

College of Arts & Sciences
FACULTY MEETING MINUTES

April 8, 1998

1. The meeting began without a quorum at 3:35 PM.

2. The minutes of the March 4, 1998, meeting were approved as corrected.

3. President's Report

- The Faculty Handbook is out. Thanks to all who worked so hard. It will be reissued in hard copy on a biannual basis. Supplements will be issued if it is modified in the interim.

- The Master plan has been approved by the City Council. The major issue of concern was a new parking lot by the ball field; we agreed to evaluate other options before building the lot. The city wants us to reduce cars coming to campus. As part of this: (1) the College will institute a housing program: the college will purchase property and sell the house to faculty. (2) Parking fees will be instituted. (3) A parking structure is planned.

- The College is exploring the possibility of purchasing the Franciscan Renewal Center.

- The Reaccreditation visit. Our visitors were impressed; reaccreditation will be forthcoming, perhaps with a requirement for an interim status report. They were a bit concerned that we were underadministered-- "investing too much in the academy". Compared to other institutions, our Deans have more power than vice presidents. They also recommended we engage in mission planning, an idea which the President opposes. In the future, we could go for national, as opposed to regional, accreditation if we choose. This is under discussion at Academic Council.

- The Law school received \$4 million gift last week, for a total of \$6.75 towards the \$9 to \$10 million needed for a law library expansion.

- Voting Rights issue. What can the President support? Centrality to the liberal arts is important.

Quality control in hiring should be similar to that for tenure track faculty. Not national searches, necessarily, but something similar. Longevity is needed. One year is too short. Supports giving tenure to those already here with the "moral equivalent" of tenure. Supports in principle resolutions comparable to Jean or David's.

4. Dean's Report

-The Dean thanked folks for hard work on the accreditation visit.

- Chris Walker has received a Fulbright. Adam Smith has received a Goldwater, the eighth Lewis & Clark recipients in six years, putting us ahead of all the other schools in the Pacific NW for the period and among the top ten liberal arts colleges nationally. Alexis Gensberg has received a Truman as has Jeremy Brown. We are among only six colleges and universities to have more than one new Truman Scholar this year.

- Latin Honors will be implemented for the class of '99.

-The Residential Life survey, with a 50%+ return rate is positive; the main problems are with facilities. There will be a retreat on April 16 to develop a plan to address the need for renovation and new construction.

- The Senior Art Exhibit opens at 5 pm.

The Meeting was officially called to order at 4:05.

-The Dean introduced a Motion to approve conferral of degrees, from the Registrar.

The Motion was seconded, and carried by voice vote.

-An additional meeting has been scheduled for April 22 to address the Teaching Evaluation issue; alternatively, we could suspend the "rule of order" and vote today, if 2/3 of the faculty so choose.

5. Standing Committee Reports

Admissions, Awards and Academic Standing:

Mike Sexton: Admission statistics are attached. Financial aid awards will be out by the 15th. Two Trustees have said yes, two have said no. Not much feedback yet from

Neelys. Princeton has started a bidding war for students; we hope it won't trickle down.

Steve Hunt: Please sign up for phonathon.

Committee on the Curriculum:

Bill Randall: The general education review will take place next fall. The Curriculum Committee will divide up into subgroups:

- Inventing America and its tie in to International Studies
- Quantitative Reasoning and relation to Mathematical and Natural Sciences
- Foreign languages
- Creative Arts
- Writing and other core competencies

No specific recommendations are being made at this point. In February, review and recommendations will be brought forth.

Committee on Education Technology:

Bill Duncan: Please read minutes on web (www.lclark.edu/~cas/faculty). This year, Information Technology largely set the committee agenda. Next year we would like to see more faculty initiative.

IT had recommended that the modern pool was in need of repair; it placed it low on the budget priority list and the recommendation was denied. CET recommended to Dean Atkinson that the modern pool be given a much higher priority.

6. New Business

Teaching Evaluations

Dick Rohrbaugh: In the Spring of 1996, his committee was charged to look at the statistical reliability and validity of the current form, and to consider alternatives.

A survey was conducted; negative feedback was prevalent. Last year we discussed a few alternatives, but they died. Last year's committee also decided that determining the reliability and validity of the form is not a task of which the committee was capable.

The negative feedback was of primarily two forms: Questions that asked two questions, and ambiguity in questions.

A major practical problem is posed by the existing two page form. The student course coding is inadequate; as a result, 10,000 forms have to be hand separated and checked. With the new forms, course coding will not have to be done by the students.

As a consequence, the committee has revised the form as follows:

- Limited it to a single page.
- Omitted problematic questions, rephrased a few others.
- Separated out questions directed towards the course and the instructor.

No change in procedures has been recommended.

Rohrbaugh moved that the form be adopted starting in the fall of '98.

Specific objections were as follow:

- "Overall evaluation of instructor" is missing.

Rohrbaugh: That is an omission.

- Items 3 and 4 are course evaluation items. Would prefer to keep the focus in teaching.
- Item 9 is too vague: what is "feedback"? Can it be applicable across courses? Mathematics or science courses provide less "feedback".
- Question 2 "pace and progression", and Question 9 "feedback and improvement" are double questions.
- Include all course evaluation material on one side, all teaching on the other.
- Questions about the course should be moved to right above (1). The second sentence should be modified to reflect reality; delete "permanent."

- Background information questions have two fine a screen.

Discussion revolved around the following points.

1. What is the purpose of the background information? They are "validity" items; put there because faculty feel they may influence the student's answers. Several faculty said that they did use this information in interpreting specific comments.

2. How do CPT, Deans and Chairs use the background information? Two CPT members and one Divisional Dean said that the information was not used much at all, and certainly not systematically. Dick Rohrbaugh gave one possible example: It might raise a flag for CPT if all students expect A's and get C's. But such cases are very rare. One CPT member said the information was useful when context was needed.

3. Will the background information compromise confidentiality in small classes?

In the course of this discussion, David Savage moved that the background information be struck from the form. The motion was seconded. A straw vote was taken on removing each of the items.

Reasons for taking the course fails by voice vote

% of classes attended yes 21 no 17

% of work completed yes 21 no 15

expected grade a tie by voice vote

After the results of the straw vote, it was pointed out that a significant minority of the faculty do use this data, and there was little cost to keeping it on the form.

The question was called on the Savage Motion.

It failed by a voice vote.

Stuart Kaplan moved that the instructor be given the option of directing the students to not include the background information.

Two people spoke against the motion arguing it introduced a chaotic element; and created an inconsistency. Also, because it does provide context for CPT, the absence of the data could hurt a candidate.

The question was called on the Kaplan motion.

It failed by a voice vote.

7. A motion to adjourn was made, and passed, at 5:15.

respectfully submitted,
Eban Goodstein

Created by: eban@lclark.edu

Updated: 17-Apr-98