Faculty Senate Minutes  
Monday, November 14, 2005

In attendance: Barry Parker, Beverly Howard, Bob Namvar, Carol Minton, Constance Milton, Jeff Cate, Jennifer Newton, James Heyman, John McCarthy, Mary Buck, Nathan Lewis, Nathan Lewis III, Nicole MacDonald, Rachel Timmons, Richard Mobley, Susan Studer,

I. Meeting was opened with prayer.

II. Minutes for October 24, were approved.

III. In response to the Faculty Senate request, Dr. Connie Milton presented a report on the status of our nursing program:

- The California Board of Registered Nursing evaluated our BSM Nursing program on November 3, 2005 and scheduled to review it for final approval on December 2, 2005.
- To be considered for admission to our BSM Nursing program, a minimum GPA of 2.7 and the objective TEAS test (testing of central academic skills in nursing conducted by ATI testing company) are required. Priority will be given to the CBU students.
- We are going to recruit an associate dean and a full time faculty member for the School of Nursing. The minimum requirement for these positions is a master’s degree in the field from a well known university.
- As of today, we have 60 pre-nursing students. The target number of student is 40 students per year.
- Due to the nature of the nursing field, a considerable amount of sources is needed to support the growth of this program.

IV. Richard Mobley referred to the February 14, 2004 Senate meeting and the amendment to a motion which gives each department or school the option of adding some specific questions to the Student Evaluation Form and expressed his concern that it is not clear that school specific questions were added by the individual schools.

V. The evaluation and assessment committee identified two primary concerns regarding the evaluation process repeatedly expressed by the faculty at large:

1. The nature of questions in the course evaluation form
2. Unease with the weight given to different components in the evaluation process as a whole
To deal with these concerns, the committee suggested both short term and long term solutions. The short term solutions are recommended to be implemented by the end of this semester and/or year and the long term solutions are the continuous improvement process which may take more than a year to implement.

VI. After discussion, other suggestions were made regarding the evaluation process:

- To do reliability and validity tests on the current course evaluation form
- Write a new evaluation form to replace the existing one
- Run tests and write a new one simultaneously
- Look at the last year's Senate work on evaluation and follow it up.
- Invite Phil Martinez to share with us information regarding the evaluation process
- In revising or rewriting the evaluation process, need to consider the WASC requirements.
- Look at other universities evaluation forms and process

VII. As part of the short term suggestions for end of semester evaluation, motion made, seconded, and passed unanimously (after considerable discussion concerning details) to request that—as a trial procedure and upon the desire of a faculty member—a non-student proctor be made available in classrooms to conduct evaluation in a professional manner.

VIII. Senate Adjourned at 4:10 PM.

IX. Next meeting is scheduled for November 28, 2005.

Respectfully submitted by Bob Namvar, Faculty Secretary/ Treasurer