

COLORADO SCHOOL OF MINES FACULTY SENATE MINUTES

December 6, 2005 – 2:00 PM

Hill Hall Room 300

ATTENDEES: Andersen, Christiansen, Honeyman, Mehta, Mishra, Parker, Romberger, Santi, Vincent, and Wolden

APOLOGIES: Dagdelen, Davis and Voorhees who is on sabbatical Fall 2005

GUESTS: Arthur Sacks -Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, Dan Lewis - Athletics Observer, Cigdem Gurgur - Faculty Evaluation Committee Representative, Kyle Fitzpatrick - Undergraduate Representative ASCSM, and Robert Applegate - President, CSM Graduate Student Association

Honeyman, Senate President, called the meeting to order.

COMMENTS FROM GUESTS:

A. Lewis - In response to the Senate request of November 1, 2005, Lewis reported the Athletic Faculty decided to remain administrative faculty with liaison representation to the Academic Faculty Senate. The Athletic Faculty's classification was changed from Academic to Administrative in 2000. This decision was the result of an ad-hoc committee called by President Trefny to examine the reporting structure of Athletics. The committee recommended that Athletics report to Student Life and not Academic Affairs. Historically Division I institutions report to the president and Division II and III institutions have various reporting structure.

APPROVALS:

A. The minutes of the November 15, 2005 Faculty Senate meeting were approved.

NEW BUSINESS:

A. Committee on Evaluation - Gurgur facilitated a discussion on the Committee on Evaluation meeting of October 28, 2005. Minutes follow:

Committee on Evaluation Minutes Meeting of Friday October 28, 2005, 3:00 PM - 3:50 PM, EH112

In Attendance: Graham Davis (Chair), Justin Chichester (ASCSCM), Cigdem Gurgur, Ron Miller, Michael Pavelich

Visitors: David Larue (Computing and Networking)

Regrets: Graeme Fairweather (DD/DH Representative), Arthur Sacks, Elizabeth Haynes (GSA representative)

Agenda Item 1: Welcome and Announcements

G. Davis welcomed the new members of the committee and reviewed the committee's charge.

Agenda Item 2: Administrator Evaluations

The committee was unsure about the purpose of reviving the administrator

evaluations. G. Davis is to go back to Senate for clarification. Committee members noted that in the past the faculty response rate was poor on these evaluations because it was widely known that the evaluations had little impact on administrative personnel decisions. The main concern of the committee is that this would be again the case unless the administration made clear that the results of the evaluations would be used.

Agenda Item 3: Revised Student Evaluations of Faculty

With a minor modification to question 11, the final set to be voted upon at the next meeting is:

1. The teaching methods used in this course are effective for promoting student learning
2. The instructor explains the material clearly
3. The instructor is available during office hours
4. The instructor creates an environment that fosters student involvement in the learning process
5. The instructor demonstrates a positive attitude toward helping students
6. The instructor facilitates student learning
7. Graded work reflects content of the course
8. The grading policies for this course are fair
9. The course goals are clearly stated
10. The course goals are being met
11. Overall, this instructor is effective

The change here is to add the word overall to the last question to emphasize that it is an evaluation intended to summarize the overall effectiveness of the instructor.

It was agreed that the grading scale would remain a 5-point scale (strongly agree, agree, neutral, disagree, strongly disagree). The three open-ended questions, found below, will be printed on the backs of the Scantrons. David Larue mentioned that the format would have to be finalized by mid January to be implemented in the Spring semester.

What aspects of instruction in this course do you find are effective for promoting your learning?

What recommendations would you make that would improve the instruction that you are receiving in this course?

If you have any additional comments, please write them in the space below.

Thank you.

Agenda Item 4: LAIS Request for Special Evaluations

G. Davis will follow up with Laura Pang.

Agenda Item 5: Other Business

None.

Agenda Item 6: Action Items for Next Meeting

None.

Gurgur reported Anne Walker is getting clarification from the State Attorney General's Office that if open-ended questions are used for faculty evaluations, they then become part of a faculty member's file and must be kept for several years.

Senators requested Committee on Evaluation report back to the Senate if administrators were to be evaluated, how would these evaluations be used.

- C. Office of Admissions and the CSM Admission Policy - Honeyman will ask for an evaluation of the admission policy in the Senate's report to the BOT on December 15, 2005. After discussion, the Senate requested Honeyman to invite Bruce Goetz to the January 17, 2006 Senate meeting to discuss the admissions structure.
- D. Role of Faculty Senate as a bridge to various groups within the CSM community - Senators asked Honeyman to contact Association for Classified Employees (ACE), administrative assistants group and administrative faculty council for their input on improving communication between various entities of the CSM community.

The meeting adjourned at 3:05 PM.