FDPC Director Feedback on School Director Evaluation Process: March 5, 2020

**Summary Points:**

1. **Directors would like to be part of the process/feedback on evaluation process and tool.**
2. **Evaluation should be inclusive of faculty, staff, students (as appropriate per unit), and other outside partners. For nursing, this may also include clinic staff; for education, this may include community members.**
3. **Recommendations:**
	1. **Directors and Dean work together on setting goals and initiatives early in the process, for which to be evaluated on. This helps set up a positive evaluation experience.**
	2. **Order of evaluation categories can also change depending on priorities of unit (e.g., budget high on list for SON, low on list for SOE).**
	3. **Tool should be more simple, flexible, more barebones, and less prescriptive.**

**Overall, directors would like to work with Dean on tailoring the evaluation tool specific to the unit’s priorities, early in the process, through goal-setting meetings. Even with pre-determined categories, the order of importance of the categories should be flexible and specific to unit. The overarching goal is to create a positive, goal-oriented evaluation process and experience.**

**------------**

**3/5/20 Discussion Notes – Bonnie and Christina**

FAC received a referral to put together an evaluation for school directors, it is up to the college to make the evaluation. CFA rep has reviewed the draft policy has been approved.

Executive committee wants director input prior to the document going to senate.

SOE Director input – big deal that evaluation goes into personnel file (PAF); although it does not go into WPAF. Anonymous negative feedback from someone that is always angry should not go into personnel file. What goes into the file, the dean letter or raw data from faculty? “I’m faculty. I’m not an administrator.”

* Important aspects of evaluation: meets deadlines, communicates with dean’s office, student services, accreditation deadlines, contract deadlines.
* Directors should be contacted to be able to review the document so directors can give feedback.
* Include big goals that the director would like to accomplish.

SON Director input - received the evaluation and was fine with the document, it was forwarded to SON faculty to discuss.

* Nursing has about 112 lecturer faculty & 8 TT. Faculty and lecturers should also assist in vetting evaluation tool.
* SON director is also evaluated by specific outside nursing boards, simpler evaluation may be best by combining evaluation efforts. [external eval doesn’t happen for SOE]
* No need to include students
* Tool should be flexible enough since director jobs are different, e.g., SON spends a lot of time on budget due to EL programs. [SOE – budget would be further down the list since SOE is state-side.]

Both agree to have questions like the following: “What are the goals of the unit and how is the director helping them get there?” “How are you going to move these goals forward?”

* Goals should be set by meeting with Dean to discuss goals and how to accomplish them.
* Example - SON is moving toward simulation education. That could be an aspect to include in the evaluation (that is tailored).
* Other examples include community outreach and increasing diversity.
* Dean can also add goals specific to college.

Current evaluation tool is more about management. Directors are not just managers.

Nursing already has external evaluation. Do we need two evals? Whereas, SOE does not have external eval, so an evaluation is good.

Each director SON/SOE has different priorities.

SOE already working on Roles and Responsibility document.

* This could align with the evaluation tool.
* Evaluation process/tool should be simple, with broad questions in each category.
* Once goals are set, ask faculty/staff/lecturers to also provide comments/feedback on those specific goals as part of the evaluation. (This way, you are evaluating on goals specific to the unit)

Interim meetings to check on goals early would be good, as well as setting yearly goals. Same that is already done with staff. This allows Dean to learn about each unit’s goals and Dean can stay abreast in field too.

Dean can also add to goals, for example: add in “communication” if there’s need for faster email replies since may cause workload issue.

The evaluation the dean sent in the past is good for SOE but needs work.

Should be more of an advocating tool for what units need.

Tool should be simple instrument, with basic categories; all the detail is minutia.

We can look at SDSU’s evaluation process too.

Important to have lead time in knowing what you are being evaluated on, from the beginning so can prepare, versus finding out what tool entails shortly before evaluation.