Faculty Evaluation Task Force Minutes for August 10, 2017
Meramec SC 201, 2-4 pm

Attendance: Deborah Char, Scott Gevaert, Doug Hurst, Andrew Langrehr (co-chair), Ame Mead, Emily Neal, Jeff Papier (co-chair), Rita Pernik, David Shields, Dustin Sweet, Robert Thumith, Dennis White, Kim Mueller (guest), Anne Wessely (guest), Zak Mussig (guest)

1. Approval of Agenda
   The agenda was approved. The order of items was rearranged to accommodate several members’ time constraints.

2. Approval of Minutes
   The minutes were approved with one revision.

3. Ongoing Tasks
   a. Online student evaluations
      Anne Wessely and Zak Mussig from Online Education discussed the steps involved in implementing online student evaluations using Microsoft Forms. Anne also distributed a useful handout containing this information. While Online Education has offered assistance with the implementation, key areas will remain the responsibility of the task force, including numerical analysis of the student evaluation data. The task force asked questions regarding, among other matters, the nature of this analysis, the reliability of the MS software, and the security and anonymity of the data collected. We ultimately decided to create a small group which will look into the feasibility of moving ahead with this project. Members of the group are Ame, Doug, Scott and David. Jeff will email Anne with an update.

4. Role of the Task Force for 2017-2017 / Schedule Next Meeting
   Andrew and Jeff noted that the original charge of the task force, to create a new faculty evaluation system for full-time faculty at STLCC, has been fulfilled. The charge of the task force has evolved to one of implementing the new system. In recognition of this, Andrew offered current members the option of stepping down. While most members indicated their desire to stay on, anyone wishing to depart the task force should email Andrew and copy Jeff.
An announcement regarding the new role of our group, and a call to fill vacancies, will be made at CAC. Andrew or Jeff will contact CAC Chair Julia Jenner regarding this. Our next meeting is scheduled for Thurs. Sept. 7 from 3:30 - 5 pm, on the Meramec Campus. Room TBD. We will only meet if there are issues to discuss as a full group. Jeff will notify everyone whether we will meet.

5. Ongoing Tasks (Cont’d)

b. Training

• **CTL Meeting for New Faculty**
  Andrew and Jeff presented the new evaluation system at a CTL session for new full-time faculty (Aug. 8, FP campus). While some of the new faculty are temporary, Andrew recommended that all new faculty complete the evaluation process.

• **Fall Service Week: Drop-in Sessions**
  WW and FP campuses are offering drop-in sessions during Service Week. Attendees can ask questions regarding the new evaluation system.

• **Due-Dates Calendar and Deans’ Handbook**
  Ame distributed the due-dates calendar which she created. All agreed that the calendar is excellent. Ame also created a Dean’s Handbook. After she makes a few revisions, Ame will provide task force members with a link to the handbook, which can be used by faculty and deans alike. The calendar and handbook, along with the other faculty evaluation documents for faculty/dean use, will be housed and linked to on the Safe Colleges system.

• **Live / Recorded Sessions**
  The task agreed that a live training session should be held. The session will be streamed so that people can attend and ask questions remotely. A link to the session will be provided for later viewing. The following task force members wish to help: Debbie, Doug, Emily, Scott, Layla, Andrew and Jeff. Other task force members who would like to volunteer should notify Jeff. Kim Mueller (Human Resources) offered her assistance with coordinating space for the live session. She and Bob noted that the Dean’s Handbook could be used to help structure this session, and be distributed as a handout. Kim pointed out that the CTLs may wish to be involved. Andrew and Jeff will discuss this and other matters, and then email volunteers so that training preparations
can proceed. Jeff will update Kim with details, so that she can support us.

Bob noted that a recording of the live session could be used as the recorded session. Alternatively, he and Kim could work with Zak Mussig and the learning experience consultants to develop a recorded session, part of which could be audiovisual. A link to the session would be housed on the SafeColleges system.

c. **Faculty Evaluation Calendar**
   Andrew and Bob have agreed to the calendar language which the task force previously approved. This language has been included in the approved faculty evaluation system document, and will be made official in a side letter between the NEA and administration.

d. **Scantron**
   Andrew talked with Patti Barnes (FV Assessment) about converting the new student evaluation form into Scantron-ready form. Patti noted that MC’s Scantron process differs from those at the other campuses. The campuses will all need to adopt the same process before further progress can be made. Andrew will convene a group to discuss all of this. David asked to be part of the group.

e. **Placing Faculty Evaluation Materials on SafeColleges System**
   The new faculty evaluation system document, the due-dates calendar, the dean’s handbook, and all training materials will be housed on the SafeColleges system. Jeff will email Bob a clean copy of the finalized evaluation system document for uploading. This document is also available in our Blackboard shell.

f. **Email during Service Week**
   At the last task force meeting, we agreed that an email alerting all full-time faculty to the new evaluation system should be sent during Service Week. Jeff shared the email he drafted, which the task force then edited. Jeff will send the revised message to Kedra Tolson, who will relay it to full-time faculty next week.
6. **Evaluation Cycles and Promotion**

Ame asked whether a faculty member who is promoted during their evaluation cycle should immediately move onto the new and longer evaluation cycle corresponding to their new rank, or be evaluated at the end of their current cycle, and then move to the new cycle. The group felt that once someone is promoted to a new rank, all of the privileges accorded to that new rank should apply, including the longer cycle. This would allow for easier administrative tracking, as well.

7. **Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 3:50 pm.