

Present: Medora Barnes, Matthew Berg, Barbara D'Ambrosia, Rebecca Drenovsky, Jeff Dyck, Rich Clark, Gwen Compton-Engle, Margaret Farrar, Nathan Gehlert, Gerald Guest, Rodney Hessinger, Anne Kugler, Graciela Lacueva, Kathleen Lee, Kathleen Manning, Sheila McGinn, Phil Metres, Keiko Nakano, Mike Nichols, Tamba Nlandu, Mindy Peden, Dani Robbins, Debby Rosenthal, John Yost

Speakers: Kathleen Lawry and Jason Lee

**1. M. Farrar – Welcome and Introduction of Kathleen Lawry, Executive Director of Marketing and Jason Lee, Director, Web and Digital Media**

Kathleen Lawry began by introducing a mockup of the new website and university homepage. She stated that Generation Z has an attention span of roughly 6 seconds so simple intuitive navigation is primary. The tool bar allows the user to identify by audience, e.g. prospective and current students and alumni-donors. The main navigation tool will be at the top of the page. The website will feature a hover effect and a program finder which searches programs alphabetically, as well as a toggle feature and mobile design. The next phase of development will include approval of the individual department site maps. Each department will have an overview and contact block option. A question block will funnel through to the Dept. of Admissions. Current department news will be located at the bottom of the page.

K. Lawry noted that IMC will also share data analytics and suggestions for what parents and students are looking for. It was also suggested by K. Lawry, that departments should identify a contact moderator, stating that the site is very user friendly and will be easy to navigate. For now, CAS, BCOB, and Athletics will have separate sites with plans for all three to interface in the future. In closing, K. Lawry stated that IMC will send a list plan with the hope that by Nov. 21, they can get approval for the content of the buckets (navigation tool at top of webpage.) Launch Date is scheduled for July 1, 2019.

**2. Margaret Farrar – Service Assumptions Regarding Service and Faculty Evaluations. *Handout***

M. Farrar began with reviewing the service handout and by opening the discussion with “what are the shared expectations of our colleagues when it comes to service?” Suggestions included mentoring colleagues over time and providing effective and meaningful leadership. S. McGinn inquired on where community service fits in? M. Farrar responded that community service should be connected to the faculty role of educator. It was emphasized that professional service should not be a substitute for university service. Referring to the service document, M. Farrar clarified the *Meets* and *Exceeds* columns as a baseline and examples of service, respectively.

R. Hessinger pointed out that professional service can be variable. M. Farrar responded that as it stands, it is not a perfect document. She suggested that the Chairs work with it, add ideas as related to the department and highlight what makes sense. The Deans and Chairs will continue to work together on the document. N. Gehlert asked if the Chairs could share the document with their department faculty. M. Farrar recommended that Chairs share the document with department faculty at their discretion and added that they ask their faculty for suggestions on what they would like to see on the rubric.

**3. M. Farrar - Course evaluation for classes taught by part-time faculty. Handout**

With regard to evaluating part-time faculty, M. Farrar reported that out of a survey of 19 departments, 6 departments did not respond, 13 did a partial evaluation, and 6 did not evaluate at all. It was determined that at least half of the departments did not evaluate part-time faculty in any meaningful way. She identified a need for a process that would include standard protocols that could alert to problems in the classroom. M. Farrar stated that she is concerned that there is a bias toward brevity and consistency and remarked that it is the Chairs responsibility to quell the red flags. She requested that the Chairs send edits and further suggestions to the Associate Deans by the end of November. The goal is to implement the process in the spring at which time a protocol will be shared with the departments. R. Hessinger related that Todd Bruce will be building the survey into an "evaluation kit" and will be contacting the Chairs in the near future. In response to B. D'Ambrosia's question on part-time response rate, R. Hessinger suggested that the evaluation would likely be administered in class as part of the protocol. J. Yost inquired if an online form could be mobile ready? M. Farrar responded that it would be.

Meeting Adjourned: 4:55pm

Minutes submitted by Ellen Valentine

	ASSISTANT		ASSOCIATE		FULL	
	Meets	Exceeds	Meets	Exceeds	Meets	Exceeds
		All of the previous, plus...	All of the previous, plus...	All of the previous, plus...	All of the previous, plus...	All of the previous, plus...
<b>Departmental Service</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Participation in department meetings</li> <li>Dept. search committees and search process</li> <li>Developing new courses</li> <li>Assessment</li> <li>Recruitment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Leadership of department initiative</li> <li>Revising department curricula</li> <li>Active advisor for co-curricular club</li> <li>Coordinating assessment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Chairing faculty search committees</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Chairing department or program</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Role model in service for others on campus</li> <li>Mentoring faculty in department</li> <li>Leadership in department</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Chairing department or program<sup>1</sup></li> </ul>
<b>University Service</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Attending faculty meetings</li> <li>Serving on university committees</li> <li>Interdisciplinary collaboration</li> <li>University-sponsored professional development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Serving on significant university committees</li> <li>Leadership of interdisciplinary initiative</li> <li>Offering university professional development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Participation in university search committees</li> <li>Participation in HLC efforts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Chairing major committee</li> <li>Leadership of university initiative</li> <li>Leadership of interdisciplinary project</li> <li>New program development</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Leadership on university committees</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Chairing university search committee</li> <li>Leadership in university curricular reform</li> <li>Leadership of HLC efforts</li> <li>New program development</li> </ul>
<b>Professional Service</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Peer review</li> <li>Active conference participation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Active participation in professional org</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Serving as external reviewer (tenure and promotion, program review) for other institutions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Leadership role in professional organization</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Serving as external reviewer (tenure and promotion, program review) for other institutions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Leadership role in professional organization</li> <li>Organizing disciplinary conference</li> </ul>

**Citizenship and leadership**



**Assumptions:**

- The faculty member is working toward active and robust citizenship in the university community
- For Full professors, effective and meaningful leadership is necessary to “exceed” expectations in service
- Departments may add to this list, but can’t subtract
- Professional service can’t be a substitute for departmental or university service over a long period of time

<sup>1</sup> Included twice because of the continuous and significant time commitment involved.

## Course Evaluation for Classes Taught by Part-Time Faculty DRAFT

**Note:** Departments will be free to merge these questions with questions of their own; they are also encouraged to consider their use for classes taught by Full Time faculty

**Instructions to Student:** We believe that meaningful input from students can help instructors improve courses. Please share your impressions of the course, and the role you played within it, in response to these questions:

### Self-evaluation questions:

1. What was the average number of hours you spent outside of class each week preparing for this course? (Include the time you spent reading, writing, and consulting with tutors, among other things.) (Scale: 0 to 2 hours, 3 to 4 hours, 5 to 6 hours, 7 to 8 hours, 9 or more hours)
2. How often did you seek out assistance from the professor outside of class? (Scale: 0 times; 1-2 times; 3-4 time; 5+ times)
3. How satisfied were you with your effort in this course (or section)? (Scale: Very Dissatisfied – Very Satisfied)

### Course Evaluation questions:

Please answer the below questions using the following scale:

1 – Strongly Disagree | 2 – Disagree | 3 – Neutral | 4 – Agree | 5 – Strongly Agree

1. Course expectations for students were clear.
2. The course material was well-organized.
3. The classroom environment was conducive to learning.
4. The instructor was accessible to students seeking help.
5. This course was academically rigorous.
6. I would recommend this course to others.

[Continued...]

**Open-ended questions:**

What are one to three specific things about the course or instructor that especially helped to support student learning?

What are one to three specific things about the course that could be improved to better support student learning?