Minutes of the meeting of February 19, 2003

Members Present: B. Trumbo (Chair), E. Padilla, J. Clarence, M. Hedrick, R. Garcia, J. Lopus, E. Barrett, L. Ramirez, (Secretary)

Members Absent: V. Traversa, J. Bhadury

Guest: M. Strait

Meeting was called to order at 2:45pm

The agenda was approved.

The minutes of Feb 5th were amended and approved.

Report from the Chair

FAC may receive referrals in the future regarding the following items:

· The suggestion has been made that tenured faculty with unsatisfactory post-tenure review should not be eligible for extra pay.
· Library PTR document is on its way, possibility that library document will be referred to FAC’s own PTR committee.
· Lecturer review document may arrive soon from subcommittee, be prepared to discuss it in FAC or to send it to FAC PTR Subcommittee.
· State-wide Academic Senate has resolved that campuses look at the CSU Whistle Blower Policy. Policy is generic and would need additional information to be implemented at CSU Hayward.

Report of the Director of Faculty Development
No report.

Old Business

· Evaluation of Temporary Faculty
Committee lecturers met and selected Mark Karplus as Chair of Committee

· Policy on Faculty Search Committees
MOU was read, there is no question Search Committee is elected by department. In practice, there are NO fewer than 3 in the committee. In small department, all sometimes participate. In large departments, there is a department election.
Student Evaluation by Faculty

B. Trumbo introduced Michael Strait to discuss student evaluations. Lecturers are supposed to be evaluated in all classes. Tenured faculty should be evaluated in 2 courses per year. The evaluations should go to the Provost's office. Student's evaluations are mainly an indication of student satisfaction. There are no conclusive formal institutional studies regarding student satisfaction or Learning Outcomes. Recent individual work by Julie Norton and John Lovell showed a negative correlation between grades received and favorability of student rating.

Numerous questions evolved from the presentation:
Is there a difference between higher and lower courses?
Between required and non required?
Between small classes and higher ratios?
Between electives and other classes?
Between student's learning and high evaluations

Highest evaluations are given to Performing Arts, Social Science and Humanities. More data needs to be collected
Differentiate which questions should go on a Formative and which should go on a Summative evaluation.

Recommendation:
Ask to include more information along with evaluation score
Some information such as:
  GPA;  
  % of students Freshman, Sophomore, Junior, Senior;  
  % of students in areas of study.

M Strait left after the student evaluation discussion.

Policy on Faculty Search Committees
Each committee must be inclusive. Some hoped that MOU #3 will include more support for ethnic and gender inclusiveness.

Meeting adjourned at 5:00pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Lettie Ramirez, Secretary