**Evaluation Sub-Committee**

**Meeting Minutes**

**Friday, Sept. 19, 10:30 – 11:50**

In attendance: Heather Steel, Cindy Hyslop, Clint Kelly, John Rice, Laurie Walsh, Steven Garcia, Janie Moore, Pete Bagley, Mary Doucette, Tami Mette, Steve Theriault, Stephanie Davis

Absent: Lynette MacFarlan

* Purpose of sub-committee is to formulate a direction for the new teaching evaluation and to work with the evaluation committee to implement the new evaluation.
* Laurie Walsh briefly discussed the history of the evaluation, and how it has evolved over the last 8 years or so.
* Steve Theriault noted that in the future he won’t sit on the sub-committee. He reminded us that moving back to a qualitative evaluation puts more power back into supervisors’ hands, and suggested a mixture of qualitative and qualitative measures on the revised evaluation.
* The teaching faculty evaluation and administrative faculty evaluation should be parallel since both will gain merit from the same merit pool.
* The administrative evaluation was revised because the one that existed at the time was poor. Merit was a secondary consideration. The evaluation was modeled after the current teaching faculty evaluation.
* Tami M. was in favor of revising the existing system.
* Mary D. was in favor of moving the existing system to Excel then revising it.
* Pete B. was in favor of using the administrative evaluation as a starting point, as the numbers that come out of the existing evaluation aren’t always valid.
* Janie M. pointed out that the final product needs to be simplified, and that the existing evaluation requires quite a bit of training.
* Steve G. said the existing evaluation did not work for CTE. The revised form needs to better reflect CTE areas.
* Laurie W. was in favor of continuing the evolution of the existing evaluation by simplifying it to be more in line with the existing administrative evaluation. We also need a policy to go with the new evaluation.
* John R. was in favor of simplifying the current system, and liked the idea of mixing qualitative and quantitative.
* Clint K. pointed out that the role of Program Coordinator needs to be changed to Program Management – per Mike’s suggestion.
* Cindy H. was in favor of keeping the same roles and simplifying. She liked how the current evaluation allows her to show the variety of things she does.
* Heather S. pointed out that the administrative evaluation works because each person has a solid job description. Perhaps we need the same?
* Stephanie D. was in favor of modeling the evaluation after the administrative evaluation.
* John R. said he will look at working with the workload policy document to help create a ‘teaching’ job description. This could be used as the baseline for a satisfactory rating.
* Department Chairs need to be included in this process.
* Heather will send a blank template of the administrative evaluation and Mary and Cindy will work on transferring the existing evaluation into it.

Next meeting: October 17, 10:30?