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The Faculty Senate of Armstrong Atlantic State University will meet in University Hall, room 156, at 12:10 p.m., Monday September 8, 2008.

AGENDA

I. Call to Order

II. Approval of Minutes

III. Comments
   A. Flow Chart Presentation on Order of Operations       Pat Thomas & Jewell Anderson

IV. New Business
   A. Final Report on e-FACE from the 07-08 Evaluation Committee
      (see Appendix A)

   B. Committee Chair Reports
      1. Academic Appeals                                      Lee Williams
      2. Educational Technology                                Linda Wright
      3. Faculty Development                                   Nancy Remler
      4. Faculty Welfare                                       Hans-Georg Erney
      5. Honors Advisory                                        David Lake
      6. International                                          Ned Rinalducci
      7. Interdisciplinary Studies                              Teresa Winterhalter
      8. Library                                                Joan Schwartz
      9. Planning, Budget, & Facilities                         David Wheeler
     10. Research & Scholarship                                Brad Sturz
     11. Student Success                                       Becky da Cruz
     12. Writing                                                Judy Dubus
     13. Graduate Affairs                                      Chris Henricks
     14. University Curriculum                                 Rick McGrath

V. Announcements

VI. Adjournment
Appendix A

Faculty Evaluation Committee - Report on E-FACE pilot study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty Number</th>
<th>Paper &amp; Pencil Quality of Instruction Rating¹</th>
<th>Paper &amp; Pencil Percent Response Rate</th>
<th>E-FACE Quality of Instruction Rating¹</th>
<th>E-FACE Percent Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

1. For the question “Which of the following most closely reflects your judgment about the quality of instruction you have received in this course?”
   ___ excellent, ___ very good, ___ good, ___ fair, ___ poor

   The percent of students responding “excellent” was multiplied by 4, the percent of students responding “very good” was multiplied by 3, the percent of students responding “good” was multiplied by 2, the percent responding “fair” was multiplied by 1, and the percent responding “poor” was multiplied by 0 to arrive at the individual faculty member’s “quality of instruction rating.” The individual quality of instruction ratings were then averaged.

2. The Quality of Instruction rating did not differ significantly between paper and pencil and e-FACE, $t_{(9)} = -1.57$, $p > .05$.

3. The response rate differed significantly between paper and pencil (Mean = 63.0%) and e-FACE (Mean = 33.6%), $t_{(9)} = 6.47$, $p < .0001$. 