Faculty Evaluation Task Force Minutes for Fri. Feb. 17, 2017
Meramec Campus, SC 200, 1:30 pm

Attendance: Deborah Char, Syed Chowdhury, Scott Gevaert, Layla Goushey, Becky Helbling, Doug Hurst, Ame Mead-Roach, Emily Neal, Jeff Papier (co-chair), Rita Pernik, David Shields, Dustin Sweet, Dennis White

1. Approval of Agenda
   The agenda was approved.

2. Approval of Minutes
   The minutes were approved.

3. Subcommittees meet
   The self-reflection, student evaluation and classroom observation subcommittees met for around 30 minutes.

4. Subcommittee Presentations and Discussion
   a. Self-Reflection
      - The self-reflection subcommittee presented the instructions it had formulated for the Professional Growth in Teaching and Professional Growth Through Service narratives. After some discussion, it was decided that reference to goals should be removed from the instructions. This and several other changes will be made.
      - The 5/3/1 frequency for faculty evaluation was put back on the table for discussion. Some task force members are concerned that the 5-year evaluation cycle for full professors may send the message that evaluation is something to avoid. Perhaps all continuing faculty should be evaluated every three years, as is currently done. Others feel that the 5/3/1 frequency should remain part of the new system. We will return to this topic at our next meeting.
b. **Student Evaluations**

The student evaluation subcommittee presented its proposed student evaluation form, along with supporting documentation. The questions on the form come from a validated instrument known as the SEEQ, or *Student Evaluation of Educational Quality*. The SEEQ is widely recognized as an effective indicator of student perceptions of educational quality. Instructors can add supplemental questions to the form as desired.

We considered comments from the Online College committee regarding the applicability of certain questions on the form to online classes. Our belief is that these questions can be applied to all teaching modalities. We are also hesitant to change questions on the form, since these have already been validated. In addition, we discussed comments from the librarians and counselors. Some concern remained that the questions on the form might not apply to all counselors. Layla will contact the counselors about this.

Ame noted that students regard the opportunity to evaluate faculty as a means of sharing feedback with the administration. She also noted that it is part of the dean’s responsibility to review student evaluations with the faculty to whom they apply. After consideration, the group agreed. It also agreed that faculty should evaluate one class per semester.

c. **Chair/Dean Classroom Observation**

The classroom observation subcommittee presented its form. The form encourages deans to describe, rather than to judge. Each dean will receive an instruction sheet, with examples, of the kinds of things they should be looking for during their visit. Towards the end of the academic year, the dean will hold a conversation with the faculty member about the observation. They will also discuss future areas of growth on which the faculty member may wish to concentrate. The form can be used for any kind of classroom observer: dean, chair, etc. The question of who should be conducting the observation came up again. Some faculty across the district feel that a person with content expertise, such as a chair or program coordinator, should observe. Other faculty believe it should be the dean, so as to avoid possible faculty conflicts. After some discussion, the group agreed that there should be two
classroom visits per evaluation cycle: one by the faculty member’s dean, and one by someone whom the faculty member chooses. This individual may be a dean, chair, program coordinator, or peer. The selected individual does not have to be from the faculty member’s home campus.

5. **Feedback from the Feb. 10 NEA Executive Council Meeting**
   - Jeff reported on feedback from the Feb. 10 NEA Executive Council Meeting, where he presented the latest information on the new evaluation system. The Council liked what it heard, with several concerns. All of these concerns have been or will be addressed by the task force: (1) Given the formative nature of the new system, does the term “faculty evaluation” still apply? (2) Perhaps the new system should have a chair (or content expert)/dean option for classroom observation, since opinions are divided among faculty as to who should be conducting those observations. (3) Since evaluation forms will no longer go into promotion packets, instructions for the new system must make it very clear what faculty must do to include evaluative data—e.g. set up separate classroom observations specifically for purposes of promotion. (4) What will happen in August?
   - The group discussed the fact that we will be ambassadors for the new system. We agreed that we should hold a refresher session during Service Week. Feedback received during these sessions could be used to help improve the system. We also agreed that we should specify a time during the academic year when any changes to the system are announced.

6. **Strategizing to meet deadlines**
   a. **Next Meeting**
      Our next meeting will be held on Fri., Feb. 24 from 1:30 – 4:30 pm on the Meramec Campus, SC 125. In order to get onto the Mar. 6 CAC agenda, we need to send our materials to Jim Munden (CAC chair) by noon on Mar. 1.
   b. **Prep Subcommittee**
      We agreed to hold a “prep subcommittee” meeting on Tues., Feb. 21 from 2:30 – 5 pm on the Meramec Campus. Becky will reserve a room on the Meramec Campus, and send out the location. Everyone on the task force is invited. The following people have already agreed
to attend: Ame, Layla, Becky, David and Jeff. Jeff will send out an email about this meeting to all task force members.

7. Schedule on-campus forums
   We tabled this agenda item, and will revisit it at our next meeting.

8. Adjournment
   The meeting adjourned at 4:10 pm.