Faculty Senate Minutes
Monday, March 13, 2006

In attendance: Barry Parker, Bob Namvar, Elizabeth Morris, Jeff Cate, Jennifer Newton, 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 Feb 27 were approved.

III. As one of the representatives of the technology committee formed by Senate, Nathan Lewis III reported that:

- An agreement was made to meet with the IT department the last Thursday of every month from 11:00 AM to 12:30 PM to discuss the potential IT related issues and concerns.
- The technology committee asked the IT department for a time frame to deal with the list of 11 issues published by the technology committee.
- The IT department plans to develop and implement an IT strategic plan for future. However, there are two unclear areas. First, how are they going to quantify and measure the success of their goals and objectives? Secondly, there is no clear role specification for IT staff in case of having IT related problems.
- The technology committee reported that the line of communication with the IT department has improved.

IV. In response to the technology committee report, a question was raised as to why do not we equip all classrooms with proper technology and what are the potential limitations?

V. Richard Mobley mentioned that we will have two more Senate sessions this year after today meeting and prompted the members of Senate to propose a list of their concerns regarding the course evaluation process.

VI. In response to Dr. Parker’s comments in the February 27 Senate meeting, several concerns were raised regarding the possibility of going on line for course evaluation.

- Is the online evaluation going to be anonymous?
- Is it going to be available to the students with a minimum acceptable attendance or is it going to be available to all registered students in a course?
- Will the online format increase the likelihood of negative responses, due to the private atmosphere of electronic response, removed from the more academic setting of the classroom?
• The online evaluation forms should be accessible to students for a limited time and not after they received their final grades.

• As a faculty member, do we have an option of doing evaluation in class or on line?

VII. After discussion about on line evaluation a motion was made that: faculty members have the option to do evaluation in class or on line. The motion was not seconded and was not pursued.

VIII. The discussion continued on evaluation process and the main focus was on the following concerns:

• We need to find a way to test the validity and reliability of the course evaluation instrument. As of today, we have not tested it academically.

• In lieu of not having validity and reliability tests, the more control we have on the course evaluation process, the better it will be.

• Do we trust the evaluation process?

• How much weight does the course evaluation have? If we do not trust it, a lot of weight should not be put on it.

• If we have not tested it and it is not trustworthy, why are we using it to evaluate faculty performance?

• Should we replace it with peer evaluation?

IX. A motion was made and seconded that because of continuing concern over the weight attached to the course evaluation, it is requested to use a standard research methodology conducted by an independent agent to determine the validity and reliability of the course evaluation process. After a long discussion the motion was withdrawn.

X. Senate Adjourned at 4:00 PM

XI. Next Senate meeting is scheduled for March 27, 2006.

Respectfully submitted by Bob Namvar, Faculty Secretary/ Treasurer