Faculty Evaluation Task Force Minutes for Monday March 20, 2017
Forest Park Campus, SC 117, 3 – 5 pm

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

1. Approval of Agenda

   The agenda was approved.

2. Approval of Minutes

   The minutes were approved.

3. Feedback on Proposed Faculty Evaluation System
   a. Results of Survey Monkey

   We discussed the results of the Survey Monkey sent to all full-time faculty. The survey was open from March 7 through noon on March 15. There were 126 respondents.

   b. Other feedback – emails, conversations, etc.

   In addition to feedback gathered through the survey, some task force members received emails regarding the new system, or discussed the system with colleagues. We will consider this feedback at the appropriate places during today’s meeting.

4. Revising Proposed Faculty Evaluation System - Question 5 on Survey: Changes to the System
   a. Evaluation System

   We discussed faculty feedback regarding the new system as a whole. Since there was some uncertainty among faculty about frequency of evaluation, Jeff will add a clarifying paragraph to the evaluation document. We agreed that including an “at-a-glance” checklist showing the purpose and components of the system, along with evaluation frequency, will prove helpful.

   b. Faculty Accountability

   Some faculty felt that the new system should contain summative components. We were reminded that an evaluation system cannot serve summative and formative functions simultaneously. In addition, deans need to have conversations with their faculty on an ongoing basis; the purpose of an evaluation
system is not to point out, in one fell swoop, areas in which faculty may need to improve. Faculty should be made aware of the fact that performance issues are largely handled outside of the current evaluation system, which is summative. And while the new system does not specify any kind of performance improvement plan for faculty who do not complete the evaluation process, failure to do so in and of itself carries personnel consequences.

c. Forms in Promotion Binders

- Some faculty wanted to use forms and data from the evaluation process in their promotion binders. We agreed that allowing this would undermine the formative nature of the new system. After some discussion, we arrived at additional language which reinforces the point that forms and data are not allowed. Jeff will update the evaluation document with this language.

We also agreed that faculty can use assessments or evaluations for promotion, as long as these are conducted outside of the evaluation process. This point should be brought up during evaluation training. Language about this also needs to be added to the directions for promotion.

- We discussed the situation of faculty who were planning on using student evaluations from previous years in their upcoming promotion process. We decided that the promotion instructions should be changed to say that final or official evaluation documents are required in promotion binders. This means that faculty evaluated prior to fall 2017 would have to include their full evaluations. Faculty evaluated under the new system would include the letter stating that they did or did not complete the evaluation process.

d. Student Evaluations

- We reaffirmed that we will keep the frequency of student evaluations at one class per semester. This is common practice, even at research institutions. We are a teaching institution, and should follow this practice as well. Some objections to this frequency may stem from issues of trust. Deans need to receive training on the formative nature of the new system.

- We should remind faculty that they can add questions to the form. They can also ignore particular questions or subscales.

- Some faculty noted that if they meet with their deans in April, they will need to conduct student evaluations prior to the end of a course. We agreed that student evaluations conducted in May should count towards the next evaluation cycle. This needs to be clarified during training.

- We discussed having students distribute and collect student evaluations. We will revisit this idea.

- The question arose as to where evaluations will go to first—the dean or faculty member. We will
return to this question.

e. Narratives

After some discussion, we decided to leave the narrative components as they are. The consensus is that asking faculty to write a page for each narrative is not an onerous request. In addition, the process of writing can help faculty clarify for themselves how they have grown professionally, and plan on doing so in the future.

f. Classroom Observations

Some faculty noted that they would like someone in their subject area(s) to observe them. The new system allows for this.

g. Probationary Faculty

Since probationary faculty need formative nurturing and guidance, David suggested that end-of-year letters for such faculty not be placed in their HR files at the conclusion of the first year. Only letters from the second and third years would go into those files. After some discussion, we agreed to this idea. Jeff will update the evaluation document accordingly.

h. Counselors and Librarians

Some faculty noted that while counselors and librarians don’t report to deans, the new system requires much participation from deans. The reporting structures for counselors and librarians is an ongoing issue, but is out of the purview of the task force.

5. Revising Proposed Faculty Evaluation System - Question 6 on Survey: Questions About the System

We agreed that with one exception, our discussions relating to agenda item 4 covered the issues raised by Question 6 on the survey. The exception is Resources for Growth. Some faculty asked whether resources would be available to help them grow professionally. Jeff noted that Forest Park’s CTL coordinator, Michelle Parrinello-Cason, requested a meeting with him to discuss the new evaluation system. This meeting may help Michelle and her CTL colleagues across the district create resources which will work well with the new system. Michelle and Jeff plan to meet on March 31. The CTL also sends out a survey requesting ideas for offerings. The new evaluation system may spark ideas among faculty for such offerings.
6. **Dean Feedback**

In hindsight, we should have sent the deans the Survey Monkey. However, Ame represents the deans on the task force, so they have had a voice. In addition, she has spoken with almost all of them and their feedback has generally been positive. She will ask for further feedback when the deans meet next.

7. **March 27 Local Academic Council Meetings**

Jeff will send his CAC presentation outline to those FET members speaking at the March 27 local Academic Council meetings. He will also copy them on the email he sends to the local Academic Council chairs. That email will contain the updated evaluation system, along with the completed agenda item forms for FP and MC—the two campuses which require them.

8. **Schedule Next Meeting**

Our next meeting will be held on Monday, Apr. 17 at the Kirkwood Station Brewing Company, from 3 to around 5 pm. This establishment is located at the corner of Jefferson and Kirkwood, in the town of Kirkwood.

9. **Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 5 pm.