

**College Assembly
January 18, 2001 Minutes**

1. CALL TO ORDER

The regular meeting of the College Assembly was called to order at 12:45 p.m. on Thursday, January 18, 2001 in room 332 of Bobet Hall. Dean Frank Scully chaired the assembly, secretary was present. Fr. Nicoll led the invocation.

2. **ANNOUNCEMENTS** – Dean Scully stated that he had invited 17 faculty from across the college to help him put together a strategic plan for the college for the next five years. Dean Scully stated he wanted the plan to be open, and inclusive with plenty of opportunity for input. Dean Scully introduced David Estes.

David Estes introduced himself as Chair of the Committee whose members are John Cornwell, Ted Cotton, Denny Czejdo, Patricia Dorn, Mark Fernandez, Eric Gorham, Georgia Gresham, Dennis Janz, Laurie Joyner, Lisa Martin, Davina McClain, Jan Melancon,

Connie Mui, Cathy Rogers, Peter Rogers and Bob Thomas. David Estes stated that they had been meeting weekly since December with their first strategy being to define their mission, which he read. He also mentioned that the committee could be contacted via e-mail with suggestions at SPAS@loyno.edu.

Dean Scully stated that the Chairs had been given targets on salaries. There was a pool for merit and a separate pool for equity. The percentage pool for a merit raise of approximately 4.5% of the total salary pool, approximate percentage of the pool for equity is approximately 1.5%. There will be a base of 3.6% for people who are doing everything we expected of them with an increment of 1.6% for people who are outstanding in research and teaching, an increment of 1.2% for people who are outstanding in service.

3. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES** – Dean Scully stated that the minutes from November 16, 2000 would be put on the web probably next week.

4. **OLD/NEW BUSINESS** – Dean Scully addressed Motion #1 Adopting a Uniform Survey Instrument for Student Evaluation of Faculty which contained guidelines for the administration of the instrument and guidelines for the evaluation of the instrument. Jim Wee asked to restate statement #3 under Motion #1. It was accepted as a friendly amendment. Patricia Dorn made a Motion to amend item #11 by removing "clearly". The Motion was seconded. The question was called. All were in favor of the Motion to remove the word "clearly" from item #11 in the survey instrument. The Motion was passed.

John Biguenet asked if the committee intentionally deferred the question of whether the instructor had demonstrated mastery of the subject matter. Nothing speaks to that question and maybe the students are not in a position to make that judgement. Julian Wasserman stated that he did think that students were in a position to make that judgement.

Mary Brazier stated that in footnote #10 there had been a suggestion to add to the question. The committee had unanimously rejected it because they felt that the context was contained in question #14. Father Nicoll stated that the implication is that you cannot communicate effectively if you don't know the subject matter. David Estes stated that students wanted the opportunity to respond about how well prepared faculty are for class sessions. Dean Scully stated that he wanted to see this move on. Jim Wee stated that the suggestions under #20 and #21 are superfluous. If students want to add anything they can write on the back of the page. Father Nicoll stated they wanted to keep it down to a minimum. Mark Rubinfeld suggested a statement should be present telling students to write comments and not giving them the option to write or not. Lynn Koplitz stated that she would like to know who has the A's and B's in the class. Gary Herbert asked whether question #3 and #4 were referring to grades in all classes or one class. The committee answered that it meant in "this course." The phrase was added as a friendly amendment. Kate Adams asked if the information was going to be Scantroned. Dean Scully stated that was the intention. Lynn Koplitz made a motion to move "student information" to the top of the form. The motion was seconded. No debate. The question was called. All were in favor of the Motion to move "student information" to the beginning of Section #1. Father Nicoll suggested to add to #3 "is this a required course?" as a friendly amendment. The question was called on Motion #1. All were in favor of adopting this uniform survey instrument as amended.

Motion #2 - Guidelines for Administration of Evaluation Instrument. Sherry Lee Alexander asked who would receive this document. Father Nicoll stated that the document would be used to help the Dean, Department Chair, or the Department Evaluation Committee, SORC, and/or CRTC. Davina McClain stated that there will be a substantial delay before the faculty gets the instruments back. Patrick Bourgeois stated that the faculty could get the written responses. Teri Henley stated that she doesn't see how the administrative assistants would have time to type these responses. Dean Scully asked for thoughts on putting the comments on a separate sheet. John Biguenet stated that faculty do not see students' handwriting very often. Julian Wasserman stated it didn't make any sense to retype these responses. Dean Scully suggested that the responses would not be retyped, but put on a separate sheet and handed to faculty. Lynn Koplitz stated that the students should type the responses themselves on-line. Dean Scully stated that could be discussed during the next phase. Kurt Birdwhistell asked if the guidelines address how many classes would use these instruments. Georgia Gresham stated that departments handled this differently. Minimum level should be set across the college. Craig Hood stated that the instrument should be used for every course and made a Motion that evaluations be administered by all faculty in all courses with three or more students. The question was called. All were in favor of the motion to amend Motion #2. Georgia Gresham proposed an amendment stating "at all points efforts would be made to insure confidentiality" The question was called and seconded. All were in favor. Motion, as amended a) evaluation should be administered by all faculty in all courses every semester in courses containing three or more students, and b) at all points efforts should be made to insure confidentiality. One person opposed the Motion as amended. The Motion was passed.

Motion #3 – Guidelines for the Evaluation of the Instrument. Sherry Lee Alexander suggested changing the word "published" to "released" as a friendly amendment. Patricia Dorn suggested that "c" be modified to say "single evaluation should not be normative, but should be part of the data, which might indicate continuing weaknesses or strengths." The question was called. All were in favor. Motion as amended which

included item "c" which says "weakness or strengths" and item "g" which has been amended to read "are not be released to anyone else". All were in favor.

Father Nicoll stated that it would be valid to include in the guidelines that the "faculty are urged to provide to the appropriate authorities the statistics on their final grades" as part of the information that the authorities need to help them make an evaluation or the grades that a person gave in his or her course. Lynn Koplitz stated that faculty should not be responsible to provide this data to CRTC. Patrick Bourgeois stated that someone else should provide that data. The question was called and seconded. All were in favor. The Motion of "faculty are urged to provide to the appropriate authorities the statistics on their final grades". The Motion was opposed unanimously. The Motion was not passed.

Meeting adjourned at 1:45 p.m.