Faculty Senate Minutes
Monday, November 13, 2006

In attendance: Anthony Donaldson; Barry Parker; Betsy Morris; Bob Namvar; Jan Kodat; Jim Heyman; Ken Pearce; Kenya Davis-Hayes; Laura Veltman; Nathan Lewis; Nathan Lewis III; Richard Mobley; Susan Studer; Susan Drummond; Tim Jackson

I. Meeting was opened with prayer.

II. Minutes for October 23 were approved.

III. Reports were given from the following committees which were appointed by the Senate officers since the Oct. 23 meeting:

- The recommendation from the committee on Faculty Forum Funds: The aging Conference held on October 21, 2006 was a success, although this Conference has a budget deficit of approximately $4,000. The committee recommends that the Faculty Senate releases Faculty Forum Funds to relieve that deficit. A motion was made, seconded, and passed unanimously to approve the committee recommendation.

- The Health Benefit for Retiring Faculty committee reported that they are in a process of getting information about the CBU insurance policy. (Specifically, GuideStone has recently provided health benefits for retirees in a couple of So. Baptist seminaries; this may be a possible resource for our university.)

- The committee on Student Evaluation Form met and discussed related issues last week.

- The Culture of Research committee had a meeting and will present data and their findings in the next faculty meeting.

- The committee on Academic Technology reported their concerns as:
  - The CBU computer technology infrastructure does not support our growth.
  - We are looking at outsourcing as a means to support CBU’s growth.
  - On-line evaluation should not be done on campus. Otherwise, it will overload the system.
  - One of the potential problems with an on-line evaluation system is that there is no way of verifying who is going to respond to the questions in the evaluation.
  - ITS (Information Technology Services) has asked to work with members of the Faculty Tech committee to develop and implement a software procurement process.
IV. Richard Mobley reported that he had a meeting with Dr. Parker concerning the on-line evaluation issue. Dr. Parker informed him that the on-line evaluation process is still in a “pilot” stage. Certain technological “glitches” need to be fixed. After the pilot test is done, the result will be evaluated. In comparison with the traditional off-line evaluation, if there will be severe negative changes in the results and level of participation, the on-line system will be reevaluated. Dr. Parker is going to inform the Senate about the result of the on-line evaluation pilot test. Also, if we switch to an on-line evaluation process, a considerable annual savings of $40,000-$50,000 is projected. Dr. Parker is open to being invited to the Senate to discuss the on-line evaluation process.

V. A motion was made, seconded, and passed unanimously that: the Senate requests that the Provost reports evaluation of the on-line student format on an ongoing basis, to the Senate Student Evaluation committee, as data becomes available, so that we can add our informed input before the final decision is made about the on-line evaluation procedure.

VI. Senate adjourned at 4:05.

VII. Next meeting is scheduled for November 27, 2006.

Respectfully submitted by Bob Namvar, Faculty Secretary/Treasurer