

Proposal for Faculty Evaluation Process Improvements

ADHOC Faculty Evaluation Committee Members: Jamie Carlson, David Antonini, Karl Stevens, Jonathen Foster, Mary Doucette, Tim Esh, Yvonne Naungayan, & Daniel Murphree,

Introduction

The ADHOC Faculty Evaluation Committee has conducted a thorough review of the current evaluation process and has identified key areas for improvement. This proposal outlines recommended revisions to enhance efficiency, fairness, and accessibility within the evaluation process at Great Basin College (GBC). The recommendations aim to modernize evaluation procedures, recognize faculty contributions more accurately, and streamline assessment process and tracking.

Proposed Recommendations

Digital Accessibility and Form Modifications

Transitioning the evaluation document into a working document integrated with an electronic system, such as Watermark or a similar platform, to facilitate ease of use, review, and signature collection.

Convert the current form into a user-friendly fillable format that allows online access each year, eliminating the need for manual distribution. Putting the evaluation onto the website for faculty to access would be beneficial to those employees that would prefer to work on it sooner than the current distribution date.

Add a fillable year field to the document. This would allow for annual updates without requiring a new template distribution each year to faculty.

Teaching 1.B. Instructional Delivery

Replace the outdated IDEA evaluation system with updated student evaluation scores. This process is one line that needs to be updated to reflect what GBC is currently using to evaluate instructor effectiveness in the classroom.

Clarify the section under 1.B. where it has the note to explain how the rating from the student evaluation is used to calculate the role rating.

Teaching 1.C. Course Assessment

The committee recommends adding a paragraph to this section to define the course assessment process and its importance. This section should outline the steps for assessing courses, ensuring

alignment with both Gen Ed and program requirements. It should emphasize regular assessments to avoid gaps, which can impact program and institutional accreditation. Clear guidelines will promote consistency, accountability, and continuous improvement, strengthening the educational experience and meeting accreditation standards.

Teaching 1. A. Instructional Design

Move the ADA statement to the required section under instructional design.

Add an additional check box for having an AI policy or statement in the syllabi.

Teaching 1. D. Instructional Management

Assign two items for faculty who create their own banks of test questions for a course due to the amount of time that it takes. Allow for one item if the faculty member chooses to order a test bank from a company.

Allow the option for up to two items for faculty who teach winter or the summer courses. These are additional requirements that are outside of the required time at the college.

Change the wording for the item desk copies ordered to include online resources for course development.

Increase the items for faculty who create a new course to reflect the effort required to create these courses. When creating a new course, the course needs to be developed in its entirety and this would count for four additional items.

Create a point system based on the number of part-time instructors the faculty member manages. List managing 1-5 part-time faculty as one item and add an additional item for managing more than five part-time faculty members.

Professional 2.B. Scholarly/Creative

Increase the value of publishing a book to five items towards this section, requiring justification for the higher level of items awarded.

Allow multiple items to be counted for each publication, book review, and/or article published if justified.

Assign one item per conference presentation to encourage faculty participation in academic opportunities outside of campus.

Justifying the additional items by the amount of time that it takes someone to prepare a presentation, author a book, publish an article, or author a book review.

Service 3. A. Service to the Institution

Implement a structured recognition system for faculty members that are serving on multiple faculty senate, institutional, or ADHOC committees. For example, list it as a item for each of the following:

- 1-2 committees or subcommittees
- 3-4 committees or subcommittees
- 5-6 committees or subcommittees

This allows for additional credit for service beyond the minimum requirements that are set.

Add an additional required category for regularly attending and participating in department meetings.

Service: 3.B. Service to Students

Define what student advising is or means within the requirements. Explaining that student advisement includes informal discussions outside of class regarding academic progress and career planning. By doing this it will ensure that faculty receives recognition/credit for student advisement, even if it does not occur through a formalized process.

For example, on the document provide a statement similar to the following:

“Advising includes but is not limited to: X, Y, Z”

Conclusion

These proposed changes aim to refine and modernize the faculty evaluation process while ensuring fair recognition of faculty contributions. Choosing to adopt these revisions, GBC can enhance faculty engagement, streamline assessments, and improve overall evaluation transparency. The Faculty Evaluation Committee submits this proposal for review and approval by the Faculty Senate to submit for potential changes in the future evaluations.