Faculty Senate Minutes
Monday, March 27, 2006

In attendance: Barry Parker, Bob Namvar, Elizabeth Morris, Jeff Cate, Jennifer Newton, James Heyman, John McCarthy, Mary Buck, Mary King, Marilyn Moore, Nathan Lewis, Nathan Lewis III, Nicole MacDonald, Richard Mobley, Susan Studer,

I. Meeting was opened with prayer.

II. Minutes for March 13 were approved.

III. As the chairperson of the “committee on committees” formed by Senate, Susan Studer reported that only 25% of all faculty members responded to the committee request for committee selection for next year.

IV. The ad hoc committee on research reported that:

• The committee designed a new survey.
• The newly designed survey was approved by Dr. Parker.
• The committee provided copies of the newly designed survey to the Senators and asked them to get feedback from the faculty members in their schools/departments.
• The ultimate goal is to find out where we are with respect to research and publication and where are we going to.
• We are going to hire a new dean to facilitate our research and publication activities.

V. In communicating with the IT department regarding the potential technology issues, Richard Mobley suggested that a broader representation of the technology committee be included in future meetings with the IT department. It is suggested that two representatives of the technology committee attend the future meetings.

VI. Richard Mobley informed Senate that a budget is devoted to format an online course evaluation. He also mentioned that Dr. Parker encouraged members of the Senate to draft a list of concerns or questions related to an online format for course evaluation.

VII. A long discussion started regarding some concerns about the online evaluation format.

- Poor rate of response to an online course evaluation due to the fact that the evaluation will be a part of the CBU email boxes and not all students check their CBU email.
In addition to course evaluation, we can look into other alternatives such as a model adapted by Indiana State University.  
Other schools research projects indicate that the overall scores may go down when the course evaluation is changed from in-class to an on-line format.  
If possible, we can do a dual evaluation, in-class and on-line, simultaneously and compare the two procedures.  
If an on-line format is suggested and implemented by administration, can we change it back to an in-class format?  
If we decided to implement an on-line format, we need to have a well planned transition time.  
We need to continue to discuss issues related to evaluation form and the weight associated with it.

VIII. To continue the discussion on evaluation process in the future Senate meeting, Richard Mobley asked Marilyn Moore to develop an information package on course evaluation process for Senate.

IX. Senate Adjourned at 4:00 PM

X. Next Senate meeting is scheduled for April 24, 2006.

Respectfully submitted by Bob Namvar, Faculty Secretary/ Treasurer