

**Minutes of the General Meeting
of the Mary Washington College Faculty and Staff
Wednesday, April 23, 2003
Lee Hall Ballroom, 4 p.m.**

Call to Order: 4:07

Approval of:

- The Minutes of the General Faculty Meeting on April 17, 2002

Moved to approve with second. Approved by acclamation.

- The Report of the Actions Taken By the Faculty Senate, 2001-2002

Report accepted.

- The Report of the Actions Taken By the Faculty Senate, 2002-2003

No approval necessary.

Tribute to Retiring Colleagues:

Mr. Kemp to Ms. Manning
Mr. Woodwell to Mr. McConnell
Mr. Lehman to Mr. Lipscomb
Mr. Gaines to Mr. Ascari

Business

- Ms. Barra: Motion for Endorsement of Candidates for Graduation. Second received.
Motion of Endorsement affirmed by acclamation.

- Challenges to Faculty Senate Actions

1. Development of Minor Programs By Academic Departments

Ms. Polack-Wahl : **Motion: “That Mary Washington College academic departments be permitted to develop minor programs as soon as it is technically feasible. MINORS: Related courses of study of not less than 15 nor more than 20 semester hours which are deemed appropriate by the departments offering the majority of those credit hours.”** Second: Ms. McAllister.

Ms. Houghtalin: spoke against the motion out of concern that small departments would lose majors, possibly jeopardizing the department’s existence.

Ms. McAllister: spoke in favor of the motion: data regarding losing majors is unclear. Departments are not required to offer a minor in current proposal. Referred to responses from other schools stating that minors can assist in supporting small departments.

Mr. Merrill: spoke in favor of the student's best interest. Minors will not promote academic diversity but neither do double majors. Supports one major only with more electives.

Mr. Vasey: expressed concern regarding the new SCHEV Productivity Standards and, with these new standards, the possible impact minors would have on small departments.

Question called. Call for paper ballot. In favor of the motion: 28 Opposed. 80 **Motion fails.**

2. Student Course Evaluation Instrument

Ms. Wellington: **Motion: to reject the course evaluation instrument proposed by CFA and passed by the Senate.**

Ms. Wellington outlined her disagreements with the adopted instrument. Areas of disagreement include: no apparent effort to bridge the effort of committee members who produced the instrument presented at 2002 General Faculty Meeting (and which failed on tie vote) with the current instrument; instrument is a flawed document (faculty wanted no numbers assigned to student responses, desired demographic data, desired comment sheet to be correlated with survey form – these elements were not included). Answers should be single-statement - some are compound. Ambiguous language used on some questions. Specific categories considered to be hallmarks of quality teaching are not addressed (there are eight such groups). Pilot testing lacking.

Second was received.

Ms. Hayob: spoke on behalf of FAC in support of the adopted instrument. Mentioned that over 80% of senators supported adoption of the instrument. Disagreed with assertion that suggestions were not considered. Demographics were eliminated to preserve student confidentiality. Written comments were kept separate to protect confidentiality – to prevent identifying handwriting styles from identification. Numbering was retained in a desire to protect new faculty. Compound statements were eliminated except for one. Pilot testing was done in three classes with an early form of this instrument.

Mr. Gable: spoke against the instrument. A single instrument to accurately evaluate a diverse faculty is not possible to develop. Comparison from department to department can be damaging. Eliminating SIR II was an opportunity to adopt multiple instruments, some without numbered ratings and based on qualitative input. The decision then goes to the department, then chair for evaluation and, in turn, to a derivation of pay raise grade 1, 2, or 3.

Ms. Wellington: opposes not because it is an in-house instrument but because instrument is not very good. Regarding comment sheet – comments should be on same sheet because number rankings can be compared to the associated comments.

Ms. Lewis: member of FAC, offered background of instrument development. SIR II discontinued in fall, 2002 and FAC was charged by dean to develop a new instrument. FAC created a subcommittee, consulted with TIP. Supports the accepted instrument – believes that it will offer useful information.

Question called. Paper ballot requested. Aye (to reject Senate action) 26 , No 74. **Action of the Senate sustained.**

••••••••Mr. Rycroft: challenged Senate action from the floor. AAC sent grade definitions to Senate in which a grade of A was defined as “unusual excellence.” The Senate changed this to “excellent.” **Motion: to return definition to original wording where grade of A is defined as of “unusual excellence.”**

Mr. Watkins: offered **friendly amendment** of “peculiar excellence.” Friendly amendment was **not accepted.**

Question called. aye: 29, no: 60. **Senate action sustained.**

Announcements

Adjournment: 5:41p.m.