

PIE Council
Meeting Minutes - March. 28, 2025

Present: Brian Anderson (Chair), Christy Dickerson, Marty Hatton, Jess Harpole, Karen George (for Lee Anne Puckett), Magan Evans, Carla Lowery, Penny Mansell, Clear Moore, Jennifer Moore, Anika Perkins, Chanley Rainey, Barry Smith, Tracee Watkins, Shelby Wilson

Absent: Aaron Brooks, Christi Dillon, President Nora Miller, Stephanie Salvaterra, Jo Shumake, and Laila Wrenn

- I. Approved (Smith, Brooks) January minutes.
- II. Discussion of Staff Evaluation

Dissatisfaction w/ Form

Anderson said that he has observed a lack of comments added by supervisors and feels that the format makes things hard to read and discourages reflection and detailed narrative. He also noted that he doesn't really think about it until Jan. and then has only two weeks or so to complete the form.

Mansell said she doesn't like the form either in that many criteria evaluated on the form are not relevant to the competencies that matter at CPDC. They end up having to do teacher evaluations as well as the university staff evaluations.

Harpole noted that Athletics also has an issue with competencies being a mismatch with the standard eval, so they have created a supplemental eval form. Lowery advised that these can be uploaded onto the evaluation site as an attachment to the staff evaluation.

Satisfaction

Hatton and C. Moore felt that they were able to add as many comments as they wanted to and were able to use the form to help prepare for face-to-face discussions with staff.

Mansell also added that it is helpful to do what Hatton instituted in the School of Ed, whereby supervisors have conversations with staff *before* completing the form and ask them to share positives and areas for growth on their performance over the past year.

Training

Lowery suggested that there may be a need to have HR (Moore suggested Hatton join) conduct a training on how to use the form and all of its functionality as well as best practices for evaluation.

Policy

There is a policy dealing with administrator and faculty evaluations, but there is nothing specific about staff evaluations as far as anyone is aware. Anderson encouraged PIE to work on developing a policy for staff evals next year.

C. Moore suggested that PIE gather input from Staff Council and Directors Council ahead of work on a formal policy.

III. Discussion of Faculty Evaluation

Hatton walked the group through the evaluation form used in the School of Ed and explained how it helps faculty and chairs focus on goal-setting and alignment of faculty and departmental priorities. Noted that it is detailed and helps faculty prepare their P&T portfolios, but doesn't require extensive narrative writing.

Anderson walked the group through the evaluation form used in A&S and explained that it does require much more narrative writing, but that may be necessary for such a sprawling college. His form mirrors the policy statement, is designed to help faculty prep for P&T, and provides suggestions for activities that might demonstrate competency and growth.

Evans echoed Anderson's thoughts, saying that his evaluation guide is very similar to what is used in Nursing. She agreed that it is a very time-intensive process if followed. Smith emphasized that it is helpful to have a more flexible guide rather than a template because of the variation in expectations across faculty.

Hatton suggested the group consider creating a post-tenure review procedure.

IV. Discussion of Adjunct Evaluation

Anderson walked the group through the Adjunct Eval. Form and noted that supervisors are often filling it out based on loose impressions because many adjuncts are online and have tenuous relationships with chairs.

Hatton noted that adjunct faculty do not routinely return self-evaluation requests, and Anderson agreed that it is often a one-way street where the chair is doing an evaluation without any conversation with or input from the adjunct.

George shared that she finds the form very helpful, but she has 10 adjuncts who have been working with the RN-BSN program for many years. She says that her adjuncts routinely turn these in to her, and they hold them until forms are returned. They do audits of the feedback being provided by adjuncts hired to grade student work, so there is a culture of strong adjunct evaluation in Nursing. They also work with the Coordinators to write narratives for the adjuncts that supplement the form.

C. Moore noted that she would prefer a Likert scale to the Yes/No dichotomous choices provided, but she gets by with the form as is. She supplements it with class observations and one-on-one conversations. She also suggests giving the form to adjuncts at the beginning so that they can do the job with the end goal in mind.

Watkins said that she found the form to be a great conversation starter in discussion with her adjuncts, possibly due to its informality.