

Faculty and Institutional Affairs Committee
Minutes
Thursday October 30, 2003
3:30 pm, 251 Chavis University Center

Members present: Cherry Beasley, Dennis Edgell, Deok-Hyun Hwang, Kay McClanahan (Chair), Liz Normandy, Jean Sexton, Susan Whitt (Chair of Faculty Development and Welfare Subcommittee), Libby Denny (Chair of Faculty Evaluation Review Subcommittee)

Members excused: Bill Gash (Associate Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs), Neil Hawk (Vice Chancellor for Business Affairs), Sandy Waterkotte (Vice Chancellor for Advancement)

1. Call to Order: Kay McClanahan called the meeting to order at 3:35 p.m.
2. Approval of the agenda: The agenda was approved as distributed.
3. Approval of the minutes of October 2, 2003: The minutes were approved as distributed.
4. Reports from Administrators

Due to a special budget and planning meeting, the administrators were not able to attend.

5. Reports from Subcommittees

A. Faculty Development and Welfare: Susan Whitt reported that there was not a quorum at the subcommittee's October 9 meeting.

B. Faculty Evaluation Review: Libby Denny reviewed the history of the subcommittee's review of the Student Evaluation of Instruction. Two years ago, the faculty was surveyed, and certain questions were identified as problematic. Last year, the questions were worked on and revised. At that point it was determined that while some departments were using a draft Student Evaluation of Instruction form, most departments were still using the approved form. Now the subcommittee has brought forth recommendations for altering the questions in the approved Student Evaluation of Instruction form. The original questions are

1. Prepared for class.
2. Made clear, understandable class presentations.
3. Explained difficult concepts and techniques and/or demonstrated difficult techniques clearly.
4. Was available to students outside of class.
5. Knew when students had mastered the concepts or skills presented.
6. Clearly explained the grading system used in the course.
7. Assigned grades fairly.
8. Graded and returned tests and other work with reasonable promptness.

9. Challenged students and required an adequate amount of work.
10. Respected students and treated them as worthwhile persons.
11. Encouraged student participation in class.
12. Clearly stated the purposes or objectives of the course.
13. The text and other materials that students were required to purchase were relevant to the course and useful.
14. Stimulated the students' intellectual curiosity.
15. In general, taught the course effectively.

The proposed replacement questions are:

Current: 4. Was available to students outside of class.

Proposed: 4. Conveyed a willingness 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.

Passed

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.

Passed

Current: 7. Assigned grades fairly.

Proposed: 7. Followed stated standards in assigning 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.

Passed as amended

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.

Passed

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.

Passed

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.

Passed

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.

Rejected in favor of the current question.

The subcommittee was charged to look at online evaluations, freshman seminar evaluations, and a timeline for evaluations for the new two-year initial hires.

6. Old Business

A. Dispute Resolution Implementation: Concerns about limitations have been passed on to the Chair of the Faculty Senate.

B. Parking: Since the closing of Dial, the parking situation has changed. The following motion was made and seconded: Vehicles displaying a Faculty/Staff parking permit are allowed to park in parking lots designated as commuter parking without penalty.

Passed

7. New Business

Change in Automatic Tenure Policy. The title of the policy will be changed to "Tenure Consideration for Newly-Hired Faculty and Administrators." The final sentence regarding the granting of administrative contracts should be dropped.

Passed

8. Announcements: The next meeting will be Thursday, November 20, 2003 at 3:30 pm in the University Center Room 251.

9. Adjournment: the meeting was adjourned at 5:00 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Jean Sexton, Secretary
Kay McClanahan, Chair