

Unit Elections

Faculty Senate Unit Representative Election Results

Academic Affairs - (currently filled by Paul Reneau) - Connie Edwards elected

Behavioral Sciences - (currently filled by Craig White)

Business - (currently filled by Mohamad Khalil) -- Joe Blankenship elected

Computer Sciences - (currently filled by Steve Haynes) - Donald Tobin elected

Fine Arts - (currently filled by Jeff Ingman) -- Jennifer Yerdon-Lejuene elected

Health & Human Performance - (currently filled by Mike Ryan) - Mike Ryan re-elected

Language & Literature - (currently filled by Donna Long) - Donna Long re-elected

Proposed Committee Assignments

**Faculty Senate Committee Assignments
2012-2014**

Elected Committees - elected by Academic Unit in odd/even years as indicated

CURRICULUM - 1 per Academic Unit and 2 students

<u>Name</u>	<u>Academic Unit</u>	<u>Term Ends</u>
	Behavioral Science	2014
Andreas Baur	Biology, Chemistry, Geoscience	2013
Rebecca Giorcelli	Business	2013
Joe Riesen	Computer Science, Math, Physics	2013
Budd Sapp	Education	2014
Valarie Huffman	Fine Arts	2014
Bev Michael	Health, Human Performance	2013
Sharon Hiltz	Language and Literature	2013
Sharon Mazure	Library	2014
Debi Hoag	Nursing and Allied Health	2013
Diana Noone	Social Sciences	2014
James Vassil	Technology	2014
	Student	
	Student	

Ex-Officio: Associate Provost (Note: Bob Mild will represent the Associate Provost for 2011-2012)

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT - 1 per Academic Unit

<u>Name</u>	<u>Academic Unit</u>	<u>Term Ends</u>
	Behavioral Science	2014
Matthew Scanlon	Biology, Chemistry, Geoscience	2013
Frank Lee	Business	2013
James Dunlevy	Computer Science, Math, Physics	2013
Denise Lindstrom	Education	2014
Aimee Richards	Fine Arts	2014
Doug Powell	Health, Human Performance	2013
Suzanne Heagy	Language and Literature	2013
Toru Chiba	Library	2014
Alexis Hicks	Nursing and Allied Health	2013
Adam Podlaskowski	Social Sciences	2014
Hugh Costello	Technology	2013

Ex-Officio: Director of the Center for Teaching Excellence

GENERAL STUDIES - 1 per Academic Unit and 1 student

<u>Name</u>	<u>Academic Unit</u>	<u>Term Ends</u>
	Behavioral Science	2014
Matt Scanlon	Biology, Chemistry, Geoscience	2013
Tim Oxley	Business	2013

Dennine	LaRue	Computer Science, Math, Physics	2014
Gwen	Jones	Education	2014
Jennifer	Bogges	Fine Arts	2014
Matt	Schmuck	Health, Human Performance	2013
Jim	Matthews	Language and Literature	2013
Rob	Hammonds	Library	2014
Veronica	Gallo	Nursing and Allied Health	2013
Ned	Radulovich	Social Sciences	2014
Kim	Murphy	Technology	2013
Shawn	Ragsdale	Student	

Ex-Officio: Provost, Associate Provost, and the Director of the Center for Teaching Excellence

LIBRARY - 1 per Academic Unit and 1 student

<u>Name</u>		<u>Academic Unit</u>	<u>Term Ends</u>
		Behavioral Science	2014
Mark	Flood	Biology, Chemistry, Geoscience	2013
Teresa	Engelbretson	Business	2013
Susan	Goodwin	Computer Science, Math, Physics	2013
Phil	Berryhill	Education	2014
Anne	Patterson	Fine Arts	2014
Bob	Cable	Health, Human Performance	2013
J. Robert	Baker	Language and Literature	2013
Charley	Hively	Library	2014
Debi	Hoag	Nursing and Allied Health	2013
Ken	Millen-Penn	Social Sciences	2014
Kirk	Morphew	Technology	2013
		Student	

Ex-Officio: Director of the Library

PRESIDENTIAL PERCEPTION SURVEY - 1 per Academic Unit and 1 student

<u>Name</u>		<u>Academic Unit</u>	<u>Term Ends</u>
		Behavioral Science	2014
Tony	Morris	Biology, Chemistry, Geoscience	2013
Dede	Burnell	Business	2013
Randy	Baker	Computer Science, Math, Physics	2014
Don	Moroose	Education	2014
Jeffrey	Ingman	Fine Arts	2014
Amy	Sidwell	Health, Human Performance	2013
Elizabeth	Savage	Language and Literature	2013
Kelly	Bradish	Library	2014
Denise	Kirchoff	Nursing and Allied Health	2013
Chuck	Shields	Social Sciences	2014
Larry	Allen	Technology	2013
		Student	

Voluntary Committees - any interested faculty may serve 2 years
--

ADMISSIONS & CREDITS

<i>Name</i>	<i>Academic Unit</i>	<i>Term Ends</i>
Matt Scanlon	Biology, Chemistry, Geoscience	2013
Ellen Condron	Nursing and Allied Health	2013
Nanette VanDyke-McDonald	Nursing and Allied Health	2013
Jennifer Myers	Social Science	2013
Gale Kirby	Nursing and Allied Health	2014
Linda Turchin	Nursing and Allied Health	2014
Thelma Hutchins	Library	2014
Sharon Mazure	Library	2014
Leland George	Language and Literature	2014
Jack Kirby	Business	2014
Tim Oxley	Business	2014
Valerie Morphew	Education	2014
Donna Long	Language and Literature	2014
Charley Hively	Library	2014
	Student	

Ex-Officio: Registrar and Director of Admissions and Recruiting

ATHLETICS

<i>Name</i>	<i>Academic Unit</i>	<i>Term Ends</i>
Tony Morris	Biology, Chemistry, Geoscience	2013
James Weekley	Biology, Chemistry, Geoscience	2013
Frank Lee	Business	2013
Sue Kelley	Language and Literature	2013
Randy Baker	Computer Science, Math, Physics	2013
Veronica Gallo	Nursing and Allied Health	2013
Charley Hively	Library	2013
Ned Radulovich	Social Science	2014
James Vassil	Technology	2014
Mike Lopez	Health, Human Performance	2014
Don Trisel	Biology, Chemistry, Geoscience	2014
Bob Cable	Health, Human Performance	2014
Budd Sapp	Education	2014
Jessica Mathew	Business	2014

Student

Ex-Officio: Director of Athletics and University NCAA Academic Representative

FACULTY HARASSMENT COMPLAINT - pool of 15 faculty (1 from each Academic Unit; panel of 6 chose

<i>Name</i>	<i>Academic Unit</i>	<i>Term Ends</i>
-------------	----------------------	------------------

Clarence	Rohrbaugh	Behavioral Science	2014
Mark	Flood	Biology, Chemistry, Geoscience	2013
Macgorine	Cassell	Business	2013
		Computer Science, Math, Physics	2014
Mike	Ryan	Education	2014
Jeffrey	Ingman	Fine Arts	2014
Randy	Hess	Health, Human Performance	2013
Suzanne	Heagy	Language and Literature	2013
		Library	2014
Fran	Young	Nursing and Allied Health	2013
Elizabeth	Savage	Language and Literature	2014
Melissa	Abbott	Technology	2013
Mohamed	Alshallah	Business	2013
Kirk	Morphew	Technology	2013
Ken	Millen-Penn	Social Sciences	2013

FACULTY PERSONNEL - 5 tenured faculty with at least the rank of Professor

<i>Name</i>	<i>Academic Unit</i>	<i>Term Ends</i>
Sharon Hiltz	Language and Literature	2014
Joe Riesen	Computer Science, Math, Physics	2014
Macgorine Cassell	Business	2014
Paul Reneau	Health, Human Performance	2013
John O'Connor	Fine Arts	2013
Ex-Officio: Provost		

FACULTY WELFARE

<i>Name</i>	<i>Academic Unit</i>	<i>Term Ends</i>
Alexis Hicks	Nursing and Allied Health	2013
Fran Young	Nursing and Allied Health	2013
Mark Flood	Biology, Chemistry, Geoscience	2013
Ashley Shroyer	Nursing and Allied Health	2013
Ellen Condron	Nursing and Allied Health	2013
Phil Yeager	Biology, Chemistry, Geoscience	2013
Tadashi Kato	Behavioral Science	2013
Erica Harvey	Biology, Chemistry, Geoscience	2014
Craig White	Behavioral Science	2014
Galen Hansen	Computer Science, Math, Physics	2014
Tulasi Joshi	Social Sciences	2014
Leia Suter	Nursing and Allied Health	2014
Fran Kirk	Fine Arts	2014
Steve Roof	Biology, Chemistry, Geoscience	2014
Sam Spears	Fine Arts	2014
Adam Podlaskowski	Social Sciences	2014
Robert Hammonds	Library	2014
Joyce Bates	Nursing and Allied Health	2014

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD

<i>Name</i>		<i>Academic Unit</i>	<i>Term Ends</i>
Julie	Reneau	Education	2013
Clarence	Rohrbaugh	Behavioral Science	2013
Philip	Freeman	Technology	2013
Aimee	Richards	Fine Arts	2013
Rhonda	Sanford	Language and Literature	2013
Joshua	Smallridge		2014
Toru	Chiba	Library	2014
James	Matthews	Language and Literature	2014
Joseph	Blankenship	Business	2014
Doug	Powell	Health, Human Performance	2014
Michael	Ransom	Behavioral Sciences	2014
Amy	Sidwell	Health, Human Performance	2014
		Student	

INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

<i>Name</i>		<i>Academic Unit</i>	<i>Term Ends</i>
Erin	Hippolyte	Language & Literature	2014
Matt	Scanlon	Biology, Chemistry, Geoscience	2013
Dan	Gurash	Behavioral Science	2013
Jeff	Greenham	Fine Arts	2013
Alexis	Hicks	Nursing	2013
Ashley	Shroyer	Nursing	2013
Suzanne	Heagy	Language and Literature	2013
Kelly	Bradish	Library	2013
Anne	Patterson	Fine Arts	2013
Sunil	Surendran	Business	2014
Mahmood	Hossain	Computer Science, Math, Physics	2014
Matt	Hokom	Language and Literature	2014
Beverly	Michael	Health, Human Performance	2014
Matt	Schmuck	Health, Human Performance	2014
Dan	Eichenbaum	Fine Arts	2014

Student chosen by Intl. Advisor

Ex-Officio: Associate Provost, Inte Student chosen by Student Govt.

LEGISLATIVE ADVOCACY

<i>Name</i>		<i>Academic Unit</i>	<i>Term Ends</i>
Gwen	Jones	Education	2013
Harry	Baxter	Biology, Chemistry, Geoscience	2014
Susan	Kelley	Language and Literature	2014
Kim	Murphy	Technology	2014
Craig	White	Behavioral Sciences	2014
Steven	Roof	Biology, Chemistry, Geoscience	2014
Galen	Hansen	Computer Science, Math, Physics	2014

Robert Hammonds Library 2014
 Ex-Officio: BOG and Advisory Cou Student

STUDENT FINANCIAL AID APPEALS

<i>Name</i>	<i>Academic Unit</i>	<i>Term Ends</i>
Debi Hoag	Nursing and Allied Health	2013
Andreas Baur	Biology, Chemistry, Geoscience	2013
Angela Schwer	Language and Literature	2013
Jean Engelbretson	Business	2013
Jeff Greenham	Fine Arts	2013
James Weekley	Biology, Chemistry, Geoscience	2013
Roxann Humbert	Education	2014
Melissa Abbott	Technology	2014
Harry Baxter	Biology, Chemistry, Geoscience	2014
Linda Turchin	Nursing	2014

Ex-Officio: Director of Financial Aid

STUDENT HEARING BOARD

<i>Name</i>	<i>Academic Unit</i>	<i>Term Ends</i>
Joe Blankenship	Business	2013
Angela McKeen	Biology, Chemistry, Geoscience	2013
Philip Freeman	Technology	2013
Mohamad Kahlil	Business	2013
Leland George	Language and Literature	2013
Nanette Van Dyke-McDonald	Nursing and Allied Health	2013
Harry Baxter	Biology, Chemistry, Geoscience	2013
Angela Schwer	Language and Literature	2013
Tara Brooks	Education	2013
Jeff Ingman	Fine Arts	2014
Vicki Kerwin	Nursing and Allied Health	2014
Tanya Rogers	Nursing and Allied Health	2014
Bob Mild	Fine Arts	2014

Appointed Committee - 9 faculty chosen from appointments by Student Govt., Faculty Senate, and ?

ACADEMIC APPEALS BOARD

<i>Name</i>	<i>Academic Unit</i>	<i>Term Ends</i>
Denice Kirchoff	Nursing and Allied Health	2013
Jennifer Boggess	Fine Arts	2013
Connie Edwards	Fine Arts	2013
Gale Kirby	Nursing and Allied Health	2013
Julie Sellers	Language and Literature	2013
Robert Weaver	Business	2013

Teresa	Engebretson	Business	2014
Sharon	Smith	Education	2014
Amanda	Beafore	Nursing and Allied Health	2014
Jennifer	Yerdon-LeJeune	Fine Arts	2014
Mohamed	Alshallah	Business	2014
Peter	Lach	Fine Arts	2014

Appointed by Student Government

Dan	Gurash	Behavioral Science	2013
Jim	Weekley	Biology, Chemistry, Geoscience	2013
Pamela	Huggins	Biology, Chemistry, Geoscience	2013
Greg	Noone	Social Science	2013
Robert	Weaver	Business	2013
Vicki	Kerwin	Nursing and Allied Health	2013

n)



Presidential Search Faculty Feedback

Presidential Search Faculty Feedback

FSU Board of Governors Feedback Form Summary Results

This form was distributed during the faculty forums with the two candidates and was made available online on the FSU website after the forums. Fifteen faculty members completed the form for Dr. Rose, and eleven faculty members completed the form for Dr. O’Rourke. This survey asked respondents to rate each candidate on each item using a scale of 1 – 5, with 1 representing “No Evidence or Weak Evidence” and 5 representing “Strong Evidence.” This summary displays the average rating for each item, followed by the percentage of respondents for the most frequently selected response and the response in parentheses. The highest rating for each item is indicated in **Bold**.

Item	Dr. Rose	Dr. O’Rourke
1. Understanding of the structure and operations of higher education	4.87 86.7% (5)	4.45 63.6% (5)
2. Advocacy for higher education, especially in serving rural communities	4.40 66.7% (5)	3.55 45.4% (4)
3. Working familiarity with the legislative process	4.33 46.6% (5)	3.00 36.3% (1)
4. Appreciation for and sensitivity to the Appalachian culture and its people	4.13 66.7% (5)	3.73 45.4% (4)
5. Experience and accomplishment in institutional advancement/fundraising	4.00 66.7% (5)	4.00 54.5% (5)
6. Articulator and implementer of vision, mission and goals at an institutional level	4.07 53% (5)	4.18 45.4% 5
7. Financial/budget and administrative experience	4.60 80% (5)	4.27 45.4% (5)
8. Leadership experience	4.40 60% (5)	4.36 54.5% (5)
9. Experience in developing and implementing institutional initiatives; strategic planning experience	4.47 66.7% (5)	3.91 54.5% (5)
10. Scholarly and academic credentials and credibility	4.20 46.6% (5)	4.27 54.5% (5)
11. General communications skills	4.87 86.7% (5)	4.09 63.6% (4)
12. Interactions and comfort level with this constituency group	5.00 100% (5)	4.27 54.5% (4)
13. Understands the importance of recruiting, hiring and retaining quality faculty and staff	4.53 66.7% (5)	3.64 36.3% (4)
14. Understand the concerns of students and parents in making higher education affordable	4.53 73.3% (5)	3.73 36.3% (5)
15. Demonstrates commitment to community involvement and civic engagement	4.93 86.7% (5)	4.55 72.2% (5)
16. Demonstrates understanding of and commitment to diversity in all of its forms	4.40 73.3% (5)	2.64 36.3% (4)

17. Ability to represent FSU with dignity, credibility and enthusiasm in all forums and circumstances	4.87 86.6% (5)	4.00 36.3% (5)
18. Overall, I would rate the candidate: 5 (strong) to 1 (do not consider)	4.73 73.3% (5)	4.00 36.3% (4)

Faculty Senate Presidential Candidate Feedback Form Summary Results

This form was developed with input from faculty related to the characteristics they believe are important in the President of Fairmont State University. The form was distributed to all faculty via Survey Monkey (an online survey management platform) after both candidates had participated in a faculty forum. Thirty-one faculty members responded to the survey, comparing the two candidates on the characteristics identified by the faculty, and ranking the candidates as either their first or second choice. The most frequently selected response (on a scale of Very Strong, Strong, Somewhat Strong, Weak, Very Weak) for each candidate for each item is indicated, along with the percentage of respondents selecting that response.

1. Ability to analyze and provide solutions to management problems	58.1% Very Strong	33.3% Strong
2. Skill in attracting and working with talented leaders/managers	61.3% Very Strong	40.0% Strong
3. Understanding of financial management	63.3% Very Strong	48.0% Strong
4. Ability to effectively delegate authority and responsibility	56.7% Very Strong	45.8% Strong
5. Ability to articulate a vision for the institution and lead toward achievement of that vision	76.6% Very Strong	32.0% Very Strong
6. Undergraduate/graduate education	83.3% Very Strong	36.0% Very Strong
7. Research and creative scholarship	53.3% Very Strong	36.0% Very Strong
8. Engagement with the community and state	76.7% Very Strong	32.0% Strong
9. Shared governance	72.4% Very Strong	45.8% Somewhat Strong
10. Teaching excellence	79.3% Very Strong	39.1% Strong
11. Positive work environment	72.4% Very Strong	52.2% Strong
12. Positive campus climate	72.4% Very Strong	43.5% Strong
13. Accessibility to the campus and the broader community	72.4% Very Strong	39.1% Strong
14. Understanding of and demonstrated commitment to diversity and multi-cultural development	50.0% Very Strong	59.1% Strong

15. Ability to articulate complex issues to many different audiences (e.g. students, faculty, staff, alumni, state government)	71.4% Very Strong	58.3% Strong
16. Effectiveness in advocating for the university and its mission	78.6% Very Strong	58.3% Strong
17. Experience in and commitment to fund raising, including private, public, and corporate sectors	48.3% Very Strong	50.0% Strong
18. Commitment to excellence in all endeavors	72.4% Very Strong	37.5% Very Strong
19. Integrity	72.4% Very Strong	43.5% Strong
20. Articulate communicator	65.5% Very Strong	41.7% Strong
21. Excellent listening skills	73.1% Very Strong	45.5% Strong
22. Appropriate demeanor	85.7% Very Strong	43.5% Strong
23. Sense of humor	55.2% Very Strong	45.8% Strong
24. Ability to handle stress	59.3% Very Strong	54.5% Strong
25. Effective public presence	65.5% Very Strong	37.5% Strong
26. Humility	77.8% Very Strong	40.9% Somewhat Strong
27. Please rank the Presidential Candidates	73.3% First Choice	68.0% Second Choice

BOG Report Talking Points

Talking Points (refer the audience to the handout)

BOG Feedback Form

- The first set of summary results is from the feedback form developed for the Board of Governors and distributed to all constituent groups; both at the candidate forums and online on the FSU website after the forums. Cindy Curry, in Human Resources, collected and collated the results from this form.
- 15 faculty members responded to the form for Dr. Rose, 11 responded to the form for Dr. O'Rourke.
- This survey asked respondents to rate each candidate on each of the 18 items using a scale of 1 – 5, with 1 representing “No Evidence or Weak Evidence” and 5 representing “Strong Evidence.”
- This summary displays the average rating for each item, followed by the percentage of respondents for the most frequently selected response and the response in parentheses. The highest rating for each item is indicated in **Bold**.
- Only in response to item 10, which asked about “scholarly and academic credentials and credibility,” is Dr. O'Rourke rated more highly than Dr. Rose.
- The Board of Governors' feedback form also allowed faculty to provide open-ended comments on each candidate. Comments indicated that Dr. Rose's strengths include: **Her history and familiarity with FSU** - “She will hit the ground running. Please hire her and don't bring someone in from the outside who has no idea what FSU is all about.” **Her leadership style** – “Dr. Rose's thoughts and ideas parallel the needs of FSU perfectly. Not only did she present herself well, but her appreciation of and desire to move the U. in the right direction were very evident.” **Her performance as Interim President** - “Dr. Rose provided strong, stabilizing leadership in her interim role. We need continued stability and have absolutely no need for another change in leadership.” And “A marvelous asset to this institution. She has grown into the job of president. Failure to hire her would be a step backwards.”
- While the majority of comments were positive, one respondent raised concerns about Dr. Rose's leadership - “A good manager in general, though not necessarily good at choosing strong subordinates. Not strong on vision. Not a strong intellectual focus. Good fence-mender, not a ripple-maker. Understands the institution and its history very well. I think we need more vision and fresh ideas so would rather we went with someone from outside for this position.”
- Respondents' comments indicated that Dr. O'Rourke's strengths include: **His academic focus and credentials** – “Extremely knowledgeable, articulate, approachable. Projected a strong academic focus, interest in the life of the mind and the purpose of education. I appreciated this

and felt it would enhance our campus culture.” **His presentation style** – “...he was very articulate and engaging in his presentation.”

- While the comments regarding Dr. O’Rourke were generally positive, there were also concerns that he “might not fit our small institution” and that he “didn't seem to have a good idea of Fairmont State as an institution. He had not reviewed and could not intelligently comment on the Strategic Plan of the University. Many of his answers were generalities or platitudes...”

Faculty Senate Feedback Form

- The second set of results is from the feedback form developed by an ad hoc committee charged by the Faculty Senate with eliciting input from faculty members regarding the qualities and characteristics they were looking for in a President. This survey was distributed to all faculty members after the faculty forums with the candidates using Survey Monkey, an online survey management system.
- 31 faculty members responded to the survey, which asked respondents to rate each candidate on each characteristic as Very Strong, Strong, Somewhat Strong, Weak, Very Weak (there were no numeric values attached to responses).
- This summary displays the percentage of respondents selecting the most frequently selected response. The most positive rating for each item is indicated in **Bold**.
- Dr. Rose is rated more positively on all items, including the final item, which asked faculty members to indicate which candidate was their first choice.
- The results of both surveys indicate greater faculty support for Dr. Rose.

Faculty Welfare Committee Report

Faculty Welfare Committee
Final Report
2011-2012 Academic Year
Submitted 5/1/2012

Members: Alexis Hicks; Elizabeth Kirk; Frances Young, Steven Roof, Jennifer Yerdon LeJeune, Mark Flood, Valerie Morphew, Ashley Shroyer, Ellen Condron, Phillip Yeager, Tad Kato, John Fitch, Galen Hansen.

Chairperson: Craig White

- The Faculty Welfare committee had occasion to meet five different times during the spring semester of 2012. A subcommittee of the FWC met on two other occasions.
- John Schooley was asked to attend our meeting on Thursday, March 29th to discuss what he learned about a particular faculty club at a university in New England. Craig White has asked John to summarize his observations in a report which will be made available to the members of the FWC in the fall of 2012.
- The Faculty Club subcommittee met with Dr. Quentin Johnson on two occasions to discuss “possibilities” including the purpose, location, and benefits of a faculty club for students, parents, visitors, staff and, of course, faculty for FSU. This is something we may want to collaborate with Pierpont about in the near future. Ideas shared included the importance of a central (accessible location), the creation of a dining facility at the faculty club, the inclusion of small conference rooms for workshops, seminars, etc., the inclusion of a small computer facility, a general meeting area for conversational purposes and for faculty presentations should the occasion require, etc.
- Colleen Roberts attended our meeting on Tuesday January 31st, 2012 to discuss issues related to medical leave and short-term disability policies and procedures.
- The FWC entertained a discussion of the kinds of benefits which could be made available for retired faculty including parking privileges, access to campus facilities (at reduced cost when applicable), access to computer resources, etc.

- Galen Hansen has been following up on the short-term disability issue with the help of Cindy Curry. I have asked Galen to provide the FWC with a report which can be shared with the FWC in the fall of 2012.
- The Faculty Senate requested that we set up two informational forums pertaining to the debate about which faculty evaluation tool (IDEA versus Banner) we want to select for the students to use to evaluate faculty in the near future. The results of the forum were delivered to the senate during its April meeting.

The first forum was held on March 27th and the second on March 28th, 2012 and were facilitated by the Faculty Welfare Committee and Dr. Barbara Fallon. Approximately 20-25 total faculty members attended. An additional discussion of the issue took place during the meeting of the FWC on March 29th.

The summary of the deliberations which occurred during the FWC facilitated forums is as follows:

**Summary of Discussion
Faculty Welfare Committee
Faculty Forums
Banner versus IDEA**

Observations (Craig White): Attendance was good. Many ideas were put forth and discussed. Discussion seemed thorough and specific “themes” evolved. Here’s hoping I represented the deliberations accurately and was able to capture the major points effectively.

1. The need to clarify the purpose of student evaluation is crucial and the choice of an instrument should follow.
2. IDEA allows the instructor to compare his/her results to national norms and the Banner instrument does not.
3. If our goal is to simply give all students the opportunity to evaluate the instructor, the online instrument (Banner) should suffice.
4. If our goal is to provide the instructor with information that would allow him/her to improve instruction, then a paper version will be needed (Banner or IDEA) since the participation rate will be superior to an exclusive online response.
5. Are there innovative ways to scan the paper results directly into the IT computer (for example, from stations accessible to unit secretaries, after completed forms are delivered to the main unit office for scanning).
6. Do we need IT to effectively scan, compile, organize and categorize evaluation data or is there a better way?
7. Do we need to hire an independent director of faculty evaluation/assessment to get the job done (especially if we return to the paper form) since it is such a daunting task?

8. We may need to explore other types of instruments besides Banner and IDEA which best serve our goals after the purpose is clearly defined.
9. Banner seems, to some, to focus almost exclusively on the evaluation of the instructor and NOT on the evaluation of the course and this may be a strength of IDEA which focuses upon both.
10. Banner could be “enhanced” by including items related to the evaluation of the course.
11. Most believe that it is very important to get the response rate up in order to avoid “response error”.
12. We are not getting enough feedback from the online tool (Banner).
13. How are we going to use the results (reference to purpose)?
14. With Banner, if the student did not learn, he/she can point to instructor deficiencies.
15. There may be a tendency, using Banner, to see most returns online from students who were either very happy with the instructor or very disappointed with the instructor, but no sincere responses from the “mass in the middle”.
16. We might want to reserve a class period to have the entire class go to a computer lab and do the evaluation at one time (solve the response rate problem). There could be problems, however, scheduling lab access, since the evaluations would be concentrated in a narrow time window near the end of the semester.
17. Some feel that the IDEA items are too “sophisticated” and make it difficult for the students to respond effectively (in conveying their true perspectives).
18. It is too soon to choose either Banner or IDEA (or any other tool for that matter) until we thoroughly debate the important issues that were raised during the forums, such as achieving clarity regarding the question of purpose, or the possibilities of “enhancing the technology” (of either Banner or IDEA or another tool) required in collecting a high percentage of responses, etc.
19. Should we wait until a new president is decided upon since his/her input regarding the purpose issue is likely to be crucial or essential regarding which tool we choose?
20. Possible purposes might include:
 - a. Feedback for improving instruction.
 - b. Allowing students to “vent” and achieve catharsis.
 - c. Giving all students the opportunity to express their perceptions about the instructor.
 - d. Giving all students the opportunity to express their perceptions about the class.
 - e. Providing instructors with data they may use for applications for promotion and/or tenure.
 - f. Providing instructors with data they may use to bolster their self-reported merit information for annual performance evaluations.
 - g. Giving students a universal “check-off” opportunity to render an opinion without concern for the feedback element.
21. What about the use of a “combined” tool, taking the best of both Banner and IDEA?
22. Create a culture in which the results of evaluation are used in a positive and NOT a punitive way.
23. Should we use the instrument we decide upon in the context of developing a “process of improvement?”
24. Should we preserve banner online as simply a bureaucratic “check-off” device and encourage faculty to create their own “home-made” evaluation tool that emphasizes the qualitative

comments submitted in essay form by students and then “gathered up” and summarized for merit, promotion and tenure purposes, etc. by individual instructors?

25. There seemed to be substantial support for choosing “Not to Vote” on selecting one instrument or another at this juncture, since extensive deliberations and debate needs to happen about such things as purpose and information needs to be obtained regarding various technological options to enhance representation and participation.
26. Preserving the anonymity of the student respondent is very important and will enhance the rate of return.
27. Banner should be amended to include questions on the course.
28. There is a danger that Banner might be exploited as a tool for complaining or “griping” about the instructor and that this might compromise its usefulness for improving instruction.
29. Perhaps items on Banner could be reconfigured to focus on the generation of “instructor improvement” suggestions over the “venting” feature.
30. For many, the expense of IDEA seemed prohibitive.
31. Could students have access to the online evaluation if they do not show up for class on the day the paper evaluations are administered by the instructor (use of anonymous code numbers for one-time registration access would allow the best possible return percentage)?

Received by email:

1. IDEA will allow those who oversee adjunct faculty to assess their evaluations which will complement the overall evaluation system and this is not possible with Banner.
2. Our priority should be to “run with the Banner tool” since returning to the IDEA instrument would be disastrous and ignore all the reasons we decided to develop our own tool.
3. Forget the online evaluation approach. The data generated is insufficient to effectuate proper evaluation.
4. Use a simple method of evaluation. Three questions with a five point rating scale: 1) rate the course; 2) rate the professor and 3) rate the course materials.
5. IDEA is too expensive.
6. It’s NOT a good idea to march the students “en masse” over to the library to access computers during a class period for the evaluation.

Personnel Committee Report

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE : Senate Report for Academic Year 2011-2012

Members: Sharon Hiltz (Chair), Macgorine Cassell, Don Moroose, John O'Connor, Paul Reneau

Committee Business: The Personnel Committee met a number of times during the current academic year. All members were present for each of the meetings. Our charge was as follows:

*to review one application for sabbatical;

*to review five applications for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor;

*to review one application for promotion to Professor;

*to review one application for Faculty Emeritus status.

We came to majority decisions in each instance and forwarded our recommendations to the Provost.

Institutional Review Board Committee Report

Institutional Review Board
2011-2012
Year-End Report

I. Members:

Joseph Blankenship
Philip Freeman
James Matthews
Jennifer Myers
Julie Reneau

Paul Reneau
Aimee Richards
Clarence Rohrbaugh
Rhonda Sanford

II. Activities:

A. The committee reviewed applications for approval to conduct research involving human subjects from individuals planning projects for school courses, and faculty working on individual or departmental research projects.

1. Minimum risk IRB approval accepted on September 1, 2011 from Indiana University of Pennsylvania for Joshua Smallridge's dissertation research on Social learning and digital piracy.
2. Minimum risk IRB approval given to Douglas Powell, FSU faculty for study on Muscle fatigue in peripheral arter disease September 20, 2011.
3. Nine students in foundations of psychology submitted applications and were approved for minimal risk studies on October 17, 2011.
4. Minimum risk IRB approval given to Tadashi Kato, FSU faculty for his studies on Gregorian modes and on Nature sound research on October 28, 2011.
5. Minimum risk IRB approval given to Julie Sellers, FSU faculty for research on Service-learning as content-based language learning on November 28, 2011.
6. Minimum risk IRB approval given to John White, a student working with Dr. Kato for research on ANS function of coping imagery on December 15, 2011.
7. Fifteen students in Health and human performance submitted applications and were approved for minimal risk studies on February 15, 2012.
8. Minimum risk IRB approval given to Michael Kittle, a CJ graduate student, for his research on Cyberbullying on March 21, 2012.
9. Thirty-one students in foundations of psychology submitted applications and were approved for minimal risk studies on March 21, 2012.

B. The committee individually reviewed applications in .DOC, .RTF, or .PDF format sent over University email. Email was used by committee members to provide feedback on all applications.

Presidential Perception Committee Report

Presidential Perception Survey Committee Report
Academic Year 2011/2012

The Presidential Perception Survey Committee met twice during the academic year and communicated via e-mail over an extended period of time. The committee also meet with President Rose to discuss revision of the survey instrument. After meeting with President Rose and discussion among the members of the committee the instrument was revised.

The survey was disbursed to faculty on the 25th day of April and left open for a period of one week. A summary of results without open- ended comments is attached to this report. The full report including open-ended comments will be provided to President Rose.

All the members of the committee worked very hard, but special thanks go to Amy Sidwell for her work on the survey instrument.

Respectfully Submitted,

CAS

Chuck Shields, Chair

Legislative Advocacy Committee Report

2011-12 Annual Report

Legislative Advocacy Committee

During the 2011-12 academic year, several committee members had two meetings with President Rose to determine the important issues for this year's legislative session. The main legislative issues were to obtain start-up funding for the Master's in Architecture program and to include higher education along with K-12 in the bill to eliminate the Other Post Employment Benefits (OPEB) liability. The committee met one time to formulate the talking points for these two legislative issues and to prepare for the trip to the legislature to meet with many of the Senators on the Senate Education Committee and/or Senate Finance Committee.

There were several events for which some members of the Legislative Advocacy Committee traveled to Charleston. One event involved spending two days to lobby for the funding of the Master's in Architecture program and to include higher education in the OPEB bill. Other events included participation in Higher Education Day at the Legislature. A member attended the passage of the OPEB bill and the last day of the legislative session. Several members attended PEIA events to protest decreases in coverage. Members continue to attend local legislative events in support of FSU's interests.

Respectfully submitted,

Harry Baxter

Chair, Legislative Advocacy Committee

Library Committee Report

FSU Library Committee Report 2011-2012

Jaci,

Greetings from the FSU Library Committee,

The library committee met via electronic meeting in the fall of 2011 and in January held election for committee chair. The committee met April 19, 2012 and discussed New additions to the library, budget, the library hours and the effect the hours of operation have on the student body. The next scheduled meeting will be Sept 18 2012.

Regards

Deb Hoag

Library Committee Chair