1. Meeting opened with prayer.

2. Minutes from March 31 and April 14 Faculty Senate Meetings were approved.

3. Reports:
   Pres. Studer listed off the Faculty Senate’s accomplishments this Academic year
   (List is attached as Appendix 2 below)

4. Old Business:
   Course Evaluations
   Committee submitted changes to Course Evaluation forms. Further changes were made to Course Evaluation forms after discussion by the Senate. Final form was submitted as a Motion, was seconded. Form was approved by a vote of 10 “yeas” and 2 “nays”. Form is attached below as Appendix 1 below.

5. New Business:
   n/a

Meeting was then adjourned.
APPENDIX 1: Proposed Changes to CBU Course Evaluation Form

1. Course learning objectives are clear and discussed.
   Excellent (5)  Good (4)  Adequate (3)  Needs Improvement (2)  Very Poor (1)  n/a (0)

2. Homework and other assignments are relevant to course objectives.
   Excellent (5)  Good (4)  Adequate (3)  Needs Improvement (2)  Very Poor (1)  n/a (0)

3. Exams and quizzes are related to course content and objectives.
   Excellent (5)  Good (4)  Adequate (3)  Needs Improvement (2)  Very Poor (1)  n/a (0)

4. Lectures are directly related to course content.
   Excellent (5)  Good (4)  Adequate (3)  Needs Improvement (2)  Very Poor (1)  n/a (0)

5. Class learning activities are relevant to course content.
   Excellent (5)  Good (4)  Adequate (3)  Needs Improvement (2)  Very Poor (1)  n/a (0)

6. Opportunities for critical thinking are provided.
   Excellent (5)  Good (4)  Adequate (3)  Needs Improvement (2)  Very Poor (1)  n/a (0)

7. A Christian perspective is integrated into the course content when relevant.
   Excellent (5)  Good (4)  Adequate (3)  Needs Improvement (2)  Very Poor (1)  n/a (0)

8. Help is available outside of class (i.e. phone, e-mail, by appointment)
   Excellent (5)  Good (4)  Adequate (3)  Needs Improvement (2)  Very Poor (1)  n/a (0)

9. Feedback on assignments is timely and helpful.
   Excellent (5)  Good (4)  Adequate (3)  Needs Improvement (2)  Very Poor (1)  n/a (0)

10. A consistent and clear grading policy is stated and observed.
    Excellent (5)  Good (4)  Adequate (3)  Needs Improvement (2)  Very Poor (1)  n/a (0)

11. Opportunity for demonstration of learning was provided
    Excellent (5)  Good (4)  Adequate (3)  Needs Improvement (2)  Very Poor (1)  n/a (0)

12. How would you rate the overall instruction of this course?
    Excellent (5)  Good (4)  Adequate (3)  Needs Improvement (2)  Very Poor (1)  n/a (0)

13. How would you rate the Professor’s knowledge of course material?
    Excellent (5)  Good (4)  Adequate (3)  Needs Improvement (2)  Very Poor (1)  n/a (0)

14. Student questions and concerns were addressed in a timely manner.
    Excellent (5)  Good (4)  Adequate (3)  Needs Improvement (2)  Very Poor (1)  n/a (0)

15. Technology was used when relevant inside and outside of class (Blackboard, e-mail, PowerPoint, web, etc.)
    Excellent (5)  Good (4)  Adequate (3)  Needs Improvement (2)  Very Poor (1)  n/a (0)

16. How would you rate the Professor’s attitude toward the course material?
    Excellent (5)  Good (4)  Adequate (3)  Needs Improvement (2)  Very Poor (1)  n/a (0)

Demographic questions (not included in averages or overall scores)

17. Textbooks, readings and other materials support comprehension.
    Excellent (5)  Good (4)  Adequate (3)  Needs Improvement (2)  Very Poor (1)  n/a (0)

18. How would you describe your investment of time and effort in this course?
    Excellent (5)  Good (4)  Adequate (3)  Needs Improvement (2)  Very Poor (1)  n/a (0)

19. What grade do you expect to earn in this course?
    A  B  C  D  F

20. Compared to other courses of this level, this course was:
    More difficult (A)  of similar difficulty (B)  easier (C)

21. Student’s reported Grade Level
    Graduate (A)  Senior (B)  Junior (C)  Sophomore (D)  Freshman (E)
This has been a productive year for the Faculty Senate. Among our accomplishments have been:

The entire *Faculty Handbook* was corrected and updated.

A resolution was passed that in order to sufficiently teach, classrooms should have a minimum of LCD projectors, DVD/VCR, Internet access, and adequate seating.

It was also noted that classroom assignments should be scheduled by faculty and course needs.

It was emphasized that Faculty be given advanced notice and input into canceling classes for chapel and other school-related activities.

Faculty Forum Funds rules and disbursement were clarified.

It was resolved that the Fall Faculty Workshop take place with Faculty input.

Faculty Forum Funds were provided for the Ben Stein event and Wolf Wolfensberger.

A drive was made to gather faculty pledges for the Faculty Forum Funds.

Disaster Plans were formalized, presented at department and school meetings, and posted in classrooms.

A request was made for sufficient notice in the future for Faculty Self Reviews to be turned in to department chairs.

The decision was made to move to 50 minute class sessions for MWF classes in the fall of 2008.

A request was made and followed through for Mark Howe and Scott Tracy to speak at a Faculty Meeting about the IT audit.
The Faculty Senate President represented the Faculty and the Senate at the President’s Advisory Meeting, the monthly Provost’s Meetings, Faculty and administrative interviews and teaching demonstrations, and the President’s Budget Hearings.

Faculty input was sought for the Senate elections.

Individual Faculty problems and questions were represented where appropriate.

A resolution was passed to streamline the process for post-tenure review.

Faculty/student evaluations were redesigned to focus on student learning.

A letter was received from the CBU Board of Trustees commending the Senate for the “significant work that was accomplished…in support of the dialogue and collegial interactions among Senate representatives and their constituents, the Provost’s office, Executive Council, and the Academic Affairs Committee…‘as they continue to raise the bar of excellence for the University.’”