<div align="center">

University Faculty Senate Minutes
March 13, 2003

</div>

Members present: Joanne Ardovini-Brooker, Terry Bilhartz, Mary Lynn DeShazo, Mary Gutermuth, Marsha Harman, Deborah Hatton, Joan Hudson, Joe Kirk, Gerald Kohers, S. Thomas Kordinak, Paul Loeffler, Valerie Muehsam, Debra Price, Kandi Tayebi, Tamara Waggener

Member absent: Bill Abbott (professional conflict), Leonard Breen (professional conflict), Ted Creighton, Jeff Harwell, Penny Hasekoester (professional conflict), David Henderson (professional conflict), Ann Jerabek (ill), Holly Miller (professional conflict), Victoria Titterington (class conflict), Gene Young (professional conflict)

Approval of Minutes
The minutes for February 13 were approved with emendations.

Dr. Peter Cooper, Chair of the Faculty Evaluation Committee
Dr. Peter Cooper reported that his committee had been charged by Dr. Payne to provide an implementation plan for on-line faculty evaluations by Fall 03. The committee attempted to adhere to two main objectives:
1. To develop a practical plan.
2. To give faculty control of the process.

The final report provided five possible options that faculty could elect:
1. "Free Evaluation—Students may complete the evaluation within the evaluation time frame, from any machine, local or remote."
2. "Campus Evaluation—Students may complete the evaluation within the evaluation period from any machine on campus."
3. "Restricted Time Evaluation—Students may complete the evaluation within the evaluation period from any machine on campus during normal business hours."
4. "Supervised Evaluation—Students may complete the evaluation within the evaluation period from a machine in a designated computer laboratory at scheduled times under direct supervision."
5. "Class Scheduled Evaluation—Students may complete the evaluation during a class period designated by the faculty member."

Dr. Cooper stated that each individual faculty member would choose which option he/she would like to use for each class. **The on-line evaluations will not be required Fall 2003. Each department will decide whether to use paper or on-line evaluations. Faculty will be able to reverse the decision for Spring 2004 if they wish.**

The committee considered on-line evaluations because paper evaluations are not practical for distance education and classes held at the University Center.

The committee was aware that there are problems with the evaluation form but felt that it was impossible to modify the evaluation form because it would be a multiple year task and outcomes would need to be monitored to assess changes due to the new medium (on-line evaluation).

Senators asked if Computer Services could accommodate on-line evaluation system. Dr. Cooper stated that Jim Stevens believed there would be no problems. Senators asked how many classes the computer labs could handle currently during the peak class times. Dr. Cooper reported that that information had not been made available. It was suggested by several senators that the current number of labs could not accommodate many of the professors choosing to use class scheduled evaluation. Dr. Cooper stated that faculty would be responsible for reserving lab time for evaluations. Dr. Cooper said that comments would be sent as a blind e-mail to the faculty member and the chair. It would not be on-line. Only students enrolled in the class could evaluate the professor.

Senators expressed concern about the following issues:
1. Participation--Senators expressed concern that most students would not evaluate the professors under less restrictive options. No studies have been done comparing the percentage of students participating according to the different options, which calls into question the assertion that Computer Services can accommodate on-line evaluations using options 4 and 5.
2. Lack of study—Senators expressed concern that no analysis was done on any of the different options.
3. Lack of equitable treatment—Senators expressed concern that faculty would be evaluated in so many different ways, and since none of the options had been studied, it would be impossible to compare one faculty member with another.
4. Education Faculty concerns--Education faculty stated three concerns they had after using an on-line system of evaluation: students were coerced into the process, comments were wild and often inappropriate, and fewer students would evaluate (low n).
5. Delay of new evaluation instrument—Senators were concerned that implementing a new evaluation system would delay establishing a new evaluation instrument, even though most faculty are concerned about the instrument itself. **Close to 80% of faculty on a survey stated that they did not like only question #20 being used for evaluation.** (I don't have what survey this was done in or who said this during the meeting. Can anyone help me out with this?)Question #20 was selected for statistical reasons.

Council of Deans and Dr. Payne have agreed not to move forward with on-line evaluations if there is significant opposition from faculty or Faculty Senate. The Senate will discuss this issue further on April 10 and provide a response to the committee.

Chair's Report
Chair Muehsam stated that the APC meeting convened on March 5.
> **Wireless Access**
James Van Roekel and Jim Stevens demonstrated the use of wireless connections. They stated that there is now the ability for wireless access in some buildings. The demonstration did show the system to be subject to slow connections and loss of connections.

Mobilization

All students who are called up for active duty from the Reservists or National Guard will have their money refunded.

Research Enhancement Fund and Faculty Support Fund

Funds have been approved. A list of the recipients will be placed on the web page.

Reassigned Time

No decisions have been made on whether reassigned time will be available next year.

Ad Hoc Committee

An Ad Hoc Committee will be formed to begin looking into budget cuts for the next two years. Members will be appointed before the next meeting.

Budget

Chair Muehsam reported that the President expects budget cuts to take place first in the following areas:

No reassigned time, cuts in pool faculty, increase in class sizes, reduction in faculty salary increases, hiring freeze, and program cuts and consolidations.

No construction projects will be cut. Promoted individuals will receive their increase.

Committee Reports

There were no committee reports for University Affairs, Academic Affairs, or Faculty Affairs.

Committee on Committee

The Committee on Committees proposed a few changes to the Faculty Survey for 2003. The Senate will discuss the changes further at the next meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Kandi Tayebi, Chair-Elect