Forest Park G332, 3:30 – 5:30

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

1. Approval of Agenda
The agenda was approved.

2. Approval of Minutes
The minutes were approved, with two corrections.

3. Consensus Building
   a. Evaluation elements, including counselors & librarians
      The group agreed that faculty shouldn’t be limited to the areas listed under Professional Growth in Teaching (Content Expertise, Course Design, etc.). These are given as possibilities only. Our consensus is that there should be a single faculty evaluation system, rather than the current tripartite arrangement. We discussed how to keep that single system, while ensuring that it encompasses the crucial responsibilities of librarians and counselors which lie outside of the formal classroom. For librarians, we believe that such duties are amenable to inclusion under Teaching or Service. Becky and Jeff will bring this topic up at their next joint librarians’ meeting. To get the counselors’ take on this, Jeff will contact Donna Zumwinkel and ask her to sound out her colleagues district-wide.

      The above conversation led to a discussion of evaluation frequency. We achieved consensus on this point. Our proposal is that probationary faculty be evaluated every year; continuing faculty, apart from full professors, every three years; and full professors every five years. This last group has already proven themselves in many ways, and needs less frequent evaluation.

   b. Data sources
      We held a lively discussion regarding student evaluation. Topics included: use of open-ended vs. quantifiable questions; regarding student evaluations as feedback or surveys; reliability of student input; frequency of student evaluations; providing administrators with a summary of evaluations conducted over multiple years; faculty-created survey forms kept separate from official student evaluation forms; use of student input to inform teaching; stoplight surveys; how student data should be used in the faculty evaluation process; punitive use of student evaluations; influence of student data on the promotion process; timing of student feedback. This conversation will be continued.
c. Strategic Plan
Andrew noted the need to connect our new system with the College’s strategic plan. Dennis observed that HLC wants our strategic plan to guide what the College does. Our current thinking is that we will add language after the new system’s Statement of Purpose, showing that this purpose ties directly into certain of the strategic initiatives.

d. Implementation of new system/Academic vs. calendar year
We agreed that the new system should coincide with the academic year. One way to implement this is to suspend the current system in Spring 2017, and begin the new system in Fall 2017. The process for those faculty scheduled to be evaluated in Spring 2017 would be deferred by one semester. Notes could be put in promotion binders reminding reviewers of this delay. We need to decide how to proceed soon, since the deans must notify faculty in January that they are due for evaluation. We also agreed that we need to bring IT on board very soon, given that the new system should be fully digital. A robust IT budget for our new system is essential.

4. Communication of Task Force Progress – Reports on Past Events

   a. CAC - Oct. 10 (Jeff)
   Jeff reported to CAC as planned.

   b. All College Day - Oct. 18 (Task Force)
   Quite a few task force members participated in the All College Day breakout session. Faculty who attended asked good questions, and provided some useful ideas.

5. Communication of Task Force Progress- Upcoming Events

   a. Local Academic Governance Councils (Task Force rep on each campus)
   Emily (MC) and Dusty (W) have already reported out to their local academic governance councils. Council members were glad to receive updates on our work. Some members at Wildwood urged that student evaluations be used with caution. Dennis (FV) will speak at his council’s 10/31 meeting. Jeff (FP) will speak at his council’s 11/28 meeting.

   b. HLC Criterion 3 Subcommittee – Nov. 11
   Becky is a member of this subcommittee, and will update it on the progress of the Faculty Evaluation Task Force. Jeff will not attend this meeting.
6. **Topics for Next Meeting**

We will begin the consensus-building part of our next meeting with further discussion of implementation. We’ll then continue our discussion of data sources.

7. **Topics for Future Meetings**

Topics we will need to address in subsequent meetings include online classes, assumed practices, performance approval plans, ensuring consistency across campuses, as well as guidelines on documentation (if any) and on length of self-reflection narratives. We also need to discuss the approval process, and what the evaluation instructions will look like (hopefully something simple).

8. **Schedule Next Meeting/Retreat?**

   Our next meeting will be held on Mon. Nov. 7, from 3:30 – 5:30 pm on the MC Campus. Andrew will send out the room. We agreed not to hold a retreat at this time. We can revisit this option if needed.

9. **Adjournment**

   The meeting adjourned at 5:30 pm.