Forest Park Campus, SC 032 (Café West), 3 – 5 pm

Attendance: Deborah Char, Scott Gevaert, Layla Goushey, Doug Hurst, Ame Mead-Roach, Lonetta Oliver, Jeff Papier (co-chair), Rita Pernik, David Shields, Dustin Sweet, Dennis White, Kelli Burns (Guest - Information Technology; Institutional Research)

1. Approval of Agenda
   The agenda was approved.

2. Approval of Minutes
   The minutes for the Nov. 7, 2016 meeting were approved.

3. IT
   Kelli Burns spoke with the task force about implementing a digitized faculty evaluation system. There are several directions we could go. One is to create a digitized system using in-house programming knowledge, along with tools and resources from vendors which the College already uses, such as Blackboard, Microsoft (SharePoint), Adobe and Axiom. Another is to use a system from an “outside” vendor which offers an integrated set of services. A further alternative could be to combine these approaches. For instance, we might use a system to automatically generate forms and collect data, then store this data into a faculty member’s Blackboard portfolio. Each option offers advantages and disadvantages regarding cost; ease of use; security; the ability to fine-tune permissions; data collection and data sharing processes; aggregation of evaluation data; report creation; archival functionality; and ownership of data. Jeff will speak with Ame about Blackboard Portfolio. Kelli will send Jeff contact information for an outside vendor.

   The task force continued its conversation after Kelli left. The issue of security was raised again, especially regarding student evaluations residing on servers. The group wondered whether digitizing the system would be too much to do, given time constraints. Perhaps the new system could be designed with future digitization in mind.

4. Consensus Building
   a. Topics to Address – Consensus Building area on Blackboard
      Jeff showed the Topics to Address document under the Consensus Building content area on our Blackboard shell. All task force members are welcome to add items to this list.

   b. Feedback from Librarians & Counselors
      Jeff reported that the full-time faculty reference librarians are on board with the proposed single-system model of faculty evaluation. He also reported that Donna Zumwinkel has not heard any objections to this system from the faculty counselors, following their district-wide meeting of several weeks ago. They therefore appear to be on board as well.
c. **Implementation of new system: Defer evaluations or start fresh?**

Ame shared the data she compiled on the counts for the next three evaluation cycles, and on the number of full professors. Based on this data, the group agreed that there is no need to reset the evaluation system. Evaluation cycles due to begin in January 2017 will be pushed back until August 2017. A memo from Andrew which notes this change will be sent to faculty applying for promotion, so that they can include this information in their promotion binders. David observed that since evaluation data will be placed in promotion binders, meaning the data will be used summatively, we may need to rewrite the purpose of the evaluation system.

d. **Data sources – Definitions, Selection of, Other**

- **Self:** We agreed that a self-reflection data source should be included in the new system. After considering whether to include goals/S.M.A.R.T goals within the self-reflection piece, we decided to keep the discussion of data sources at a more general level for now. The instructions for self-reflection must make it clear that setting a goal but not (fully) achieving it is acceptable, as valuable learning may occur from this experience. This learning could itself constitute rich material for reflection.

- **Students:** We agreed that student evaluations should be included in the new system. While recent research casts doubt on the value of student evaluations in determining teacher effectiveness, it is important for students to have a voice. It is also important for faculty evaluations to include multiple data sources. Information gleaned from student evaluations could be used as part of self-reflection. We agreed that student evaluations need to be thoughtfully designed, and that we need to discuss the weight which they will be given. Faculty and administrators may need to receive training in how best to use them.

- **Peers:** After careful consideration, the task force agreed that peer observation should not be a required data source. Instead, peer observation/collaboration should appear as one of the possibilities listed under “Professional Growth in Teaching.” Among the factors entering into our decision were the following: resulting increase in faculty workload; possibilities for faculty-faculty conflict; the need to ensure training in and consistent implementation of protocols; and questions about selection of peer observers. Reframed as an opportunity for growth in teaching, peer observation and collaboration could become part of the input for self-reflection.

- **Chairs/Deans:** Due to time constraints, we agreed to table this discussion until our next meeting. An important question we will consider is whether the chair/dean should be able to give the entire evaluation a thumbs up/thumbs down, or whether all data sources will carry the same weight.

5. **Report from HLC Criterion 3 Committee - Becky**

Jeff reported for Becky. The HLC Criterion 3 Committee appreciated Becky’s update on the progress of our group. They posed four questions:

a. How will the new system be approved by faculty? This question is certainly one which our task force will be addressing as our work progresses.
b. Would it improve faculty buy-in if we were to solicit input on pieces of the new system as these were proposed? We agreed that while faculty buy-in is essential, piece-by-piece approval would likely slow down what is already a productive, but (of necessity) less than speedy process. In addition, the task force has provided faculty with a number of opportunities for input, and will continue to do so.

c. Does Blackboard offer a module for providing confidential student evaluations? This is a question for Online Education or IT. We will inquire.

d. Should our NEA Blackboard shell include a link to the FET guide? Jeff asked Rob Hertel (local NEA president) to include this link, which he has done.

6. Other Topics
At the 11/18 NEA Executive Council meeting, it was proposed that any faculty evaluation system, whether the current one or a replacement, should run on the academic year. This means that regardless of which evaluation is up and running in 2017, the next evaluation cycle would begin in August rather than January of that year. The Council voted in favor of this, and would like the proposal to go to Governance. The task force agreed that this proposal is in line with our thinking. While the proposal does not fall within the scope of our charge, Jeff will contact Rob Hertel and Emily Neal (local NEA vice-president), to let them know that the idea has our support.

7. Topics for Next Meeting
   a. Chair/dean data source
   b. Further work on data sources: continue to work together? Subcommittees?
   c. Service week

8. Final Meeting of the Semester: Friday, 12/2/16, 2:30 – 4:30 pm, Meramec Campus. Room TBA.
We agreed that Friday 12/2 would be the final meeting of the semester. At that meeting, we will schedule our January 2017 gathering.

9. Adjournment
The meeting adjourned at 5 pm.