

Date: Wednesday, September 29, 2010

Time: 3:00-4:00 p.m.

Location: 110 ERL

Those Attending: Yinfa Ma (Chair), Diana L. Ahmad (Secretary), Mary Ellen Kirgan, Don J. Sharpsteen, Ron Bieniek, Clayton Price, Kurt Kosbar, Yoo-Mi Chin, Scott Miller

Those Missing: Lokesh Dharani, Mitsy Daniels

Guests: Stephanie Fitch

Non-Voting Member: Allan Pringle

Meeting was called to order by Y. Ma at 3:00 p.m.

Point 1: Minutes were read, corrections to two names of attending members from September 1 were noted, then the minutes were approved unanimously.

Point 2: Chair Ma requested a small budget for the committee from the Provost to cover incidental expenses; however, no response was received from Provost Wray prior to the start of today's meeting.

Point 3: The Purpose of this Committee

- Stephanie Fitch and Allan Pringle were invited to attend this meeting to provide background information that might help explain the purpose of this committee.
- Fitch provided a handout ("Ad Hoc Committee for Teaching Evaluations," reporting activities of that committee from December 2008 through June 2010)
- Pringle provided a handout explaining the three types of CET committees presently in existence on campus.
 - **The rest of the meeting discussed the three committees noted above and why this committee exists.**
- Pringle's handout explained the existence and basic duties of three committees each noted briefly here).
 - Chancellor's CET (the "original" CET committee)
 - This is the committee that awards the teaching awards (the plaques) each year.
 - NO monetary gift accompanies these awards.
 - This committee also chooses the "Class of '42" and the "GTA of the Year" awards.
 - In addition to the CET scores, these two awards also consider the number of students in the classes of the winners, as well as the number of classes a person taught the previous academic year.
 - This committee still exists.
 - Faculty Senate CET Committee (that is THIS committee)
 - This committee was established by the new by-laws passed in AY 2009-2010.
 - One of the responsibilities of this committee is to make sure that the CET evaluations are done correctly.

- “Correctly” needs to be defined.
- The basic reason to create this committee was to replace the Chancellor’s CET committee.
 - Doug Carroll, former president of the Faculty Senate, said NO. The Chancellor’s CET committee would continue to function.
 - That results in two committees with basically the same function; however, the Faculty Senate CET committee will NOT choose award winners.
- It was suggested that the Chancellor’s CET committee change its name.
- Chair Ma announced that it is vital that this committee’s charge be clarified.
- It was also suggested that the Chancellor and Provost decide what committees should exist.
- Then the discussion switched to what questions should be asked on the evaluation forms.
 - Four questions are mandated by Missouri State law and cannot be changed.
- Then a discussion of how to better handle the evaluation of professors on campus.
 - This committee will NOT conduct the evaluations.
 - The question arose that the committee needs to find out who will do the evaluations.
 - This committee cannot do them as it deals with personnel records and that is out of the purview of this committee.
- The discussion then started about electronic versus paper evaluations of professors.
 - At this point, Fitch explained what her Ad Hoc Committee for Teaching Evaluations did in the past.
 - In their first semester, they looked at why evaluations were done in the first place, then they looked at the advantages of electronic evaluations.
 - With the electronic evaluations, it was determined that at bare minimum the University would save approximately \$10,000 per semester if it switched to electronic evaluations.
 - That \$10,000 is only for the paper involved in the process.
 - It does NOT include the number of people hours spent administering the evaluations, running them through the computer, and so on.
 - It was noted that the process takes several weeks and the hiring of an outside person to handle the evaluations.
 - Two electronic evaluation pilots were conducted
 - Fall 2009 and Spring 2010

- NO decision has yet been made about which evaluations will be done in Fall 2010 semester (electronic or paper).
 - A decision must be made soon in order for Vice Provost Schwartz's office to order the paper forms and prepare for the process.
- It was noted that if the University switched to the electronic evaluation, it would save money.
 - That could make it attractive to the administration and others in an effort to help the S&T budget.
- It was also suggested that the electronic evaluations become the DEFAULT evaluation style.
 - Paper evaluations would still be available for those who insist on them.
- Electronic evaluations are "inevitable" for the campus.
- The Third Award committee was also discussed...the Missouri S&T Faculty Awards (the new awards that first came out in Spring 2010).

RESULTS OF DISCUSSION:

- Contact Faculty Senate Michael Schulz
 - Tell him that THIS committee LIKES the idea of electronic evaluations.

Point 4: Tasks to be completed before next meeting

- Chair Ma to contact RP&A about the purpose of this committee.
- Committee members to evaluate the CET webpage
 - Just "look at it" for next time.

Point 5: The rest of the agenda was put on hold until the next meeting.

Next Meeting: To be determined