Faculty Senate Minutes
Monday, September 25, 2006

In attendance: Anthony Donaldson; Barry Parker; Betsy Morris (Barbara Cockerham as substitute); Bob Namvar; Carl Schafer; Dennis Bideshi; Don Dunavant; Jan Kodat; Jim Heyman; Ken Pearce; Laura Veltman; Nathan Lewis; Nathan Lewis III; Richard Mobley; Susan Studer; Susan Drummond; Tim Jackson

I. Meeting was opened with prayer.

II. Due to power outage and evacuation of the building, some members of the University Senate could not attend the September 11 Senate meeting. Therefore, the new Senators were reintroduced.

III. As of this date and for the rest of the Fall Semester, Barbara Cockerham joined the Faculty Senate as the representative of the School of Education temporarily substituting for Betsy Morris.

IV. Faculty Senate President Richard Mobley reviewed the basic roles of the University Faculty Senate as:

- Communication channel for schools, departments, and Senators
- Initiate recommendations for changes
- Respond to administration request
- Nominate faculty members for committee assignments
- Receive relevant report from ad hoc committees

V. Issues come to the Senate for discussion and recommendation from the following entities:

- Schools
- Departments
- Faculty committees
- The Provost office
- Individual faculty

After discussing the received issue, Senate makes recommendation to Provost and from the Provost office to the Executive Council for approval. If approved, it will be a new policy and will be reflected in the Faculty Handbook. If not, it may go back to the Senate for revision.

VI. Brief revisions of the last year passed motions were presented.

VII. To continue discussion on the faculty evaluation issue and to strategize groundwork for possible changes to Faculty Handbook, Richard Mobley asked the Senators to form groups of 3 to 4 members to make recommendations.
regarding possible revision of weighted values in faculty evaluation. At this time, the focus is on the weight attached to evaluation due to the fact that:

- CBU continues to be primarily a “teaching institution”
- The faculty values student response, particularly as an instrument leading toward personal improvement in teaching effectiveness.

VIII. At the present time, a faculty member is evaluated for promotion and merit increase periodically based on the following weights:

- 60% teaching performance
- 20% scholarly activity (broadly defined)
- 20% service (institutional & community)

As a “working proposal” on teaching performance weight (60%), Richard Mobley suggested that an adjustment of weights be considered as follows:

- 30-35% Student Evaluation—with revision which reflects most appropriate areas for student response
- 15-20% Peer Evaluation (beyond a “one-shot” classroom visitation) including consideration of syllabus material, testing materials, and classroom procedures.
- 10% Self-Evaluation—This may a new self-assessment of having achieved objectives set for ourselves and not the current form we complete annually.

Regarding his proposal, the Senate President prompted the formed groups in the Senate to work on the following questions:

- What hesitance (resistance) might a “stronger” (more intentional) inclusion of peer evaluation encounter within Schools and Departments; i.e., what issues need to be dealt with for this to become a viable component of faculty evaluation?
- Should there be more distinction made between criteria for Promotion/Tenure and for Merit Pay increase? If so, What?

IX. After discussion, the group responses to the above questions were:

- The process is time consuming
- Not enough objectivity- friends evaluate friends
- Politics may be involved
- Possibility of retaliation
- Loose evaluator versus tough evaluators
- Interpersonal relationship may affect the peer evaluation
- Some faculty who like student evaluation may oppose it
- The question of subjectivity versus objectivity
• Can we distinguish between peer evaluation for merit increase and personal improvement?

X. Richard Mobley prompted the members of the Senate to ask their colleagues in their schools and departments for responses to the following questions.

➢ What would be the potential issues and concerns regarding a proposal to include peer reviews as a formal component of faculty evaluation?
➢ If we decide to adapt peer evaluation, what form of review we should use; formative or summative (voluntary versus non-voluntary)?

XI. Senate adjourned at 4:00.

XII. Next meeting is scheduled for October 9, 2006

Respectfully submitted by Bob Namvar, Faculty Secretary/Treasurer