

Faculty Evaluation Review Subcommittee
Meeting Minutes
October 3, 2006

Members present: Charles Beem, Chair, Richard Gay, Ginny Jones, Elizabeth Normandy, John Purnell, Cyndi Sheard, Guo Wei.

Members absent: Jean Sexton.

1. Call to order: Chair called meeting to order at 3:35.
2. Approval of the Minutes recorded September 5, 2006: Minutes were approved. Chair announced that, although she could not attend today, Jean Sexton will serve as Secretary at future meetings. Cyndi Sheard volunteered to record minutes for today.
3. Introductions: With two members in attendance for the first time, subcommittee members introduced themselves to each other.
4. Discussion of rules and parameters of FERS functions and actions:
 - a. Chair reminded those present that FERS is charged with following the directives of its “parent” committee—the Faculty and Institutional Affairs Committee. FIAC oversees FERS activities.
 - b. Chair reviewed responsibilities as explained in summary document titled “Faculty Evaluation Review Subcommittee” (distributed at meeting). The document is derived from the current *Faculty Handbook* and lists schedule of meetings: 10/3, 11/7, 12/5 (subject to change), 2/6, 4/3.
5. Discussion of possible tasks FERS should pursue this academic year, including ideas discussed at previous meeting and suggestions brought forward by FIAC:
 - a. From Andy Ash: Look into creation of electronic Faculty Evaluation Review timeline with links within UNCP website to alert faculty to guidelines and deadlines for submission of materials and other procedures.
 - b. From the Provost: Revise student evaluation forms and process to make them more “useful” to faculty and review committees.
 - i. Liz suggested that we might try to learn “what’s wrong with” the current instrument and/or process so that FERS might better focus this work: What are the complaints? What are the alternative instruments that might be considered?
 - ii. Charles mentioned that the Provost would like to see two student evaluations for each class—one midway and one at the end.
 - iii. After much discussion of the various aspects of the problem of finding a useful instrument for student evaluations, Charles suggested that the subcommittee focus on a limited segment of the larger problem.

- iv. Liz suggested reorganizing or “streamlining” the Faculty Evaluation Review process itself since it is clear that the current procedures as described in the Faculty Handbook “were written for a totally different institution.” For example, the current model does not serve the growth and structure of UNCP now.
 - v. Charles reminded all present that FERS can only make suggestions for how we might focus our efforts. Our suggestions are subject to approval by FIAC.
 - vi. Conclusions: Possible activities FERS might propose: Address the problem of student evaluations, including evaluation of on-line courses and instruction.
- c. Various concerns and ideas expressed by FERS members present:
- i. The impact of grades (actual and expected) on students’ evaluations of instruction. (Liz noted that the number one factor influencing students’ judgments about the success of a class is their expected grade.)
 - ii. The reality of student absences on the day evaluation forms are distributed.
 - iii. The timing and frequency of evaluations: Mid-semester only? End of course only?
 - iv. The possibility of on-line student evaluations.
 - v. Other models.
6. Assignment for next time: Find out from departments about their concerns and experiences with faculty and student evaluation processes and procedures.

Minutes prepared and submitted by Cyndi Sheard