Faculty Senate Minutes
Monday, January 23, 2006

In attendance: Barry Parker, Bob Namvar, Constance Milton, Elizabeth Morris, Gilberto Perez, Jennifer Newton, James Heyman, John McCarthy, Mary Buck, Mary King, Nathan Lewis, Nathan Lewis III, Nicole MacDonald, Rachel Timmons, Richard Mobley, Susan Studer,

I. Meeting was opened with prayer.

II. Minutes for November 28, were approved.

III. As of this date, Mary King joined the Faculty Senate as the representative of the School of Music replacing Beverly Howard.

IV. Per Senate request, David Pearson and Phil Martinez shared their information regarding the evaluation process with the members of the Faculty Senate. The focus of the presentation was on the history of evaluation at CBU, the evaluation process, and the conduct of reliability and validity tests on the evaluation process.

- In response to the question of how the course evaluation began at CBU, Phil Martinez reported that prior to 1997, the evaluation form was outlined as a questionnaire. It was a collection of questions established to evaluate the course and professor that had been manually administered for some unknown amount of time previous to that time. Students were asked to fill in the answers to the questions with pencil.
- Based on the questions from the old form, Phil Martinez developed (with approval by Dr. Metcalf, the VP for Academic Affairs at that time) a new evaluation form with 25 questions. This form was used from 1997 to 2001.
- The University Assessment Committee, the Faculty Senate and the Provost’s Council spent approximately 1½ years reviewing and recommending changes to the questions. The revised form was used from 2001 through Spring 2005. At the time additional changes and an adapted new form with 17 questions was finalized from work done by the Provost’s Council, the Faculty Senate and approved by Executive Council. We started to use the new 17-question form in Summer of 2005. The main goal was to make the form more clear.
- In response to a question raised by a Senator that if this new adapted form is in accordance with WASC requirements, Phil Martinez mentioned that this form is more for CBU internal application.
• With regard to reliability of the evaluation process, he reported that all tabulated scores in form of “averages” for all questions in the evaluation form have been consistently improving during the last 4-5 years indicating that the questions and the answers were reliable sources to professors to improve their teaching quality. In addition, the standard deviation for each question has been relatively low indicating that most answers to the questions in the evaluation form have been close to the averages. According to Phil, this is a good indication of the reliability of the set of questions in the form.

• Since we started to use the more recent form with 17 questions, the “averages” are closer and the standard deviation for each question has been lower than before.

V. Senate Adjourned at 4:05 PM

VI. Next meeting is scheduled for February 13, 2006.

Respectfully submitted by Bob Namvar, Faculty Secretary/ Treasurer