CCRI

COMMUNITY COLLEGE
OF RHODE ISLAND

Minutes

Department Chairs' Council Committee	
Date of Agenda Posting:	n/a
Meeting Date:	May 8, 2019
Meeting Start Time:	10:10 AM
Meeting Location:	Room 3076 KC
Meeting Secretary :	*Monique Giguere*

Members Present

Committee Member Name	Title
Renee Andersen	Faculty member, English
Jeanne McColl	Assistant Dean, Nurse Education
Catherine Poirier	Interim Dean, Learning Resources
Jason Stockford	Faculty member, Math
Lauren Webb	Interim Dean, BSTM

Guests	
Monique Giguere	Administrative Assistant, BSTM Division

Minutes

Agenda Item	Notes on Discussion
1. Elect Interim Chairperson	Jason Stockford nominated Lauren Webb as Interim Chairperson, seconded by Cathy Poirier. Unanimous vote, Lauren elected as Interim, new chair to be elected in September.
2. Adoption of Proposed Agenda	Jason motions to adopt, Renee Andersen seconds. Unanimous vote, agenda adopted.
3. Approval of minutes from last meeting	Renee motions to approve, Jason seconds. 5 votes to approve, 1 abstention, minutes approved.

4. Announcements a. 2019-20 AY Meeting Dates	Survey monkey will be sent out in August to pick a date, 3 pm is preferable time.
5. New Business a. Introduction of proposals from Jason Stockford and Leslie Kilgore for discussion	General discussion on proposals 1 and 2 (see Attachment A), discussed at previous meetings of the committee. Information on evaluations should be organized on one website. Departments with information on faculty evaluation should instead link to Academic Affairs website. Discussion on proposal 3, requiring annual observations for all new faculty in first 3 years of service, resulted in the following motion, introduced by Jason Stockford: **When departments consider creating a peer evaluation form, the department has an active discussion on including observations in the peer evaluation.** 3 votes in favor, 2 abstentions, motion passes. Jason withdrew proposal 4 from consideration, and the committee discussed Leslie Kilgore's comments on the SRI, the committee agreed that reviewing SRI practices at other institutions would be good first step to a systematic review of when, how, and what questions are asked on the survey.
6. Additional Items?	Meeting adjourned at 11:57am.

Attachment A: Some Proposals for the Faculty Evaluation Committee:

1) We should have a set time (e.g. every two years) when we do a review of the departmental evaluation procedures. In particular, we should look at the peer evaluation forms as some departments use their own forms. While these forms were originally approved by this committee, we should periodically review the forms to make certain that they are still relevant.

2) As has been discussed before, we should require that departments not post evaluation procedures and forms on their own departmental websites. It would be better to have everything on one page within the academic affairs website. Such a page could have the following links:

   - Evaluation procedures
   - SRI procedures
   - Self-evaluation form
   - Peer evaluation form (default)
       - Peer evaluation forms for departments using a custom version
   - Promotion and tenure procedures

3) We should have a discussion on observations of faculty with less than three years of service. Some departments currently require them for all faculty with under three years of service, some leave them as optional and some departments do not address the issue. There is some degree of inequity when some departments require these and others do not. My proposal is that we require all new faculty (those with under three years of service) to be subject to an observation as part of the annual evaluation procedure. Ideally, when someone is in need of an observation the chair will designate an individual to perform an observation. The chair will advise the faculty member being observed of what week the evaluation is to take place, but not necessarily the precise class.   The idea is to see the faculty member in a natural environment and not one that is overly scripted. While refusal to permit a chair or the chair's designee to perform an observation should be treated as insubordination, it should be stressed that the observation is an opportunity to get constructive feedback and not an attempt to catch someone doing something wrong.

4) Follow-up observations by the dean when faculty members have been subject to disciplinary action. The purpose for this proposal is to insure that there is a meaningful follow-up after a disciplinary issue. In most organizations there is counseling at the time of a disciplinary issue, but often there is little follow-up after the fact. By suggesting that the Dean conduct a follow-up evaluation after some time has passed (following a disciplinary issue) it gives the faculty member the opportunity to show that they have taken corrective action and moved past the previous issues. It also allows for follow-ups in those instances where disciplinary action is taken but there is not sufficient effort to by the faculty member to address the original root of the problem.

Professor Kilgore has some suggestions for the committee which she was kind enough to put in writing. I am copying them here. I hope that we can make time at this or a future meeting to discuss her suggestions.

I have several thoughts that are relevant to the work of your committee.

First, having students complete the SRI online is incredibly helpful and more respectful of resources (e.g., paper; class time; staff time for distributing, scanning, and uploading; etc.). Students may complete SRIs electronically outside of class, which allows for more instructional time. The problem is that the rate of return is often very low. Faculty are subject to results (esp. in T/P) that may be based on fewer than 10 students in a class of 32. I propose that the committee research how other schools organize their efforts and encourage greater participation. I've heard that some withhold grades until the SRI is completed— here, faculty submit as usual, but students who log on to view their grades are interrupted by a message that says they cannot be viewed until the SRI is complete, and then directs them to the form. I'm sure there are pros/cons, but a systematic review of this and other ideas would give us a firm foundation to make a policy proposal.

Second, we need greater institutional research that aggregates the results of the forms so that department chairs can compare all sections of a course (across multiple faculty), all faculty in a department, tenure v non-tenure v part-time. Basically, data that are aggregated in a variety of ways to help with our overall assessment efforts. Involvement with Alan Whitcomb and Raj Malhotra might be helpful here.

I wish I could attend the meeting and explain in more detail, but I have another commitment tomorrow. I hope this gives you something to go on, and I'm happy to visit another time, if that's helpful.

Thanks much!
Leslie