Members present: Glenn Abney, Joan Carson, Gayle Christian, Bonnie Fritz, Gerald Gay, Mona Matthews, John Peterson, and Jim Senn


Guests: John De Castro and Bill Fritz

The meeting began with Bonnie Fritz thanking the group for responding to her email asking for approval of the nominations of college representatives to serve on the Faculty Awards Committee committee. It was pointed out by several Faculty Affairs members that there were no females nominated. Barbara Baumstark will represent Faculty Affairs on the Faculty Awards Committee. Bonnie also put out an urgent plea for membership on the Auxiliary Services committees. Members from Faculty Affairs are needed to serve on the Parking and Transportation Committee and the Parking and Transportation Appeals subcommittee for Faculty and Staff. In addition, members from Faculty Affairs are needed to be involved in the bid process for print/photocopy services and travel agency services. Services on these committees would require service during the summer. Please contact San Miller in Auxiliary Services or Bonnie for more information.

Bonnie Fritz declared a quorum. The minutes of the February meeting were approved by the group. A discussion of on-line evaluation followed.

Glen Abney has served as the chair of the subcommittee on on-line evaluation since the Faculty Affairs Committee voted to form an oversight committee for this process. This subcommittee was formed as a result of faculty anxiety over the decrease in the response rate. Glen, Bill Fritz, and John De Castro met to attempt to come up with a compromise to shape the direction of the process when it became obvious that on-line evaluations were not going to be abandoned. The proposal devised by this group would require a student to either fill out an on-line evaluation or to select a “do not wish to participate” option in order to access his or her grade for that course. Legal Affairs is comfortable with the proposal as long as students have the option not to complete the evaluation. The group agreed that such a requirement made sense. What the group did not agree upon was the timing of the on-line evaluation period.

Evaluation completion would take place from one week before finals until two weeks after grades are available to students. The proposal would extend the evaluation period until after grade submission. After the two week period, the course evaluation ratings will be tabulated and no further evaluations would be included in the overall evaluation of the course. The students, however, would still be required to fill out an evaluation to view their grades, but their evaluation would not count.

Students felt that they would like to have the opportunity to fill out the evaluation after finals when they had more time. Students agreed that they should not be able to see their grades until after the evaluation was completed. Jim Senn was uncomfortable with students filling out evaluations
during finals. He felt that a student might feel overwhelmed by all the work he or she still has to do, and that the student might then give the faculty member a poor evaluation. A schism developed as to whether or not the final should be considered part of the course. Jim Senn believes that the evaluations should be halted on the last day of class, or, at least, prior to the final. Others felt that the final should be considered part of the class, and students should be able to evaluate a professor based upon the content of the final. During the discussion of the proposal, it was noted that many faculty members have already made the decision to return to pencil and paper evaluations in an effort to increase the response rate. Glen Abney wondered if the faculty who had elected to use the paper system may not be happy now that the guidelines have been changed to make give on-line users more time to administer the evaluation.

Bill Fritz presented an analysis of qualitative statements from the Fall 2002 on-line evaluations in which 3027 quotations were coded. 1100 of the quotations were not applicable to the question, “Add any constructive comments you wish to make about this evaluation form or the evaluation process”. 1927 total quotations were applicable to the question. 45.1% of the students preferred on-line to in-class evaluations. 7.1% of the students preferred in-class evaluations, and 47.8% expressed no preference. Like the faculty, most respondents who preferred in-class evaluations were concerned with low response rates. Anonymity was an issue among both those who favored in-class evaluations and those who favored on-line evaluations.

Glen Abney presented a preliminary data analysis of evaluations in Arts and Sciences in Fall, 2002. Contrary to popular belief, scores were not different between the two methods of evaluation; higher scores were not a factor of paper evaluations. The differences between the two methods were statistically significant, but not vastly different. The online average mean for effectiveness is 4.25, and the paper average mean for effectiveness is 4.10. Clearly response rates were higher with paper evaluations (42.08% for on-line and 70.42% for paper). Lastly, the data show that scores for overall effectiveness proved to be related to response rate.

The group agreed that the problem with the instrument itself tends to confound the decision as to whether to use paper or on-line. Mona Matthews expressed a hope that Promotion and Tenure committees are using more than just the evaluation in making their decisions, and, if all scores go down, lower scores will not be an issue. Bill Fritz pointed out that if we do nothing differently for Spring, there will be no increase in response rate. If the proposal were to be adopted, the response rate would increase. The group agreed that getting to only one system is crucial, and that dual systems of administration must be eliminated.

In conclusion, the group agreed (with Jim Senn abstaining) to make a “friendly” amendment to the Student On-Line Course Evaluation Proposal to make the proposal effective for Spring and Summer 2003 only, to be revisited for the Fall. John De Castro and Bonnie Fritz will get together to craft the exact wording of the “friendly” amendment. Bonnie thanked John, Bill and Glen for their hard work on this issue.

Gayle Christian reported that her group was almost ready to present the Disruptive Student Policy to the group. There is a question as to whether or not this policy is a legal document, and mediation needs to be added. The Executive Committee wanted a change which is not possible. The group should be ready to vote on the policy at the next meeting.

John Peterson presented the Domestic Partner Benefits document. The group suggested that the
document be renamed Resolution in Support of Domestic Partner Benefits. The following language was added to the document: The Georgia State University Senate supports that the President make a formal request to the Board of Regents that it adopt policies and procedures which treat married couples and domestic partnership couples in an equal manner and ensure that system-wide benefits are available to both married couples and domestic partnership couples and that this request proceed from approval of the Senate to the President, and, if accepted, then to the Chancellor of the Board of Regents. A grammatical error was noted; couple is singular. John suggested that the Resolution stand alone, with the addendum and affidavit being an appendix. The group approved the Resolution.

The group approved adding a statement regarding accountability for ethnic diversity to administrative evaluation forms. The group also approved, for just this time, the proposal to extend deadlines for the administrative evaluation process, due to the adoption of the perpetual calendar.

Hugh Hudson is still working on the Senior Lecturers Policy.

Marian Meyers will present a report on Childcare at the next meeting.

The Benefits Committee had no report, nor did the Bookstore Committee, which is meeting tomorrow.

Bonnie Fritz again asked for representation on the Auxiliary Services committees, and she volunteered to attend the Facilities Task Force meeting today for Glen.

The meeting adjourned at 11:30.