts, Beverly Howard, David Isaacs, Nathan Lewis III, Tim Luther, John McCarthy, Richard Mobley, Betsy Morris, Ken Pearce and Rachel Timmons

I. Meeting was opened with prayer.

II. Minutes from January 24, 2005 were approved.

III. Report from Tuition Waiver Benefit Committee. Progress is being made gathering relevant data from competitor institutions.

IV. Report from Technology and Teaching Committee. Committee meets with IT every Wednesday. Discussions have been going very well as IT seeks to implement priorities listed in minutes from last Senate meeting (January 24th).

V. Continued discussion of Student Evaluation Form.

VI. Motion was made to eliminate question #5 on Student Evaluation Form due to lack of clarity: Substantiveness of Course Content. Motion failed by a 7 to 3 vote.

VII. Motion was passed unanimously to change ratings on Student Evaluation Form to A = Excellent, B = Good, C = Average, D = Below Average, E = Very Poor. The previously suggested rating system was A = Excellent, B = Good, C = Adequate, D = Needs Improvement, E = Very Poor. Motion was forwarded to Provost for submission to Executive Council. The Senate regarded the adopted rating system as more understandable for students. Also “needs improvement” is a category that could apply to each and every course.

VIII. Motion was made to change “substantiveness” in question #5 on Student Evaluation Form to “depth and comprehensiveness.” Motion was made to amend “depth and comprehensiveness” to “depth or comprehensiveness.” Motion passed by a 9 to 1 vote. Motion was made to amend the amendment “depth or comprehensiveness” to “depth and/or comprehensiveness.” The latter motion passed by an 8 to 3 vote. Over-all motion was then passed to change “substantiveness” to “depth and/or comprehensiveness” by an 11 to 0 vote. Motion was forwarded to Provost for submission to Executive Council.

IX. Motion was passed unanimously to change “instructor” to “professor” in question #4: Instructor’s use of technological resources (video, software, internet, computers, etc.). This renders Student Evaluation Form uniform in its usage of “professor” to designate the teacher. Motion was forwarded to Provost for submission to Executive Council.
X. Motion was passed unanimously to change question #24 in the following ways. The instructions are to read: “Mark as many as apply. Leave blank if you prefer not to respond.” The categories are to read: A = African American, B = Asian, C = Caucasian, D = Hispanic, E = Other. The previously suggested categories omitted “Asian” as a category and implied that you could mark only one. Motion was forwarded to Provost for submission to Executive Council.

XI. Motion was passed unanimously to amend motion made at last Senate meeting that each department or school will determine department or school specific questions to add to the Student Evaluation Form. The amendment gives each department or school the option of adding department or school specific questions to the Student Evaluation Form. Motion was forwarded to Provost for submission to Executive Council.

XII. Motion was passed unanimously to adopt Student Evaluation Form with recommended changes. Motion was forwarded to Provost for submission to Executive Council. The Senate has a priority to make further recommendations to the over-all evaluation process.

XIII. Discussion of benefits for faculty. Motion was passed unanimously to invite Julie Fresquez to next Senate meeting for further information.

XIV. Meeting was adjourned at 4:10 PM.

Respectfully submitted by Avery Fouts, Secretary-Treasurer of the Faculty Senate.