

Faculty Equated Overload/Release Time Semester Report

Winter Semester, 2012

Name _____ Sandra Andrews _____ Work/Project _____ Faculty Evaluation Coordinator _____

Goal/Objective/ Assignment	Outcomes Expected	Results/Impact	Accomplishments/Progress	Barriers/Issues/Comments/ Questions
Chairing JEET.	Successfully chair JEET sharing issues, concerns and work with Team members and receiving input, insight and solutions from Team members.	<p>JEET met in January, February and April.</p> <p>For JEET meetings I schedule, arrange, plan and run the meetings. I inform JEET members of the meetings through electronic appointments and reminder messages and provided information prior to and after meetings to keep members informed. During meetings I facilitated discussions and engaged members in decision making processes.</p>	<p>This winter JEET</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • member Paula Sullivan provided a report out of her participation during MCCVLC Webinar – Evaluating Performance of Online Faculty. Team discussion followed. • discussed additions/deletions to current Online Teaching Standards and how these standards would mesh with the AGC approved <i>Academic Standards for Teaching Practice</i>. As a result of the recent winter 2012 HLC visit to review GRCC’s online curriculum, it was decided that separate standards were not warranted yet online standards could be incorporated as operationalize components of the approved <i>Academic Standards for Teaching Practice</i>. • discussed the current state of negotiations as it pertained to JEET’s progress toward department projects. • discussed the pros and cons of two “clicker” models under review for College adoption. The Team endorsed the Turning Point Technologies clicker as it could best support face to face evaluation (as a substitute for paper student questionnaires). A formal recommendation for this model was submitted to IDLT • member Paula Sullivan presented the Portfolio rubric and guide she recently 	<p>During Fall 2011 and Winter 2012 there were only three administrative members of JEET as Kathy Keating has expressed concern that the Team’s work is best handled by its academic members and is no longer participating in JEET activities. Because JEET’s membership is prescribed by a Faculty Association MOU, I recommended in my Fall 2011 report that the language be changed to ensure the relevance and value of each member position. No changes were made to the MOU.</p>

			<p>developed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• engaged in a webinar presentation regarding Class Climate, a course evaluation feedback system available through the Scranton corporation. The Team learned about the System and had an opportunity to ask questions about its benefits and limitations as a replacement to our current student questionnaire printing, scanning and Zoomerang survey practices. Class Climate offers both high throughput paper and online questionnaire possibilities. Following the Course Climate Evaluation System webinar presentation and JEET discussion, Sandy met with Fred van Hartesveldt to discuss the System's capabilities and how it would align with the questionnaire protocol outlined in the Faculty Evaluation Plan. Following this discussion a written endorsement was shared with IRP outlining JEET's approval of the System and the need to use the tool within the boundaries of the Faculty Evaluation Plan.• addressed faculty concerns (JEET faculty members only)• discussed Department Project 3 (JEET faculty members only)• continued work to align the GRCC <i>Academic Standards for Teaching Practice</i> with current and proposed evaluation tools.• reviewed the Winter 2012 student questionnaire response data: 92% adjunct faculty, 93% full-time faculty (as of April 18th), discussed issues and implications.	
--	--	--	--	--

<p>Assisting with the development of the Faculty Evaluation program.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explore new electronic means to collect, tabulate, manage and disseminate student questionnaire data. <p>Faculty Evaluation Plan Revision</p> <p>Since the Faculty Evaluation Plan which outlines the Evaluation Process is a negotiated document, work to update and improve the Plan and Evaluation Process will be central to the role of the Joint Executive Evaluation Team (JEET) during 2011-12.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developed the year-end survey for faculty and administrative academic leadership. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Central to the process will be the need for very high student compliance in questionnaire completion at a nominal cost. • The Class Climate system was also reviewed and discussed later in this report. • One of the critical issues to be addressed by this project is the lack of alignment of the current evaluation instruments, for example the FGIP and the self-evaluation, with recently developed and AGC approved standards and codes. • Distributed the survey to 227 fulltime faculty members and 17 academic administrators. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JEET discussed the pros and cons of two “clicker” models under review for College adoption. The Team endorsed the Turning Point Technologies clicker as it could best support face to face evaluation (as a substitute for paper student questionnaires). A formal recommendation for this model was submitted to IDLT • Paula Sullivan presented the Portfolio rubric and guide she recently developed. • Collected data following a 10 days period. Faculty response rate was 53%; administrative response rate was 47%. Collected data will be used to inform future Faculty Evaluation Plan Revision work. 	
<p>Co-leading review of documents, creation of policies, standards or procedures.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop and plan processes for addressing opportunities and challenges in anticipation of the Faculty Association Contract. • Work with the Provost’s office and IRP staff to ensure Evaluation Processes continue to run smoothly. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JEET will review the contents of each tool to determine what adjustments should be made for better alignment. • Worked with Denyse Bening and Deb DeWent to ensure the Winter 2012 questionnaire procedures, potential issues and updates to the process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • JEET continued its review of FGIP, self-evaluation, portfolio and student questionnaire tools as they relate to the <i>GRCC Academic Standards for Teaching Practice</i>. • The Winter 2012 distribution and questionnaire process occurred with few issues. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work with Evaluators to address Evaluation process and procedure needs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distributed and discussed Evaluator checklists data for 2011-12 with JEET and ISIS members. • Spoke and met with Bill Faber to discuss his online faculty questionnaire, <i>GRCC Online Course Quick Evaluation</i> form. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Worked with Deb DeWent to update communication letters and evaluation information sheets for mid-year (off-cycle) and temporary full time faculty members • CTE faculty appreciatively received the data and indicated their use of it in future programming. • Faculty Association disapproval over the distribution and use of the form resulted in its retraction. 	
Serving as a lead faculty in Faculty Evaluation projects.	Represent faculty member interest and needs regarding the Faculty Evaluation Process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Received Input from faculty council members regarding proposed Evaluation changes • Work as the liaison for faculty members regarding all aspects of faculty evaluation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addressed numerous questions regarding student questionnaire process and timing as well as Portfolio preparation. <p>Questionnaire questions issues/topics included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o receiving too many packets o receiving too few packets o receiving too many questionnaires o receiving too few questionnaires o questions about early/late end course o forgetting to distribute questionnaires o requesting to distribute questionnaires later o questions/concerns about protocol for distributing and tabulation questionnaires o questions/concerning about protocol for written comments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Portfolio concerns ranged from what to include through the depth of the included material. 	

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Faculty concern was also raised about question 7 of the standardized student questionnaire, "The climate of this class is conducive to learning." Apparently some students are unclear about the meaning of the words "climate" and "conductive". With the term "climate" some students questioned if this was referring to "weather". Also, some students are unclear if the word "conductive" is a positive or negative term. JEET discussed these concerns and will propose review of the questions for reading level and suggest alternative language if appropriate. • Concerns were also raised regarding language in the recently created and distributed portfolio rubric. As a result, JEET reviewed and proposed language assured the faculty members and Faculty Association of the rubric's review and endorsed its current use. 	
Regularly taking a lead role as representative of the Faculty Evaluation program in campus and community meetings.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As the Chair of JEET served as a member of the Strategic Leadership Team <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Serve on the SLT Executive Team ○ Lead the Academic Alignment End sub team 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SLT <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Participated in SLT executive Team planning for 2011-12 SLT meetings ○ Continued leadership of the Academic Alignment sub team. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SLT <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Participated in all SLT meetings and activities. ○ Presented the Academic Alignment report and PowerPoint presentation during the January SLT meeting. Addressed questions asked by the SLT membership. 	
Develop a plan for leadership training and succession and mentor a co-leader in the Winter semester.	Increased capacity As the number of individuals being evaluated increases and anticipated Process changes occur, a greater number of individuals with a deeper understanding of GRCC's Faculty Evaluation history,	All current JEET faculty members were given the opportunity to accept one hour of equated overload for Winter 2012 to increase the capacity of faculty evaluation.	When this department project was developed it was not anticipated that faculty negotiations would be ongoing during Winter 2012; or that the future status of faculty evaluation as well as the work of additional faculty member would be unclear. None of the current	In Fall 2011, I proposed that the one hour of unassigned EOL for Winter 2012 semester be added to my load. I also recommended that this EOL hour could be assigned in a future semester such as

	processes, procedures, projects, challenges and opportunities will be required.		JEET faculty members were interested in accepting this opportunity due to a lack of time, clarity of role and/or interest in the work.	Summer 2012 since much work is done in summer to prepare for the upcoming academic year and close out the prior year. The addition one EOL hour to my Winter 2012 did not occur. I continue to recommend that an hour be assigned to an interested faculty member to learn more about evaluation processes during Summer 2012.
Participating as a peer-learner in professional development activities that are aligned with the assigned equated overload.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participate in ISIS meetings and professional development activities. Learn more about alternative systems to our current student questionnaire distribution and tabulation model. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participated in Winter ISIS meetings. Deb DeWent, Denyse Bening and I participated in a conference call with a Mississippi State University staff member to learn about MSU's experience using Class Climate. Later JEET, with the addition of Deb and Denyse, participated in a webinar to an experience Class Climate's operational pros and cons. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ISIS meetings provide a necessary opportunity for networking with fellow ISIS members and work coordination. Provided an oral update of JEET activities and plans. Engaged ISIS members in a valuable discussion about the alignment of GRCC academic standards and online instruction standards resulting in clarity and direction for the relationship of these standard sets. Resulting from this work a written endorsement was shared with IRP outlining JEET's approval of the System and the need to use the tool within the boundaries of the Faculty Evaluation Plan. 	
Providing reports that inform the College on how the Faculty Evaluation program could be sustained or improved.	Requested reports were prepared and submitted.	Reports include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This semester end report 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Written feedback regarding the Fall 2011 end of semester report was requested and received. A request for a follow up meeting with Ric Underhile was requested and held in March. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Barriers from earlier this year continue...Evaluation work is influenced by the outcome the Faculty Association contract. Without direction JEET does not efficiently use Team

				members' time and resources for process and tool development. Without a new contract new practices and instruments cannot be approved or implemented. It would be helpful if decision makers took these points into consideration when contract negotiations resume.
--	--	--	--	--

How closely did your goals and intended outcomes align with the actual accomplishments and results?	JEET worked toward achieving its department projects for 2011-12 and made significant progress. The Faculty Association Contract was not settled during the semester and the current Evaluation MOUs remained in effect during the Winter semester 2012; therefore new tools and processes were not completed nor implemented
What have you learned as a result of being involved in this work?	It is important to work and represent what you believe. Also, those closest to the work have the most to share and intimately understand the strengths, weaknesses and practicality of current work and proposed changes. These are not new lessons, but this work reiterates the value of these practices.
What have you learned about yourself as a leader and about leadership?	I am reminded that I am resilient and can operate well in times with many unknowns. Also, due to the negotiation process, I am leading during a time that requires a commitment to work when sufficient input is not available. Working in academia for many years has prepared me for this.
If you will continue with this work next semester, describe your next steps.	I would like continue to lead JEET and Faculty Evaluation work. At this point it is very unclear what the summer and fall semesters will hold, however I would like to continue implementation of whatever system and processes are utilized. Undoubtedly there will be extensive logistical changes. Summer work always includes the wrap up activities of the academic year and preparatory actions for the fall. It is still unclear what directions evaluation work will take during this time, but work on department projects was well thought out and should be integral to future work.
What should the college's senior leadership know about this work?	Faculty evaluation work is and always has been important throughout the course of this Team's tenure, even when its importance was not apparent to onlookers. As always, Senior leadership should be aware that JEET appreciates constructive feedback regarding its proposed framework for faculty evaluation. Keeping JEET involved in the contractual progress is in the best interests of the College, staff and faculty and ideally is the role of both the administration and faculty negotiators. Prior to this contractual cycle when JEET put forth a proposal, feedback was promptly given. Typically changes posed by the negotiating teams were addressed. Neither side had all its requests met, but the exchange and expressed concerns made for a smooth transition when new contract language was shared and implemented.

Sandy,

It certainly has been an interesting year for JEET. Although I suspect that we are simply in a period of rest as contract negotiations proceed.

Your interest in and concerns about faculty evaluation are always valued. We're all eager to engage in the processes that are currently being developed.