Faculty Evaluation Task Force Minutes for May 16, 2017
Meramec BA 105, 2- 4 pm

Attendance: Deborah Char, Scott Gevaert, Layla Goushey, Andrew Langrehr (co-chair), Ame Mead-Roach, Emily Neal, Lonetta Oliver, Jeff Papier (co-chair), Rita Pernik, David Shields, Dustin Sweet, Robert Thumith, Dennis White

1. Approval of Agenda
   The agenda was approved.

2. Approval of Minutes
   The minutes were approved.

3. Recap and Reflection
   a. Recap
      The faculty evaluation system was passed in amended form at the May 1, 2017 College Academic Council meeting. Almost all of the amendments had been made at the preceding local Academic Council meetings. While Leadership Team has not yet approved the document in its current form, Andrew believes it will do so at its next meeting. The main changes to the proposed system are as follows: addition of a sentence stating that “additional artifacts” of the meeting with the dean “will be kept in the Dean’s office for the purpose of continuous quality improvement”; removal of language stating that forms and data generated during the evaluation process cannot be included in promotion binders; specification that a task force will be convened every three years, rather than just “periodically,” to review the faculty evaluation system.

   b. Reflection
      The Task Force reflected on the path which the evaluation system took through Governance, and the modifications which it underwent along the way. Of particular concern to many was the sentence stating that artifacts are to be kept in the Dean’s office, as this language tends to undermine the formative nature of the evaluation process. In response to this and other concerns, we decided that the system should be evaluated after its first year; subsequent evaluations will occur every three years thereafter. Andrew and Jeff will discuss this matter further.
4. To-Do List

The group used the remainder of the meeting to work on its to-do list. The list includes the following areas:

a. Student Evaluations
   - Our responsibility is to ensure that the student evaluation document is accessible in both print and online form. Ame will contact Michael Hudspeth (IT) regarding online implementation, and include Anne Wessely (Online Education) in the communication.
   - Getting a representative sample of students to complete electronic student evaluations can be an issue. Lonetta suggested that faculty designate in their syllabi an “evaluation week”; this would send a clear message to students that evaluations are to be completed during that time. Lonetta also noted that a prominent link in Blackboard could be used to this effect.
   - We discussed whether student evaluations should go to the dean or faculty member first. While we did not come to consensus on this issue, it does impact how online student evaluations will be implemented.

b. Training
   - At a previous meeting, the Task Force agreed to hold informal Q & A sessions on the evaluation system during Fall 2017 Service Week. Jeff asked the group to arrange those sessions on their campuses. A session has been scheduled at Forest Park.
   - Bob noted that a formal training session should also be held. Like the formal promotion training sessions, the evaluation session could take place on one campus, and be videotaped. Faculty who cannot attend the session in-person could have access to the video via a link. The group agreed that the session should occur within the first few weeks of the Fall 2017 semester, but not during Service Week. We will discuss this idea in detail at an upcoming meeting.

c. Calendar
   - The section of the evaluation system titled “Due dates for Conversation with the Dean” still contains references to “date TBD.” The Task Force proposes replacing these references with the following language (in italics):
     - “By the Monday after Spring Break, faculty in an evaluation year [the final year of their evaluation cycle] will submit their evaluation materials to the Division Dean.”
     - “All memos indicating whether or not faculty members have competed the evaluation
process as required must be submitted to faculty and HR by the last day of the faculty contract.

- The NEA Executive Council has received complaints from faculty whose deans have asked them to complete student evaluations far too early in the semester. The Council asked Jeff to bring this concern to the Task Force. After discussion, the Task Force agreed that student evaluations should occur only when 50% or more of a course has been completed.
- Emily will take the above information to the STLCC NEA negotiating team, so that they can craft a proposal for presentation at an upcoming negotiation session.

d. Checklist

Lonetta volunteered to create an evaluation system checklist for faculty; Ame volunteered to create one for the deans.

e. Access

Once the faculty evaluation calendar has been agreed upon at NEA negotiations, and the system has been approved by Leadership Team, the document will be uploaded to the STLCC Human Resources web page. Links to the system will also be placed under College Forms, and under the Faculty tab on Blackboard. Jeff will update the current document (still in marked-up form), and send it to Bob for uploading.

5. Schedule Next Meeting

Our next meeting will be held on Thurs. June 29 from 2 – 4 pm, on the Meramec campus. Room TBA.

6. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 pm.