Faculty Evaluation Task Force Minutes for August 4, 2016
Meeting at Meramec Campus, BA 219L, 2:00 pm

Attendance: Emily Neal, David Shields, Doug Hurst, Dennis White, Lonetta Oliver, Deborah Char, Layla Goushey, Dustin Sweet, Bob Thumith, Ame Mead-Roach, Andrew Langrehr (co-chair), Jeff Papier (co-chair)

1. Approval of Agenda
   The meeting agenda was modified to some degree, to better meet the needs of the group. “Architecture/Big Picture of Proposed Faculty Evaluation System” was tabled until the next meeting; “Styles of Faculty Evaluation” was added.

2. Approval of Minutes
   The minutes for the July 13, 2016 meeting were approved.

3. STLCC Evaluation Systems – Other Employee Groups
   For purposes of comparison, the group reviewed the Performance Appraisal-Assessment form which has been in use at STLCC for Administrative, Professional, Classified and Physical Plant personnel. The form has been in use for about two years. It was noted that the current faculty evaluation system already assesses some of the categories included on this form. Bob pointed out that because the form is electronic, professional development needs can be easily captured in an aggregated way, leading to in-house workshops to meet those needs. The same could be true of an all-electronic faculty evaluation system. The group discussed the need to tie the new faculty evaluation system as a whole to the College’s strategic objectives; individual faculty members could also show as part of their individual evaluations the ways in which they have met certain of the objectives.

4. Styles of Faculty Evaluation
   Ame led a discussion regarding varying styles of faculty evaluation. In particular, she suggested that in a new system, the summative (transactional, “HR”) and formative (“professional growth”) components of evaluation could occur on different timelines. The formative portion could be integrated into the Article 32, promotion and sabbatical application processes, and clearly demonstrate how a faculty member intends to grow professionally, or has already engaged in such growth. The current application processes aren’t necessarily the best tools for capturing the professional development piece. In addition, integration would cut down on faculty and administrative workloads, since these processes are repetitive. By focusing the applications on how faculty grow/intend to grow, both the individual faculty member and the College would benefit. Emily noted that Article 32 is a negotiated item, and that changes to procedure would need to be
worked out at the bargaining table. Ame clarified that receipt of Article 32 money would not be contingent on administrative evaluation of the formative piece of the Article 32 application.

The above discussion led to consideration of what the very purpose of a faculty evaluation system is, and the need to create a system which reflects that purpose. The group explored whether summative evaluations are even necessary, and whether numerical ratings serve a useful purpose. It also explored the idea that a purely formative system, emphasizing professional growth, could be more meaningful and valuable for faculty and the College, and would support the professionalism of the faculty, rather than call it into question. Behavioral issues could be dealt with on a one-on-one basis, outside of the evaluation system. Administrative and peer-review observations could help to identify strengths and areas for improvement, and complement self-assessment. The group agreed not to decide on the formative/summative issue at this meeting. Finally, the group discussed student rating forms. These can be summative or formative. Blackboard may have a way to create and administer student rating forms.

5. Capturing Faculty Input
The task force agreed that given our compressed timeline, a survey to all full-time faculty would work better than focus groups. We ultimately decided to use Survey Monkey. The survey will be sent out during Service Week, and close prior to our next meeting, on Sept. 9. All responses will be anonymous. To assist with our survey, Lonetta will post to our Blackboard shell a Recruitment and Retention survey which she helped create. We agreed to preface our survey with a brief summary of the group’s work thus far, and to attach meeting minutes in the interests of maximum transparency. Members composed these survey questions, deemed most useful for our purposes:

a. “What components of a faculty evaluation system would you find valuable?” Choices include “self-assessment,” “observation by chair, dean or supervisor,” “peer observation,” etc. Answers will be on a “not valuable” to “extremely valuable” scale. Respondents may select as many choices as they wish.

b. “What purpose should the faculty evaluation process serve?” Choices will be “opportunities for professional growth”, and “accountability for basic professional functions (timeliness to class, turn-around time for returning student assessments, etc.).” Answers will be on a “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree” scale. Respondents may select as many choices as they wish.

c. “How often should faculty evaluations occur for probationary faculty”? Choices will include “every year,” “every two years,” etc.

d. “How often should faculty evaluations occur for continuing faculty?” Responses will include “every year,” “every two years,” etc.
e. An open-ended question: “What works for you in our current evaluation system? What does not work for you? Please include any suggestions you may have for improving those areas which do not work for you.”

6. **Reporting to Faculty on Task Force Progress – Start of Fall Semester**
   During the Fall 2016 Service Week, a task force member from each campus will provide a brief report to all full-time faculty on the group’s progress thus far. The actual meetings during which the reports will be given will vary by campus. The reports will be based on talking points which Andrew and Jeff will create. As part of reporting out, the group discussed the idea of holding activities on All College Day (Oct. 18, 2016), such as discussion of survey results, break-out sessions, etc.

7. **Topics for Next Meeting**
   a. Survey results
   b. Big picture / architecture of the proposed faculty evaluation system. This discussion will be informed by the survey results, as well as the research, reading and conversation the task force has engaged in thus far.
   c. Timelines for communication of task force work, and for completion/implementation of work
   d. Possible activities for All College Day (Oct. 18)

8. **Schedule Next Meeting**
   Our next meeting will be held on Friday Sept. 9 on the Meramec Campus, BA 219L, from 3 – 5 pm.

9. **Adjournment**
   The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 pm.

--Submitted by J. Papier