

**UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA SCHOOL OF THE ARTS
FACULTY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
February 18, 2009**

Present: Ellen Rosenberg, Jeff Morgan, Michael Dodds, Trish Casey, Renata Jackson, Bill McCord, Geordie MacMinn, Joe Mills, Christine Spizzo, Sean Sullivan, Bland Wade, Pam Griffin, Janos Kovacs, Norman Coates, Jessica Taylor

Guest: Geri Cochran

I. Approval of minutes

Minutes of the February 4, 2009 Faculty Council meeting were approved as written.

II. Discussion of instrument for the evaluation of deans and senior administrators

- A. Discussion of new item, Item K, as written by Jeff Morgan.
- B. Ellen Rosenberg shared evaluation tools for “senior administrators.”

III. Presentation by Geri Cochran on electronic course evaluations by students

- A. Geri reported that she hoped to “sow seeds” of conversation about on-line course evaluations by students.
- B. Rationale for change: In their current and various forms, course evaluations by students require (3) weeks to transcribe at a cost to the institution of about \$17,000.
- C. Hope: There will eventually be a single, summative electronic instrument in use by every faculty member for course evaluations by students.
 - 1. No time will be taken from class or from office staff to complete or process/transcribe this evaluation instrument.
 - 2. Students will have more control over the privacy of their responses than is typical with in-class, handwritten evaluations.
 - 3. At the end of each term when students access their final grades, the evaluation form will appear first and must be submitted on-line for each class before students can see their grades.
 - 4. Any narrative comments by students will already be typed when submitted, and faculty will receive their course evaluations quickly.
 - 5. Faculty may still ask their students for formative responses, but these would not go to the Office of Institutional Research.
 - 6. Target date for on-line course evaluations: Fall 2011.
- D. Discussion:
 - 1. Michael Dodds noted a pro and a con to online evaluations: Students would not be responding to evaluations with the anxiety of a final exam hanging over them; on the other hand, properly supervised in-class evaluations can lead to greater focus from students and more thoughtful responses.

2. Janos Kovacs expressed concerns about a uniform evaluation instrument that doesn't take course variety into account. At the very least, the evaluation instrument should have a "not applicable" option for all questions.
3. Norman Coates asked if there should not be different evaluation instruments for lecture and studio classes.
4. Michael Dodds asked if course evaluations, as opposed to teacher evaluations, can be used to judge a faculty member for contract renewal. Cochran's opinion: UNCSEA needs "trained teacher evaluators" to go into classrooms, not just peer evaluators, in order to get valuable formative evaluations of classroom teaching. Norman Coates: There is the problem of vast course format variety on the UNCSEA campus. Cochran: These trained evaluators would "look at universal best pedagogical practices that go beyond course content."
5. Ellen Rosenberg charged the Council members to share the idea of on-line course evaluations with their departmental faculties and to gather concerns and questions.

IV. Return to discussion of evaluation instruments for deans

- A. Bill McCord made a motion, seconded by Renata Jackson, for the removal of the line "comments will be destroyed" in the introductory passage of the evaluation form. Motion carried.
- B. Bill McCord made a motion, seconded by Trish Casey, to add "does not meet expectations" as a fifth answer choice for each evaluation item, A-K. Motion carried.
- C. Bland Wade made a motion that Faculty Council accept the evaluation instrument for deans as amended per above and with Item K as written. Motion was seconded by Joe Mills. Motion carried.

V. Meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,
Jeff Morgan, Vice Chair