

Faculty Evaluation Review Subcommittee
Minutes
Tuesday December 2, 2002
3:40 pm Oxendine Science Building, Room 105

Members present: Danny Davis, Jim Frederick, Sivanadane Mandjiny,
Merrill Miller, Jean Sexton, Velinda Worix

- I. Call to Order: Velinda Worix called the meeting to order at 3:47 p.m.
- II. Approval of the Minutes from November 5, 2002: The minutes were approved.
- III. Approval of the Agenda: The agenda was approved as distributed.
- IV. Old Business
 - A. Revision of Student Evaluation of Instruction: Involved discussion about revising the Student Evaluation of Instruction focused on the purpose of the tool. After much debate, it was decided that the Subcommittee would forward the following proposed changes in wording, thus perhaps getting guidance from the parent committee concerning further pursuit of this project:

Current:	4.	Was available to student outside of class.
Proposed:	4	Was willing to help students outside of class.
Rationale:		Instructors may be available, but not pleasant about helping outside of class. This revision tries to evaluate the attitude of the instructor.
Current:	5.	Knew when student had mastered the concepts or skills presented.
Proposed:	5.	Drop.
Rationale:		It is difficult for a student to know what the instructor knew. Furthermore, sometimes it is not feasible for the instructor to continue until everybody in the class has mastery of the topic or skills.
Current:	7.	Assigned grades fairly.
Proposed:	7.	Followed reasonable standards in assigning letter grades.
Rationale:		Students should not know all of the grades assigned. However, they should know the standards followed in assigning grades and be able to judge if the standards are reasonable.
Current:	9.	Challenged students and required an adequate amount of work.
Proposed:	9.	Challenged students to achieve course objectives.

Rationale: The current question tries to evaluate two criteria. Students that are challenged to achieve course objectives will have enough work.

Current: 10. Respected students and treated them as worthwhile persons.

Proposed: 10. Acted in a courteous and professional manner.

Rationale: Questions were raised about what a "worthwhile person" meant. If an instructor acts courteously and professionally, then students in the class will be treated with respect.

Current: 13. The text and other materials that students were required to purchase were relevant to the course and useful.

Proposed: 13. Made good use of the materials that students were required to purchase.

Rationale: The current question does not evaluate instruction. An instructor may "inherit" the selections of a previous person. The question should be how well the materials were integrated into the course.

Current: 14. Stimulated the students' intellectual curiosity.

Proposed: 14. Stimulated a desire to learn more about the subject.

Rationale: The proposed question is more specific about the object of the intellectual curiosity.

V. Clarification of policy on flow of material in Tenure and Promotion Process: This was tabled until the February meeting.

VI. New Business: None.

VII. Announcements: The Subcommittee will meet in the 1st floor Conference Room (Room 105), Oxendine Science Building at 3:40 on the following days:

January, no meeting

February 4, 2003

March, no meeting

April 1, 2003

VIII.

Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 4:40 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Jean Sexton, Secretary

