South Central College

Faculty Performance Appraisal/Evaluation Process – Interview 10/9

Questions:

1. **Is the written process clear and understandable? Are the expectations of the faculty member clear?**
Documents are too long, confusing, and hard to reference back and find information. Reorganize the information, make it more clear what are faculty responsibilities, what are dean responsibilities. Who does what, who keeps what, what information is retained and where. It seems like it is 3 evaluation models squished into one. It is way too long and burdensome as it is. **Are there any oral interpretation issues?** Dean emailed the documents, and then just informally explained what his role was right before Christmas break.

2. **Are the most appropriate materials being collected for the appraisal? Should any additional materials be included? Should any current materials not be included? (*from both faculty and dean perspective*)** Faculty: Gathering a sampling of documents would be much better, especially for technical faculty who may have many more different courses than LA faculty. Perhaps do all the materials for just one class, the one the dean observes. Deans probably don't look very in depth at all the material any way. They would not have time and their feedback seemed to reflect that they didn't read it all. Why even have optional material, dean for sure doesn't look at it. The deans have already seen a lot of the required materials so why create the extra work of requiring it again in this process. Faculty Portfolio Contents for Faculty Performance Appraisal: remove #1 (Form FPA #1), #3 Transcripts of Courses for College Faculty Credentialing (only good for probationary faculty), #4 Student Evaluations (dean has already seen), #7 Prof Development Plan (dean has already seen). And why bother with optional items?

3. **Regarding the dean's classroom observation, when during the semester would be the best time for the dean to conduct the observation? (*Dean & faculty member mutually agree on a time. Deans may also observe at unscheduled times.)** No best time, but make sure the process is started early enough in the semester to get things done. It would be very helpful to have a time line with deadlines to complete things. Also, the Faculty Pre-Classroom Observation Form (FPA #2) is not needed, it is ridiculous. The dean should be able to observe these things in the classroom, doesn't need pre-knowledge. Same thing with

getting any handouts or Power Points ahead of time. To truly experience the classroom the dean should not see them ahead of time. And this form doesn't fit for online courses. Regarding the Dean Classroom Performance Appraisal Form (DPA #3), it contains quite a bit to be covered in a 50 minute class, and some items might not be appropriate or covered during that 50 minutes. On page 2, strengths and/or opportunities for growth should be 2 separate questions.

(Did you have a peer classroom observation?) No, don't know anyone who did. Peer to peer could be helpful, but it could also be the case where the observer won't say anything negative because it's not anonymous and doesn't want hurt feelings. Noted that the Dean Classroom Performance Appraisal Form is twice as long as the Peer-to-Peer Review Form.

4. **What are the strengths of this appraisal/evaluation process?** Forces dean & faculty to have a discussion on faculty strengths and opportunities for improvement. Faculty self-reflection is good, but the process did not help shine a light on any strengths or weaknesses, or bring out any suggestions for improvement. The point was made too that the deans could at any time do classroom observation without this process being on place.

5. **What opportunities for improvement to the appraisal/evaluation process do you see? (*Do you have any input on how to streamline the appraisal/evaluation process?*)** Scale it down and have it align better. Regarding the Post Portfolio Review Summative Commentary (FPA #8), many of the materials required to be collected in this process will not assist or provide helpful information to score many of the items (#1 - #12) on this form. There is no guideline given on how a dean should determine a score. There is no place for the dean to give any explanation on why a particular score was given. There is no place for a faculty member to refute or disagree with a score. No follow up or "action plan" for improvement.

    Form FPA #5 – Syllabus Review Form – the "encouraged content" section – felt like the dean was saying faculty had to have this content, even though it indicated "encouraged" not required. The ADA statement – there has been an issue on where to find this, but with the new WIDs pre-programming it should not be an issue now. As the syllabi are intellectual property, deans should not be able to tell faculty how to design theirs.

    FPA #7 – Self Appraisal form – is redundant and not necessary. Could ask instead for the faculty's "Teaching Philosophy Statement" Or ask for faculty to write out 2 professional development goals, and review those in a year's time.

    FPA #1 – Faculty Position Data Reflection – ridiculous form. Mentions activities such as advising, committee assignments, etc. Since this is only about 20% of a faculty members' job, how do we best assess it? This form isn't very useful for that assessment.

6. **Comments on the timeline – enough time to accomplish the process in the semester?**

7. **Any other comments or concerns?** Faculty perceive that this process is way too long and cumbersome for the deans too, especially if they will be doing evaluations for 15+ faculty members in a semester. What about adjunct faculty, or temporary faculty?