

---

# MEETING MINUTES APR. 19, 2019

---

10-11:30 a.m. RDMT 333

**Meeting Called to Order:** 10 a.m.

In Attendance: Sameer Bhattarai, Eddie Burke, Wade Hampton, Warren Hejny, Dan Hooper, Scott Huber, Andy Hughes, Robert Kirchman, Linda McGillicuddy, Melanie Purdy (chair), Brandy Scarnati, Trenton Schoope, Cheryl Woehr, Dolores Wonder, Kelley Wong

**Absent:** Dave Boden (proxy Scott Huber), Keziah Dutt, Cheryl Olson, Paul Seybold

**Guests:** Anne Flesher

## Approve March 15, 2019 Minutes

---

Wade Hampton and Linda McGillicuddy motioned and seconded respectively. The minutes were approved. Scott Huber and Cheryl Woehr abstained.

## Criteria for Tenure Track Faculty

---

The charge is to come up with guidelines, using objective criteria, for tenure track faculty, tenure committee chairs, deans, and the vice president to use to help to assess if the tenure track person is meeting the standards of: Unsatisfactory, Satisfactory, Commendable, Excellent on the [Probationary Development/Department Review Report](#).

Faculty Senate Chair Elect Anne Flesher brought a valuable document that identifies guiding principles for rating tenure track faculty in the teaching and service areas. The committee agreed to move forward with a twofold approach:

- Use the guiding principles statement from Anne Flesher as the direction
- Use select rubric content as the detail to guide the above ratings

Committee members reviewed both the guidance document and the rubric independently, and forwarded suggestions to Chair Purdy. Chair Purdy will compile the input and present it electronically to the committee for further review.

The placement of these guidelines was discussed - including having it as a separate link, having it embedded in the as a link under the Duties of the Committee Chair items (<http://www.tmcc.edu/vpaa/tenure/guidelines/>). Also perhaps have it linked in the [Guide to Preparing the Summary of Tenure Related Activities Reports](#), and to having the information more readily available in both the Probationary Development/Department Review Report (so tenure track individuals can find it easily) and the [Recommendation for Tenure form](#). Placement is to be discussed further later.

## Course Evaluations

---

**1. RESPONSE RATE** - Course evaluations submitted by students have diminished in percent since the discontinuation of the "Nag" button. Chair Purdy was asked to explore this with the Professional Standards Committee.

Web College manages the distribution of the course evaluations, though they have NO responsibility in content or course specific response outcomes. Because of this, Brandy Scarnati was kind enough to report on the history of evaluation distribution.

- 2014, ALL evaluations went to the online format
- November 2015 distribution guidelines were established, including sending these out at 80% course completion; sending email reminders; and having “nag” reminders wherein students had to click into the evaluation in order to move forward in their classes
- Spring 2017 saw the removal of the “nag” button, and response rates have dropped since then

**2. PHYSICAL EVALUATION** - There have been numerous complaints about how the course evaluation is worthless except for tenure track faculty; how it is a “popularity” contest; etc.- the faculty response to the actual evaluation is mixed. Additionally, faculty complain that the “motivation” section is irrelevant; and that the only valuable part is the “Comments” section.

- Eddie identified that this course evaluation creation included students and faculty
- It was clarified that the “motivation” section is intentional
- A number of committee members spoke up for the current evaluation

Chair Purdy asked the committee if they felt we should revamp the current evaluation or if we wanted to stick with what we currently have. Cheryl Woehr recommended having committee members discuss this with their faculty colleagues.

To Do - Committee members are charged with:

- Asking colleagues about their personal feedback about the course evaluation
  - Do they find it useful?
  - How do they work with students to have students complete them?
  - What changes would they like to see on the actual form?
- Identifying methods to increase student participation and/or identify/promote the usefulness of the course assessment.

Next Meeting TENTATIVE: August 23, 2019 from 10 a.m. - 11:30 a.m. -RDMT 333

**Meeting Adjourned:** 11:25 am.