The Faculty Senate met on Tuesday, March 28, 2006, at 5:00 p.m. in Beatty Center 115.

The minutes from the February 28 Senate meeting were approved.

Reports

Provost

Provost Elise Jorgens reported that a new round of strategic planning is set to begin at the College. This round of planning will explore where the College hopes to be in the next 5-10 years. Faculty members will soon be asked to participate in this process. The administration wants to be sure to put together a process that doesn’t ignore other types of planning that go on at the College. All voices should be heard, and there is plenty of room for new ideas.

Ms. Jorgens also informed faculty that Academic Affairs had written up an institutional profile that is available at both the website of the Chronicle of Higher Education and the College of Charleston website (http://www.cofc.edu/academicaffairs/). This document highlights the College’s location in the Lowcountry and the distinct programs the College is able to offer because of this location. The new round of planning will continue to identify programs of distinction at the College.

The Provost then invited questions from faculty members. Terry Bowers (English) brought up a brief discussion the Senate had at its last meeting about a new course proposal for MGMT 250: Business, Leadership and Society. The syllabus for this course states that all company analyses performed by students become the property of the professor. Mr. Bowers said that he’d asked around and discovered that such a practice may be illegal. He wondered if the College has a policy on this issue. Ms. Jorgens replied that she didn’t know, but would look into it. The College certainly needs to have some kind of stated policy concerning intellectual property, she said, adding that the College is in the process of searching for a new legal counsel. This person, when hired, might draft such a policy.

Carolyn Morales, Associate Vice President for Diversity

Carolyn Morales, the College’s new Associate Vice President for Diversity, introduced herself to the Senate and explained that her position is connected to the Office of the President. She has been charged with piecing together a comprehensive diversity plan at the College. She is currently working with the Diversity Council to set up subcommittees on specific issues concerning diversity. She also announced that the College is soon to receive a gift directed toward increasing diversity; she is working to establish an advisory council which will review proposals about how the gift should be used.
David Katz, Assistant Treasurer

College of Charleston Assistant Treasurer David Katz reported that, in the fall semester, a new policy to enforce student payment of tuition will be instituted. Students who do not pay by the August 11 deadline will be dropped from their courses for non-payment. Although they may re-register immediately, these students will have no guarantee of getting back into the classes they’d originally registered for. Mr. Katz asked faculty members to remind students to check their Edisto e-mail accounts regularly. He also asked for suggestions about what kind of post-drop process his office should institute.

Mark Lazzaro (Biology) asked some procedural questions about dropping students. As a department chair, he wants to know when students have paid so that he can let them get back into courses they might have been shut out of. He also wondered if there would be one time when the Treasurer’s Office drops lots of people. If so, he asked if a list of dropped students in particular majors could be forwarded to department chairs. Mr. Katz replied that his office can do both of these things and is, in fact, working right now on these issues.

Reid Wiseman (At-Large, Biology) asked if there would be big signs on campus to apprise students of the new policy. Mr. Katz assured him that his office plans to notify students and parents repeatedly by e-mail before dropping students from classes, and that there will indeed be signs on campus as well.

The Provost spoke next, urging faculty members to take this matter seriously. She believes we are giving students a terrible lesson if we continue to allow them to take classes without paying. She is very supportive of this new policy, though she recognizes that the first time students are dropped, it might be an administrative nightmare. The problem should die down, however, in subsequent semesters.

Mr. Lazzaro then suggested that it might make more sense if students aren’t allowed to re-enroll in courses until they pay. Mr. Katz replied that the administration doesn’t want to make students leave school; rather, they want students to get into financial compliance. Kay Smith, Associate Vice-President of the Academic Experience, added that once a student is dropped from his or her schedule, that student’s bill disappears. The student has to re-enroll to generate a new bill. Mr. Lazzaro then asked whether students or parents were financially at fault. Mr. Katz replied that it was a combination. Some students can’t pay, others won’t. Some simply bank the money to try to earn interest.

Calvin Blackwell (Economics and Finance) asked whether the Treasurer’s Office anticipated that students would sit out the fall semester. Mr. Katz replied that they might, but that his office will work with anyone who calls and tries to work out a payment plan. Mr. Blackwell pointed out that once a student is dropped from courses in the School of Business, the chance of getting back in goes to zero. Mr. Katz acknowledged this possibility, pointing out that students will be warned in e-mails that they might not be able to graduate on time if they miss payment deadlines. He then ended the discussion by
saying that he’d send an e-mail to faculty members, letting them know where they can post suggestions for making the drop process run as smoothly as possible.

**Speaker**

Speaker of the Faculty Bob Mignone thanked the organizing committee of the College Identity discussion for its successful forum Friday afternoon, March 24. He also thanked Claire Curtis for making the original motion that instigated this discussion. In addition, Mr. Mignone announced that, in his role as Speaker, he will help organize the process by which faculty will participate in the next stage of strategic planning. Finally, he reminded faculty members to think about how to handle the transition to the new grading policy. In his spring newsletter, he will outline several specific models that might be used.

**New Business**

**Curriculum Committee**

The Speaker then recognized Agnes Southgate, Chair of the Curriculum Committee, who moved several curriculum proposals (see Appendix I):

During discussion of the new course proposals for the Interdisciplinary Comparative Literature Minor, Reid Wiseman (At-Large, Biology), ever vigilant about language use, suggested we stop referring to “capstone” courses, which he said reminded him of what you put over people when you bury them. He suggested “keystone” as a more elegant metaphor to describe these culminating courses.

Next, Glenn Lesses (Philosophy) proposed the following friendly amendments to the proposal for a new Interdisciplinary Comparative Literature Minor:

**IV. Administration of the Minor, p. 6**

Insert first sentence:
The minor will be co-sponsored by the School of Languages, Cultures, and World Affairs and the School of Humanities and Social Sciences.

Change next sentence to:
It will be administered through two . . .

p. 7, replace sentence:
The Program Director will be appointed by the Steering Committee. . .

with
The Program Director will be recommended by the Steering Committee and appointed by the deans for a term . . .

**Administration of the Minor, p. 11**
Insert first sentence:
The minor will be co-sponsored by the School of Languages, Cultures, and World Affairs and the School of Humanities and Social Sciences.

Change next sentence to:
It will be administered through two . . .

p. 12, replace sentence:
The Program Director will be recommended by the Steering Committee and appointed by the Dean . . .

with
The Program Director will be recommended by the Steering Committee and appointed by the deans for a term . . .

Terry Bowers (English), who brought the proposal, said that while he supported Mr. Lesses’ amendments, he would like to have a vote on them, so that anyone who disagreed could voice their objections. Mick Norton (Mathematics) asked whether the amendments really got at administrative issues. Mr. Lesses replied that they did because the program director will come from one of the two schools and the dean of one of the schools will have to appoint this person. Mr. Lesses’ proposed amendments passed on a voice vote.

Discussion then turned back to the main proposal (for a new Interdisciplinary Minor in Comparative Literature). Joe Kelly (English) said that he supported the minor but was concerned about the list of ten duties for the program director, many of which would have to be performed during the regular semester, and the $1500 summer stipend, which he felt was inadequate. A general problem with interdisciplinary minors, he added, is a lack of support. The Provost replied to Mr. Kelly’s concerns, pointing out that her office is in the process of reviewing the duties and compensation of all program directors, a task they hope to accomplish as soon as possible. Discussion ended, and the proposal passed.

Speaker of the Faculty Bob Mignone announced that the new major in Supply Chain Management is currently being reviewed by the Planning and Budget Committees. An oversight on the forms rather than negligence by those proposing the new major had caused this step to be omitted previously. The proposal will come back to the Senate at the April 11 meeting. Mr. Mignone also announced that he is currently looking into the possibility of streamlining the curriculum process.

None of the other curriculum proposals elicited discussion. All of the motions brought by the Curriculum Committee passed.

Committee on Graduate Education

The Senate approved the new course proposal for FREN 630: Seminar in French Language Study.

Faculty Welfare Committee—Motion to Make SCIP Evaluation Results Available to Faculty Members
The Speaker recognized Claire Curtis of the Faculty Welfare Committee who made the following motion:

The motion:
The faculty welfare committee moves that results for SCIP evaluations be made available to each faculty member for their classes.

Rationale:
We feel that if the faculty are going to be evaluated they should have access to the results, the same as the students.

The motion passed with no discussion.

Faculty Educational Technology Committee—Recommendation on Online Student Evaluation of Classes

The Speaker recognized Myra Seaman and Christophe Boucher of the Faculty Educational Technology Committee who made the following recommendation (see Appendix II for a full rational of this recommendation):

Recommendation
The FETC recommends that the Senate support the implementation of online student evaluation of classes.

Meg Cormack (Religious Studies) began the discussion by asking how and when students would fill out online course evaluations. Ms. Seaman replied that students would complete evaluations on Cougar Trail, during the same two week period that currently exists to complete paper evaluations.

George Hopkins (History) then asked what concerns have been raised about online evaluations and what the committee’s response to these concerns is. Ms. Seaman said that the biggest concern involved response rates. The goal of online evaluations is to eventually get a better response rate than paper evaluations since a student’s absence from a course on a particular day won’t negate their ability to evaluate. Yet, Ms. Seaman acknowledged that, initially, response rates using online evaluations would be lower than with paper evaluations. At other institutions that use online methods of evaluation, the best way to increase response rates seems to be encouragement from faculty across campus rather than some kind of punitive measure for not responding. Ms. Seaman then added that another large concern has been how electronic evaluations will affect faculty members coming up for tenure, promotion, and third year review. Mr. Boucher pointed out that we can pilot a small online evaluation project first, in order to work out some of the concerns before instituting online evaluations college-wide.

The Speaker then recognized David Gleeson (History), who said that the Citadel has recently adopted online evaluations and that the response rate has been “disastrous.”
Though they are talking about moving to a compulsory method of evaluation at the Citadel, Mr. Gleeson opposes this because he believes students should be free not to respond if they wish. He also expressed concern that it seemed to him a pilot program was not simply a possibility, but had already been decided on at the College. Ms. Seaman responded by pointing out that, in the research she’s seen, 3-5 years is often cited as the amount of time needed to get the response rate for online evaluations back up to the rate for paper evaluations.

Todd Grantham (Philosophy) spoke in favor of what he called a “mindful” pilot program. He fears the strongly bi-modal responses that might result from online evaluations (that only students with extreme reactions, whether positive or negative would bother to evaluate a course). He pointed out that these are the troubling type of responses one sees at websites such as RateMyProfessor.com. Ms. Seaman responded that her committee wants people to realize that the type of information collected in online evaluations might be different in the beginning than that collected by paper evaluations.

Michael Skinner (EDFS) pointed out that the experience of evaluating a course online would be qualitatively different for students than evaluating a course in a classroom setting. Students might get together, talk about evaluations, etc. The results could be very different. Although he commended the committee’s work, Mr. Skinner said that he’s not very supportive of the recommendation because of these reasons. He also asked whether research exists that studies evaluations done of the same course using different methods. Evaluation is a very important issue for people coming up for review. Mr. Boucher responded that, even in the classroom, students could get together and talk about evaluations. He suggested that maybe students would feel less pressure to conform with online evaluations than with evaluations conducted in the classroom. Mr. Skinner re-emphasized that the experiences are different and would generate different responses.

Daryl Phillips (Classics, German, Italian, Japanese, Russian) then pointed out that the committee had done a good job in identifying the benefits of online evaluation. Yet, his department was in unusual agreement in opposing the recommendation for the following reasons:
--Currently, there are no time or space limits set on online evaluations. This invites students who feel passionately to write a lot. Skewed results would arise from these very passionate responses.
--It’s dangerous to do a pilot program that involves a small number of faculty. Under such a program, what would happen to the cross-department and cross-school comparisons we receive? Comparing courses evaluated on-line to courses evaluated on paper is troubling and unfair.
--While the 3-5 year adjustment period may seem short to some, to others those years are crucial and may mean tenure.
Finally, while Mr. Phillips said he would like to save trees, he does not think the recommendation is faculty-friendly at this point.

Melissa Hughes (Biology) argued that she studies behavior and doesn’t think that the data obtained from online evaluations will be meaningful if the only motivation for students to
evaluate courses is a desire to participate. She suggested that all students be required to go to Cougar Trail to either evaluate or to specifically opt out of evaluating. We could withhold grades until they do so. Otherwise, the data will be about as meaningful as that obtained by RateMyProfessor.com.

Mick Norton (Mathematics) added that, in online evaluations, the middle responses (students who don’t feel strongly either way about a course) would not be represented. Charles Kaiser (At-Large, Psychology) asked whether the committee had examined any well-controlled research studies that compare online evaluations with paper evaluations. Elizabeth Jurisich (Mathematics) responded that we haven’t examined any well-controlled studies for the type of evaluation we do now.

Sarah Owens (Hispanic Studies) then called the question, arguing that points were starting to be repeated. The Senate voted down calling the question, so discussion continued.

Mark Lazzaro (Biology) asked whether anyone had asked students their opinions about online evaluations. At this point, the Speaker recognized student James Eby, a member of the Faculty Educational Technology Committee. Mr. Eby said students are strongly in favor of the recommendation. The SGA passed an almost unanimous resolution endorsing online evaluations. Students have a stake in the process—they don’t want to see “lousy” teachers get tenure. Mr. Eby also pointed out that he has witnessed many points of failure in the current system of evaluation. Melissa Hughes asked Mr. Eby what he thought the odds were that students would actually participate in online evaluations. He replied that he thought participation would be low at first, but would return to normal rates after the 3-5 year adjustment period. Students, he added, want the evaluation process to be voluntary and anonymous.

Julia Eichelberger (At-Large, English) then asked if anyone had considered a paper evaluation system that used only bubble-in responses. Comments could be added later online. Then, the paper forms would not have to be retained after the results were calculated. Ms. Seaman replied that the burden lies in producing and distributing paper forms, not only in maintaining them. She added that her committee is recommending that online evaluations be debated, discussed, and considered, that the door not be shut against them.

Gerry Gonsalves (Management and Entrepreneurship) expressed concerns about the two-week window during which students could complete online evaluations. He thought evaluations should be done only after a course if fully completed. Ms. Seaman responded that a similar two-week window currently exists in the system we use now.

Meg Cormack (Religious Studies) commented that part of her problem with the recommendation is its generality. While she’s willing to hear more about the issue, she doesn’t want to support online evaluations at this point. She would be more comfortable with a more specific proposal. Ms. Seaman pointed out that the actual process for how online evaluations would work is being pursued by a different committee. The Faculty
Educational Technology Committee was brought in to determine whether further investigations into online evaluations should continue. She hopes that faculty members do become involved in further discussions of this issue.

George Pothering (At-Large, Computer Science) said that he would hate to see the possibility of online evaluations die without being tested. He volunteered to serve as a guinea pig in a pilot program, pointing out that if we don’t give online evaluations a chance, we’ll never know if they could have worked.

Glenn Lesses (Philosophy) argued that the way the motion had been described by Ms. Seaman (as something that should be debated and considered further) sounds more like a report than an actual motion or recommendation. He moved to table the recommendation until the committee comes up with a more specific process. Then the Senate could vote on a specific document. Ms. Seaman asked for clarification about what the FETC was specifically being asked to do, reminding the Senate that her committee (the FETC) is not the committee that is actually developing the process for online evaluations. Melissa Hughes spoke next; she said she was also uncomfortable voting for the recommendation as it’s currently worded, suggesting the FETC come back with a proposal that says faculty would be willing to support online course evaluations if our concerns are met. Erin Beutel (Geology) pointed out that the current document recommends that the Senate support the implementation of online student evaluation of classes. The language of implementation is the problem, and that’s why we’re asking for a new proposal.

A vote on the recommendation was taken, and Mr. Lesses’ motion to refer the recommendation back to the Faculty Educational Technology Committee passed.

Post-Tenure Review Committee—Proposed Additions to Procedures for Post-Tenure Review

The Speaker then recognized Mick Norton of the Post-Tenure Review Committee, who proposed the following additions to procedures for post-tenure review:

Add item

O. 2. a. (8): A late packet will not be considered for a superior rating except in extraordinary circumstances. A letter must accompany the packet to explain these circumstances.

Add item

O. 6. f.: Appealing a Satisfactory Rating
A candidate who receives a satisfactory rating when having sought a superior rating and who alleges that the rating was based upon discrimination, violation of academic freedom or violation of due process may follow the appeals procedure outlined in item O. 6. c. (1).
If the candidate feels that the satisfactory rating received is incorrect due to reasons other than those outlined in section O. 6. c. (1), a formal appeal is not allowed. However, upon the candidate’s request, the candidate will be allowed to undergo one “successive” post-tenure review the following year and to modify the packet so as to better document the case for a superior rating. The candidate is allowed to modify statements on teaching, research and service, to include additional or different peer letters, and, generally, to strengthen the packet with the kinds of evidence outlined in section O. 2. a. However, other than the fact that the vita included in the packet shall be current, the evidence in the packet shall cover the same six-year period that was covered in the prior year’s review. A candidate’s post-tenure review cycle does not change as the result of undergoing a successive post-tenure review, and no further reviews covering the same six-year period are allowed.

After the Senate decided to handle the two items separately, the floor was opened to discussion on the issue of late packets. Joe Kelly (At-Large, English) asked whose job it was to decide if a late packet met the criteria for “extraordinary circumstances.” Mr. Norton replied that the Post-Tenure Review Committee would decide. Mr. Kelly then proposed a friendly amendment be added to the proposal which would make this point explicit. Mr. Norton accepted the friendly amendment.

The Senate voted on the issue of late packets, and the change in procedure passed.

The floor was then opened for discussion on the issue of the appeals process. Bob Perkins (EDFS) asked why the Hearings Committee was not chosen to hear appeals. Mr. Norton replied that the Hearings Committee *does* hear cases that involve discrimination, violation of academic freedom, or violation of due process. No process currently exists, however, for people who simply disagree with decisions made by the Post-Tenure Review Committee.

Glenn Lesses (Philosophy) spoke next, arguing that he was uncomfortable with the appeal proposal because it bureaucratizes the process. Mr. Lesses does not believe that a candidate’s failure to get a desired outcome in the post-tenure review process is a good reason for an appeal. No such process exists during the tenure and promotion review. Mr. Lesses would prefer to see appeals allowed only on the basis of discrimination, violation of academic freedom, or violation of due process. Mr. Norton replied that tenure is an “up or out” review process. But when undergoing review for promotion to full professor, candidates have the option to come up again the very next year if they disagree with a decision, or if they add to their record. Mr. Lesses pointed out that candidates can also choose to come up again in six years under the current post-tenure review process. The $2500 reward is a one-time benefit.
The issue was then brought to a vote. The Senate approved the change in the appeals process.

Scott Peeples (on behalf of the Amnesty International student group)—Resolution Regarding the Contract with Coca Cola

The Speaker recognized Scott Peeples (English) who introduced a resolution written by the student group Amnesty International that urges the College of Charleston not to renew its exclusive vending contract with the Coca-Cola Corporation. (For the full resolution, see Appendix III). Mr. Peeples pointed out that the students who brought this resolution have worked on the project since August. Among other things, they collected 600 signatures on a petition, screened a documentary three times, brought in speakers, and held a tele-conference. Mr. Peeples then introduced students Kristen Neumann-Martiensen and Jess Berens who gave a power point presentation pointing out what they believe to be human rights violations the Coca-Cola Company has committed in Columbia, South America.

Because of time constraints (it was 7:00 and the room was needed by another group), the Speaker ended the meeting before discussion of the resolution or the usual Constituents’ Concerns portion of the meeting could take place. Mr. Mignone directed that the Amnesty International resolution would be the first order of old business taken up at the next Senate meeting, on April 11.

The meeting adjourned at 7:05.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan Farrell
Faculty Secretary
Appendix I: Curriculum Proposals

A) School of Languages, Cultures, and World Affairs
- New Interdisciplinary Comparative Literature Minor

- New course proposals:
  1. CPLT 200 Introduction to Comparative Literature
  2. CPLT 400 Comparative Literature Capstone

- Change a course: LTFR 250. Change title and description to better define content

B) Latin American Studies:
- Changes in degree requirements to the major: add LTPO 150, LTPO 270 and LTPO 280 to CORE II list
- Changes in degree requirements to the minor: add LTPO 150, LTPO 270 and LTPO 280 to CORE II list

C) Anthropology:
- New course proposals:
  1. ANTH 342: Human Behavior and Evolution
  2. ANTH 352: Folklore of Ireland and the British Isles

D) Economics and Finance:
- Change a course: FINC 380. Change title, description and prerequisites

- New course proposal: FINC 381

E) Hispanic Studies:
- Change a course:
  1. SPAN 315, 316, 317, 318, 320, 322, 323, 326, 327, 344, 381 and 382. Change in prerequisites to include SPAN 312 or 328 as alternatives
  2. SPAN 400. Change in prerequisites

F) English:
- New course proposal: ENGL 2XX: Writing Song Lyrics

G) Women's and Gender Studies Program:
- New course proposal: WMST 381: Women’s and Gender Studies Internship

H) Biology:
- Change a course: For Biol 310 Microbiology, Biol 312 Molecular Biology, Biol 313 Cell Biology and Biol 321 General and Comparative Physiology: Change prerequisite to add 1 year of chemistry. This was part of the original prerequisites before last year’s curriculum changes, and was an omission.

- Changes in degree requirements to the major:
Degree: Bachelor of Science with concentration in Molecular Biology. The total number of hours in the major should be changed from 35 to 34. This was a miscalculation

I) Marketing & Supply Chain Management:
- New major proposal: Supply Chain Management
Appendix II: Full Recommendation on Online Student Evaluation of Classes

To: College of Charleston Faculty Senate  
From: Faculty Educational Technology Committee  
Re: Recommendation on Online Student Evaluation of Classes  
Date: 15 March 2006  

Recommendation
The FETC recommends that the Senate support the implementation of online student evaluation of classes.

Rationale
We value the intent and purpose of the College’s evaluation system.
The current paper-and-pencil delivery mechanism has weaknesses that can be addressed by an online delivery system.
The financial, physical and technical resources are available to implement online evaluations.
An online delivery system can provide additional formative and summative features that will benefit faculty, students and the institution.

Presented by the FETC members:
Christophe Boucher, History  
Sara Davis, Education  
James Eby, Student  
Allen Lyndrup, Theatre  
James Neff, Physics  
Myra Seaman, English (Chair)  
Jared Seay, Library  
Chris Starr, Computer Science
Purpose of Student Evaluation of Classes

The College has been evaluating courses and instructors under the current system since the early 1990s.

Pedagogically, many faculty members find the student evaluations of classes to be an important source of information for measuring the success of classroom strategies and student satisfaction.

Institutionally, these evaluations are an important part of annual reviews and of the tenure and promotion process.

More recently, one purpose of student evaluation of classes is to meet external requirements placed on the College by the SC Commission on Higher Education (CHE), which mandates that each institution conduct evaluations of all sections of every course every semester (except those with a single student enrolled or those courses coded “independent study”).

Limitations of the paper-and-pencil delivery system

- The current procedure rests on a manual multi-step delivery system for dissemination. By the time the final copies of the evaluations reach the faculty, the original form has transited back and forth between no less than 3 offices on campus (ACTS, AAPA, Departments) and various other intermediaries including faculty, staff, and students. At this point, there are too many gaps in the system and too many places where evaluation forms can be lost, momentarily misplaced, misused, or incorrectly administered. In such conditions, confidentiality and privacy can also both be compromised given how many junctures there are for information failure.

  - The process for preparing, delivering and tabulating the paper evaluations is slow, spanning over 15 weeks, prohibiting professors from obtaining results in a timely manner.
  - The current process involves a great deal of labor in each of the various offices involved and represents therefore an excessive burden on the College.
  - Each semester too many classes remain unevaluated, placing the College in jeopardy of a CHE fine (which could be as high as $500,000) for non-compliance with the CHE mandate cited above.

  - The process is inflexible and changes are expensive (e.g., new print plates).
  - Open-ended (comment) questions are hand written and compromise the student’s privacy and anonymity.
  - Results are presented in a paper format that is difficult for both faculty and chairs to use.
• If the forms are lost, numerical results can be duplicated, but comments cannot be retrieved.

• Issues such as reprints, “double bubbling,” incorrect forms being distributed, use of old or “doctored” forms, etc., render results invalid and are of no benefit to the professor or the institution.

• In-class evaluations use valuable class time.

• The process is expensive, necessitating the use of up to 70,000 evaluation forms per semester not including paper copies issued later to faculty. Since the current printer is 22 years old and will go out of service in May 2006, the College will have to spend tens of thousands of dollars to replace it, placing an additional financial burden on our institution.

Development of Online Student Evaluation of Classes at the College

In response to faculty expression of interest in transitioning to online delivery of student evaluations, a committee of faculty and administrators was formed in January 2001 to investigate the topic. For the following five years, the committee researched and analyzed existing systems as well as the results those systems generated. This information was considered in terms of the history of student evaluations of classes at the College, local uses of the evaluations and the data they generate, and needs of the main audiences – faculty, staff, and students – involved.

Upon discovering that only a former Faculty Educational Technology Committee, but not the Faculty Senate itself, had expressed support of the online student evaluation system being proposed, the committee suspended its work. At that point, a trial run that had been scheduled for Spring 2006 was postponed. Instead, the committee pursued faculty support for the system. Faculty Senate President Bob Mignone in Fall 2005 charged the FETC with investigating online student evaluation of classes generally, and the particular version of them being prepared at the College, to return in Spring 2006 with its recommendation.

Proposed Online Delivery of Student Evaluation of Classes

The culmination of five years of extensive research and implementation has replicated the current system utilizing an online delivery mechanism with the following characteristics:

• Via Cougar Trail, students will be able to view and evaluate only their own classes.

• Students will be able to evaluate each class only one time.

• Students will not be able to view course evaluation results.

• Students will be able to evaluate classes only during the last two weeks of the semester; this schedule closely corresponds with the current time frame for student evaluation of classes.
Online evaluation would be available only to those classes consisting of more than two students and those not coded as independent study.

The proposed online student evaluation system addresses several issues elicited from the five-year study and faculty response.

- The Cougar Trail system will ensure anonymity between student and professor, privacy of response, and confidentiality even in open-ended response formats.
- Student participation will be optional, as it is now, but student absence from class will no longer prohibit individual participation.
- Research indicates that response rates will decrease initially. However, research also indicates that rates increase in response to coordinated efforts among student groups and instructors.

**Implementation Options**

**Full Implementation**

The Online Evaluation System would be fully implemented and completely replace the current paper-and-pencil system. The system could be operational and accessible through Cougar Trail as early as Fall 2006. The evaluation process would be open only during the last two weeks of classes, mirroring as closely as possible the current evaluation system. Current Cougar Trail hours are 8 a.m. until 11:45 p.m. Monday through Thursday, 8 a.m. through midnight on Friday, all day Saturday, and 12 a.m.-11:45 p.m. Sunday. Hours for evaluation access can be further restricted.

**Pilot Project: Partial implementation of Online Evaluation System**

A subset of the faculty would use the online student evaluation system during the evaluation process (instead of the paper system), while the rest of the faculty uses the current paper-and-pencil system. This could be implemented as early as the fall semester 2006.

**Benefits of Online Evaluation**

The first version of the online student evaluation system would be intended to replicate the paper-based evaluation system with no changes in questions or format. Some changes will result directly from the electronic means of delivery. These include the following:

**Immediate benefits**

For Instructors:

- Student comments are returned immediately after the semester ends for formative use before the next semester starts.
- All student comments are legible even if they remain unintelligible.
• Student comments are typed to better preserve anonymity.
• Results are returned electronically in a form ready for printing.
• Results are returned electronically in a form for analysis and graphing.
• System integrity is increased (encryption of data, no hand-manipulation of forms).
• Faculty will not miss access to student feedback due to student absences.
• Business processes are simplified (do not have to remember to take the evaluations to class).
• Security is increased (faculty do not have to depend on one student to execute the process in class and return the forms on behalf of the instructor).
• Class time is recovered.

For Students:
• Student anonymity will increase because comments will be typed.
• SCIP responses will be available before registration for the next semester.
• A student will not miss an opportunity to complete an evaluation due to a class absence.
• Every student will have access to the evaluation forms for their classes.
• Students will not be able to bubble in more than one response to each question.

For the Institution:
• System integrity is increased (via data security and student anonymity).
• System reliability increases (with simplified business process).
• Data validity is increased (by eliminating opportunities for cheating).

Future Benefits
Once the first version is in place, the faculty could consider adding features to the online system. Examples of features enabled by the online delivery mechanism include the following:

Options to consider for future versions of the online student evaluation system:
• The number of days and the hours per day, during which the evaluations are available, can be adapted to improve the system.
• Comment boxes can have a spell checker to improve anonymity of student comments.
• Each faculty member could add questions to the evaluation specific to a course or section.
• Each department and school could add questions to the evaluation.
• Program assessment questions can be included for learning/accreditation standards.
• Data is stored electronically allowing instructors and administrators to analyze trends over time.
• The system can remind and encourage students to complete their evaluations.
• A report of the response rate can be sent to instructors during the evaluation period to allow instructors to encourage student participation.
• The evaluation system can automatically generate the T&P section on course evaluations at any time.
• Instructors can insert comments into evaluations and evaluation summaries (perhaps explaining how they plan to respond to or improve the course).
Online Student Evaluation of Classes
Selected Bibliography


Appendix III: Resolution Regarding the Contract with Coca-Cola

College of Charleston Faculty Senate Resolution regarding the Contract with Coca-Cola

WHEREAS paramilitary groups have threatened, kidnapped, tortured, and murdered union workers at Coca-Cola bottling plants in Colombia; and

WHEREAS a fact-finding delegation of labor, educator and student representatives led by New York City Council member Hiram Monserrate concluded that the Coca-Cola corporation’s “complicity in the situation is deepened by its repeated pattern of bringing criminal charges against union activists who have spoken out about the company’s collusion with paramilitaries” (Final Report dated April 2004, p. 1); and

WHEREAS credible reports have also charged Coca-Cola with irresponsible business practices elsewhere, including: using sugar harvested through hazardous child labor in El Salvador; illegal salary reductions and unsafe working conditions in Guatemala; and the theft of common water resources and consequent depredations to subsistence agriculture in the Indian province of Kerala; and

WHEREAS the Coca-Cola Corporation currently holds an exclusive vending rights contract with the College of Charleston that eliminates competition from other soft drink manufacturers while encouraging members of our campus community to subsidize human rights violations and environmental degradation by purchasing Coca-Cola products; and

WHEREAS, as educators at a liberal arts and sciences institution, College of Charleston faculty are deeply committed to protecting human rights and promoting environmental responsibility;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

That the Faculty call upon the Administration not to renew the College of Charleston’s exclusive vending contract with the Coca-Cola Corporation; and

That the Faculty request that President Higdon send a letter to Edward E. Potter, Director of Global Labor Relations and Workplace Accountability, and E. Neville Isdell, Chairman of the Board of Directors and C. E. O. of the Coca-Cola Corporation, stating the College of Charleston’s intention not to renew its contract and urging the Coca-Cola Corporation to

- Denounce the violence that has occurred in the name of Coca-Cola in Colombia;
• Reinforce Coca-Cola’s public stance against violence by directing all bottling plants in Colombia to stop dealing with any armed groups that are participating in violence against trade unionists;

• Respect the fundamental rights to free association and to organize trade unions, as reflected in Colombian law, Article 22 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, as well as Conventions 87 and 88 of the International Labor Organization;

• Provide compensation to known victims of violence at Coca-Cola bottling plants.