

Minutes of Peer Review Committee Meeting

Tuesday, September 27, 2005

2:00 – 3:00 pm

Blum Union 209

Members Present: Allison Sauls, Phil Mullins, Martin Johnson, Mike Cadden, Michael Ottinger, Don Vestal, Shiva Nandan, Evelyn Brooks, Kelly Henry

Members Absent: Brenda Blessing, Jeanne Daffron, Cindy Heider

Report from Subcommittee A:

The subcommittee reviewed a copy of online form that began as an evaluation tool in UMKC's Nursing Program. It is currently used at all four of MU's campuses. Evelyn described the program exhaustively. A hard copy of the FACULTY ACTIVITY REPORT GUIDELINES 2003-2004 was handed out to all committee members for review. Allison provided a secondary handout showing how sections on creative activity in professional development could be expanded to better meet the needs of faculty in the arts.

It was asked if UMKC would modify the program to meet the needs of MWSU faculty, or would they sell the program without the code. Possibly MWSU faculty/staff could modify the program to meet our needs. The current program is copyrighted. The UMKC personnel supervisor who is in charge of the program is out of the office until October 7th, so no additional information was obtainable. Subcommittee will contact UMKC after the 7th to get cost information. The program, if used effectively, could be used to generate Point of Pride, promotion/tenure packages, award applications, and annual evaluations, and so forth. To effectively employ the program we would want to add some narrative to the various sections (possibly with a word limit).

Developer indicated that the program was already modified for UMKC. Are certifications included in the program?

Next moves:

1. Check on costs to use the program at MWSU
2. Check on modifiability of the program. What can be changed? Who would have access to modify the program UMKC or MWSU? What would we want to have changed, assuming it could be?
3. If Peer Review Committee says go with this, the committee will need to do a job of shopping this outside the committee to convince faculty that such an evaluation form is better than the present outline form.

Other questions:

- Is this program cumulative can it be printed to cover only a number of years (e.g., 1).

- How would this interface with a P & T package? It likely could it be exported and modified to make a P & T package.
- Could an institutional curriculum vitae be created from this? This online evaluation form eliminates repetition and creates some consistency.
- How would this online approach be presented to your department?
- This online approach raises some privacy issues. How would they be dealt with?

Sub Committee A should go forth with their work.

As an annual evaluation vehicle, some sort of short narrative would have to be written by the dean and/or provost that replaces the form that we now have with S/M/U. Is it problematic to have narrative evaluation only? Several thought not.

Major advantage to this system would be the ability to update the online form as achievements are done. However, a narrative by the person whose records these are would still need to be completed, as part of the annual evaluation process. This would probably have a January deadline, thereby not eliminating the annual self-evaluation. A question was raised as to whether the evaluations would need to be printed and sent to the chairs/dean/provost, or if they would be viewed online. If a hardcopy were printed, would the chair/dean/provost's comments be handwritten on the hardcopy, or would they be electronically attached, thereby becoming part of the permanent database?

Report from Sub Committee B

The subcommittee members have been working on changes in organization of the *PG* section on Peer Review.

A copy of the section outline was distributed to the members. The sections previously appeared quite a hodgepodge, as it has undergone many modifications in content over the years. The subcommittee's first goal was to reorganize the outline so that it made better sense. Then the current material would be placed in its appropriate area. Some information that is in the current section can be moved to a more appropriate section of the policy guide.

Review of the Outline:

Section VII of the *Policy Guide*

Section A: Areas of Faculty Evaluation. The committee discussed eliminating this section and including the information as part of the section on Tenure/Promotion package. However, the committee felt that this section should remain to define the university's concept of faculty evaluation. The information may need to be streamlined.

Section B: The Permanent Evaluation File. In chair's office is a permanent file with 5 things included (Job Descriptions, Annual Summaries of Teaching, Summaries of Student Evaluations of Faculty, Annual Self Evaluations, and Annual Chair/Dean/VPASA Evaluation).

- Can job descriptions be discarded? Probably. There are no real differences in job descriptions for ranks or different years.
- Annual summaries of teaching: should these be included in permanent file. If go with online evaluation, this would be included there and could simply be printed off.
- Could the Permanent Evaluation File be replaced by the electronic file that subcommittee A is examining?

Due to time constraints the subcommittee was not able to discuss the other sections in the outline.

The subcommittee is working on a clean up of the *Policy Guide*. No new policies nor changes to existing policies are being proposed. The committee is working on organizing the policies so that they are clearer. This distinction needs to be made clear to faculty in presenting any proposals.

Meeting outcomes:

- Sub Committee A will continue to work on the online form and seek information on cost of program and modification.
- Sub Committee B will continue to work on the outline, considering how to incorporate the on-line form.

Next meeting date will be on Tuesday, October 18th at 2:00 – 3:20 pm. Do not give up this hour (Tuesdays, 2-3:20 pm) in your schedule!