

Associate Deans Council
June 23, 2021
Meeting Minutes

Present: Peter Ryan, Jim Dunne, Randy Follett, Dana Franz, Nancy Fultz, Don Grebner, Robert Green, Jeffrey Haupt, Brien Henry, Deborah Lee, Melanie Loehwing, Tabor Mullen, Ian Munn, Seth Oppenheimer, Steve Parrott, Kevin Rogers, Michael Seymour, Emily Owen, Scott Willard, Eric Moyen, Jermaine Jackson, Tina Gilliland

Dr. Peter Ryan called the meeting to order at 1:30 p.m.

1. Consideration of the minutes

Upon a motion made by Dr. Brien Henry and second by Dr. Scott Willard the minutes from June 9, 2021 were approved with no edits.

2. Annual Faculty Evaluation Document – Dr. Eric Moyen

- When the Student Evaluation Taskforce presented their report, one of the recommendations was to create a subcommittee to evaluate the current and draft a new student course evaluation survey instrument. Committee members were assigned to sub-groups to review student course evaluation instruments from 14 peer and peer+ institutions in an effort to develop a new and more balanced survey instrument for Mississippi State University.
- The committee had many long, laborious meetings, regarding which questions to keep and which questions to delete, from the information they obtained during their research of other institutions.
- One of the concerns of the committee was the possibility of “survey fatigue” among students. Due to that concerns, the committee tried to use as few questions as possible on the new survey document.
- Are the students able to learn what they want to, based on the instructional activities in the class? The entire survey itself is designed to answer that question. So if the students know what is expected of them, if activities help them learn, if the assignments meet the objectives of the class, if the instructor welcomes their feedback, provides information that helps them learn, and in the class they gain the knowledge that they need --- that’s effective instruction.

After listening to Dr. Moyen’s presentation on the merits and potential shortcomings of the new survey document, the council agreed that this document speaks to the effectiveness of the instructor. The council members also agreed that the intent of Question 3 on the proposed new survey instrument addresses the intent of Question 2 on the current survey instrument.

3. Annual Faculty Evaluation Document – Dr. Jim Dunne

- The Faculty Performance Task Force was given their charge from Dr. Shaw on October 10, 2019. The three charges were as follows:

- Develop a comprehensive performance evaluation document that fits the needs of faculty across the university.
- Evaluate best practices from other institutions that could be part of the evaluation process.
- Recommend adjustments to any relevant university policies regarding faculty performance evaluation. The current AOP was approved in 2011 and the revised AOP has been approved by the Faculty Senate but was put on hold until the recommendations of this task force.
- The taskforce was comprised of a mix of faculty and department heads/directors along with several administrators. Three subcommittees were then formed: Best Practices, Evaluation Language, and Annual Faculty Evaluation Form.
- The taskforce recommends new evaluative language for the evaluation document.
 - There is an intentional change in language to avoid similar words used in the P&T review. The two reviews are different; one is primarily formative and done by one individual. The other is summative and performed by numerous people, both internal and external.
 - Dr. Scott Willard asked how one would use the new phrase "... for current rank and position" at the end of each rating description. For example, in principle, what determines how "Effective Performance" or "Highly Effective Performance" should be viewed in relation to current rank and position. On the Annual Evaluation instrument Dr. Willard asked whether we are assessing faculty differently in research, teaching, extension or service based on rank and position – e.g., are Full Professors held to a higher standard than Assistant Professors on the annual evaluation and departmental metrics, or vice versa? Is this true in practice for the Annual Evaluation vs. the P&T processes? Dr. Willard asked whether “current rank and position” needed to be a qualifier on the annual evaluation and how faculty and Heads will interpret this.

(Dr. Dunne shared slides displaying the taskforce language recommendations.)

- The four university-wide goals:
 - International component
 - Community engagement focus
 - Innovation and entrepreneurship focus
 - Inclusion, diversity, equity, and access
- For overall ratings, the Department Head/Director initiates the FTE assignment. However, it should be a collaborative effort with the faculty member.
- Dr. Scott Willard stated that some faculty members in DAFVM have very defined FTE assignments that are linked budgetarily to federal mandates and matches associated with the separately funded units. Dr. Willard expressed some concern that changing FTE assignments in the annual evaluation that may be contrary to their budgeted assignment may be problematic in these cases and would need some discussion. Dr. Dunne noted this is an issue that would need to be worked out.
- Dr. Ian Munn requested a possible language change from FTE to workload, or something similar. Several council members agreed with this request.

4. AOP's

➤ **AOP 13.15: Evaluation of Teaching Performance**

This document has been revised by the Evaluation of Teaching Task Force.

The spirit of the changes overall, were an approach to have a more holistic evaluation of teaching.

Dr. Willard had concerns with the last sentence in the first paragraph: "Student will be informed of how the course survey will be used." Dr. Willard suggested changing "used" to "administered". After further discussion, Dr. Ryan suggested tabling this AOP to allow the taskforce or Professor Seymour to review and clarify the intent of the language in the sentence of concern. AOP 13.15 was tabled.

Adjourned 3:00 PM