

## University Faculty Senate Minutes March 13, 2003

**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-

### **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