**Sub-Evaluation Committee Agenda**

Thursday, November 6, 2014

LUND 102

11:00 AM – 12:00 PM

**Meeting Agenda**

Clarification of purpose of sub-committee

Options/Questions/Decisions:

Criteria: What is fair in terms of - what we do, how it compares to other institutions and to Admin. Faculty?

1. Form Structure:

Keep existing evaluation and clean it up – use points

Pro – Already done

Cons – Cumbersome, a lot to clean up

TMCC

Pro – Simple, elegant, easy to use

Con – Unable to accurately reflect what you do each semester with no weights, no narratives

Merge ours with TMCC

Weights for main roles, no weights, set weights or ranges?

Pro – Accurately reflect what we do, comparable with Admin. Fac.

Con – Skewed – able to ‘game’ system?

Impact weights for sub-categories?

Pro – Accurately reflect what we do, emphasize areas of focus

Con – Confusing, faculty ‘gaming’ system

Packets of activities to achieve commendable/excellent – overall or for each role?

Must achieve Satisfactory before adding activities for commendable/excellent?

1. Other questions/points:

How do IDEA scores fit into the roles/weights? Just enter as a satisfactory score? If you don’t make satisfactory IDEA scores, can you still obtain merit?

How do we fill in the score for each sub-category?

Check box for Satisfactory?

Score 1-5 for Commendable/Excellent activity packets, or check box?

Need to clarify sub-categories, Ex. Instructional Design

Have narratives to justify weights and activities/packets to achieve commendable and excellent

How many activities needed for commendable/excellent? Should there be a cap/maximum?

Need to be able to change weights mid-year

1. Assignments