
Members absent: Barbara Baumstark, Pauline Clance, Nancy Floyd, Ronald Henry, Charles Marvin, Richard Miller, Linda Nelson, John Peterson, Ted Poister, Jim Senn and Marta White

A motion to approve the minutes of the December meeting was introduced by Glenn Abney, seconded by Cherian Thachenkary, and approved by the group.

The meeting began with the subcommittee reports.

On-line Evaluations
Glenn Abney was first on the agenda discussing the on-line faculty evaluation system. Glenn distributed a handout detailing the progress of this subcommittee. The subcommittee has put together a draft questionnaire to be sent to the faculty to elicit feedback on on-line evaluations. This survey will be placed on the goSOLAR page, with a link to the web-based survey. Bill Fritz is compiling a summary of the comments made by students to protect the anonymity of all individuals involved.

Glenn reported that we now have the ability to determine response rates of students enrolled in classes after withdrawals, which serves to raise the response rate a few percentage points. In the past, students enrolled prior to withdrawals were included in the response rate figures. Determining the response rate for Fall 2001 by college/department and the usage of on-line evaluations in Fall 2002 have both proven to be problematic.

The RCB evaluation form asks students to tell how satisfied they were with the class. This helps to establish the relationship between student satisfaction and the desire to respond to the survey. Faculty are reporting that student responses from the first on-line evaluation are either bad or good, and that there does not seem to be a middle ground. This is an area that will require additional discussion.

The group agreed that we must find out why students are not completing the on-line evaluations and suggest measures to increase participation. Tech found that students did not complete the on-line evaluations because there was not incentive to do so. When pen and paper evaluations were completed in class, the time spent completing the form was not the student’s personal time. Interestingly, after three years, Tech has a response rate in the forties, even after offering incentives. Gerald Gay suggested that we may want to move to the extreme of requiring students to complete the evaluation in order to receive their grades for the course. Jean Miller reported that students at Duke who complete an evaluation for each of their courses are allowed to view faculty evaluations for courses for which they wish to register.

Cherian noted that many students do not use their GSU email and have not received reminders to complete the on-line evaluations. The group responded that there is a vehicle in place for forwarding student GSU email accounts to other accounts, and that use of this forwarding is being encouraged. Cherian also suggested that a .cc command would be helpful for faculty to see if responses are being received.

Regarding the questionnaire, Barb Carroll suggested that perhaps it might be useful to indicate on
question four that more than one response could be selected. Perhaps an open-ended response could be added to both questions four and five. Harry Dangle had suggested that “Dissatisfaction with scores” could be added to question five, although this might be the same as “Reduces accuracy of instructional evaluation”, in Glenn’s opinion.

Bonnie Fritz summarized the discussion by stating that an ongoing program is needed to monitor and increase participation, and a draft of an On-line Policy is needed for the Executive Committee as soon as possible (Executive meets 2/13; Senate meets 2/27).

**Evaluation of Administrators**
Hugh Hudson reported that minor modifications were needed in the form. Since the form lists directs reports, reporting structure changes had to be made. The corrected form is ready for Mary Nell Stone to send out. Evaluators need to be encouraged to complete the form. The evaluation is not on-line at present.

**Non-tenure Track**
The BOR requires each institution to have a clear policy on promotion from Lecturer to Senior Lecturer. The subcommittee already has a draft, so there is no need to start from scratch, and it will review this draft at the next meeting.

**Benefits**
Certain propositions/resolutions coming before the State legislature this session affect pension. In the past, TRS has not been allowed to invest monies in private equities (venture capital). Such investments offer a three to four percent higher yield than ORP, but there is much higher risk involved. The State formed a committee to report to the legislature on this subject by the end of 2002. It would be extremely helpful if we could receive a copy of this report. It is possible that investment in venture capital may be allowed, with a five to ten percent limit on such investment. Cherian suggested inviting Tom Lewis or a member of his staff to give this group regular updates when the legislature is in session. Bonnie Fritz agreed to pursue this.

Also, it is possible that the number of investment companies offered under ORP may be expanded. Even though ORP has been in existence for more than ten years, it was the provisions of TRS, the dominant plan, which governed retirement. To remedy this confusion, the BOR, at its October 2002 meeting, defined “retiree” from the University System of Georgia, as differentiated from a “retiree” under TRS.

There are significant differences between TRS and ORP. Under TRS, an employee can credit unused sick leave, which is not possible under ORP. TRS has a ten-year vesting schedule, while ORP has immediate vesting. ORP, unlike TRS, does not have a governing body, since it is not a pension. The legislation, which created ORP, is what governs it.

Also mentioned was a possibility that employee contributions to TRS may drop from five percent to four percent for TRS. The impact on ORP would be determined by the University System of Georgia. Bonnie Fritz stated that Benefits might look into ways to have input about management of ORP, such as contacting the representatives for Research Universities to the BOR ORP subcommittee.

**Domestic Partners**
This committee’s goal is to formulate a new proposal for Dr. Patton to take to the BOR in support of extending System benefits to domestic partners. The University of GA has already sent its support to the BOR. A request was voted by Faculty Affairs, and taken to the Executive Committee. The President asked for clarification and also for a procedure. Barb Carroll pointed out that a procedure had been written when domestic partner benefits were extended to non-System benefits.
Barb Carroll reported that the FASA Coordinator position has been posted in Employment.

**Advancement of Women**-passed

**Strategic Plan**
This group’s suggestions have been passed on to Planning and Development to be incorporated into the Strategic Plan (see mail message handout from Bonnie Fritz).

**Faculty Development**

**Salary Equity**
Bonnie met with Linda Nelson, who is forming a task force to look into this issue. Linda will select a member of this group to serve on this task force.

**Disruptive Students**
This committee needs to either incorporate the suggestions of the Executive Committee or re-do the policy.

**Childcare**
This subcommittee met with the Director of the Child Development Center and the Chair of Early Childhood Education. The Center only has 85 slots, half for children of faculty and the other half for children of students. The demand for service is so great that there is a two-year waiting list. The group agreed that with the opening of the University Lofts, even more spaces would be needed to accommodate these families.

The Center is nationally recognized, and it trains all of the pre-K childcare directors for the state of GA. Research is conducted at the Center on an ongoing basis. The Center could and should be a valuable tool for both recruitment and retention.

The Center is seriously under funded, and its expansion would clearly be beneficial to the University community. Gerald Gay suggested that possibly raising the tuition might generate more revenue. Marion Meyers believes that there is a limit to what clients would pay, particularly the students who use the service. Marian clarified the role of her subcommittee as one of providing alternatives, but not dictating fees.

During the discussion, several other suggestions were made by the group members:
- Implement different rate structures (have faculty pay more than students)
- Offer variable services, such as short-term drop off for students and high quality care for those who stay all day, with different rates for services
- Bring in a private vendor to operate a second perhaps lower service center
- Add the Child Care Center to the list of recipients of Faculty and Staff Giving

Mona Matthews felt strongly that offering quality care must be our number one priority, since such care provides the cornerstone for success in life. Cherian suggested that it might be prudent to determine how many slots are needed and to base our recommendations for long-range planning on those numbers. Mona and Lynn Hart will share membership on this subcommittee. Since the University Strategic Plan includes development of plans to expand the Center, Hugh Hudson advised asking the Executive Committee to charge Faculty Affairs with developing this report, which Bonnie Fritz agreed to do.
There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 11:23.