Frustrations with the current IAF process included:
- the current IAF procedures in general,
- inconsistencies in interpretation & difficulty in reading requirements,
- reasons for collecting students work (Probable for proof of teaching competencies since largest weighted point value),
- laborious time commitment vs limited monetary award (definitely not cost effective if for merit only),
- lack of understanding of point system,
- unstructured classroom observation instrument/format (Is the observation for continuing contract and admin decisions?),
- importance doesn’t seem to be on “Did you achieve your objectives from last year? Where are you headed this year?” – but it should be (would require preapproval of your objectives before the start)
- unfairness of expectations for non-tenured track

Suggestions discussed included:
- Matching the tenure process to the IAF process for those working on tenure process (timelines don’t match up - IAF is calendar year…the previous year… Tenure is from August to August & a 5 yr compilation)
- Using a current Vitae for the IAF with additional info (proof of instructional competency needed) – consider having a minimum requirement like the Vitae and just share the Merit monies with everyone who meets the minimum
- Using a format similar to other departments (looked at business)
- Making the process scoring weighted differently for non-tenure, tenure, post tenure (non-tenure might choose 0 research/publication pts., tenure track might choose more research/publication pts., and post tenure might choose more service points)
- Creating a Rubric for outlining point standards (more clearly detailed than present)
- Creating a system which matches the KTIP format with artifacts relating to each of the KY standards
- More involvement of peer recommendations/observations (IAF committee observations?)
- A more standardized form and format for observations
- Could we eliminate course materials, course tests, syllabi? (Probably not – needed for proof of teaching competencies – Could they be kept in teacher’s desks and provided if requested?),

Final Consensus Suggestion:
- Can we revise the current format by outlining a new shell and take a look at it? Will there be enough info for the IAF to judge the teaching? Is it possible for everyone to decide where their points will come from with different priorities? (non-tenure = teaching, tenure track = research/publication/presentation, post tenure = service, etc)

Next Meeting: Wednesday, Sept 10 4:00
Individual Activity File Clarification Suggestions:

In an effort to standardize the format for the IAF, we recommend:

- 3 ring Binder divided into 4 Main Category Tabs = Teaching Portfolio, Research/Scholarship, Service, Recognition. There will be numerical sections within the tabs which may be subdivided with colored paper dividers. Note: An electronic file may be submitted utilizing this format.

**Tab A: Teaching Portfolio:**
- Section 1: Responsibilities – ie, schedules for spring, summer, fall, # of students, # KTIP, # advisees (list)
- Section 2: Philosophy – ie, brief (half page)
- Section 3: Efforts to improve teaching – ie, attended workshops, conferences, readings, course development, new materials (brief paragraph or list)
- Section 4: Relation of your teaching & research – ie, action research that benefits your teaching (brief paragraph or list)
- Section 5: Direction of Student Research – ie, research projects assigned (brief paragraph or list)
- Section 6: Course Constraints – ie, ITV, overload, web courses (brief paragraph or list)
- Section 7: Course syllabus – One course (Not common syllabus)
- Section 8: Graded Assignment & Exam - At least 1 each (Photocopy – No names)
- Section 9: Washington Instrument Student Rating Summary (Photocopy - No student comment sheets), Student teaching evaluations (Photocopies) & ABC sheets (No names)
- Section 10: Other – ie, Course management, office hours, return papers timely basis

**Tab B: Research/Scholarship:**
- Section 1: Research
- Section 2: Publication
- Section 3: Grants
- Section 4: Presentations
- Section 5: Major Research Project Reports
- Section 6: Other - ie, journal reviewer, grant evaluator/reviewer

**Tab C: Service:**
- Section 1: Road Scholars
- Section 2: Committees
- Section 3: Non Professional Community/Civic Service
- Section 4: Professional Consultation to schools, colleges, agencies, businesses, and institutions
- Section 5: Professional Organization Leadership roles (Local, State, Natl)
- Section 6: Residential College
- Section 7: Other – ie, Institutional reports, Program Coordinator

**Tab D: Special Offices/Recognition (Optional)**
Sept. 10, 2003    IAF Meeting # 2    4:00 pm:

Members Present:  Ginny Richerson, Chairperson, Joe DeBella, Dana Harader, Tom Lough, Pam Matlock

Minutes were distributed prior to meeting.  Discussion continued.

The IAF shell revisions from last week’s meeting were revisited with the intent of seeking further clarifications and simplifications. Additional revisions were suggested. See revised shell for these revisions.

Additional comments:

The rating system should be less arbitrary, but a rubric may be difficult because it is subjective in nature. Further discussion was tabled until the next meeting.

Whether the IAF is utilized for Merit only or for additional administrative purposes should be discussed and clarified.

A copy of the revised IAF shell will be given to Department Chair, Marty Jacobs, for his input prior to the next meeting.

Agenda for Next Meeting to include:

- Additional changes to IAF shell, if necessary
- Scoring/rating criteria
- Use of the IAF for merit and “other” administrative decisions
- Deadline for Committee Recommendations

Next Meeting Tentatively set for 7:30 a.m. Friday, September 26, 2003

Addendum:  Sept. 11, 2003:
Dr. Jacobs suggested the following revisions:
    - Add Student teaching evaluations to Tab A Sec. 9
    - Add provisions for supplying an electronic version.

Additionally it was decided to take out the appendices and additional tabs as a way of marking the sections.
See revisions on attached shell.
Addendum: Wednesday, Sept. 24, 2003

Dana Harader and Ginny Richerson met to expand the IAF shell with descriptive wording to assist understanding. These suggestions were sent to the committee for preview before Friday’s meeting.

IAF Committee: Sept. 26, 2003  7:30 am
Members Present: Ginny Richerson, Chairperson, Joe DeBella, Dana Harader, Tom Lough, Pam Matlock

Discussion about the point system and scoring grid were discussed and everyone felt comfortable with it.

Drop the “same course consecutive years” since some may teach the same courses year to year and it is difficult to monitor.

The wording, “A collection of documents and materials,” was felt to not be specific. It was decided it would read better as “Choose artifacts representative of the scope and quality of your teaching performance. Quality not quantity counts!” Concerns about not including “fluff” were addressed. It will be suggested at departmental meetings to discourage thank you e-mails from students, etc.

Concerns were expressed about the cost of joining professional organizations as a criteria of the IAF.

Issues were addressed about the purposes of the IAF as being more than just for the meager merit pay. It is a good process for personal reflection and for consideration of continuing contract.

Revisions to draft:
Tab A: Section 4 was revised to be Relationship Between Your Teaching and Research.

Tab A: Section 1: List schedules for spring/summer/fall, number of students, number of KTIP interns, number of student teachers….etc

Tab A: Section 3: Bulleted list …at departmental meeting it will be suggested to highlight conferences, workshops, etc

Remaining Sections will reverse the order…description first then examples…eliminate ie and parenthesis.

On Page 2, C6 – will be moved to Tab B. Punctuation, spelling, and grammatical errors were revised.
Tab B: Format was changed to match Tab A’s bulleted lists. Artifacts are not suggested and will be relayed at the departmental meeting. Section 5: Research Project will be eliminated and included under Section 1.

Tab C: Revisions made to match format of Tabs A & B. Most sections were revised to just include bulleted lists. Section 6 title was changed to Community/Civic services.

Tab D was revised to be descriptive instead of list.

It will be noted that all sections be included. If there is no documentation, then a sheet which just says Not Applicable.

The committee addressed the low weighting of student evaluations under Tab A.

These final revisions will be submitted to the Department Chair. If no additional suggestions are made, the revised document will be presented at the next departmental meeting.