Faculty Evaluation Task Force Minutes for Jan. 20, 2017
Meeting at Meramec Campus, SC 125, 1 pm

Attendance: Deborah Char, Scott Gevaert, Layla Goushey, Becky Helbling, Doug Hurst, Andrew Langrehr (co-chair), Ame Mead-Roach, Jeff Papier (co-chair), Rita Pernik, David Shields, Dustin Sweet, Robert Thumith, Dennis White

1. Approval of Agenda
   The agenda was approved.

2. Approval of Minutes
   The minutes were approved.

3. Consensus Building - Formative vs. Summative System
   At the Dec. 2, 2016 meeting, we agreed that in order to move forward, we needed to come to consensus on whether the new system would be formative or summative, or whether some middle ground was possible. At today’s meeting, after a far-reaching conversation, we arrived at consensus on this fundamental issue: the new system will be purely formative. The faculty member will own any data that may be generated during the evaluation process (possible examples: results of dean’s classroom visit, results of student evaluations, etc.). After a faculty member completes the evaluation process, the only document which will go into his/her personnel file is one stating whether the process has been completed. The dean will make this determination based on a conversation with the faculty member regarding the latter’s professional growth during the evaluation cycle.

However, it is essential to remember that the purpose of the new system is to foster and provide feedback on professional growth, not to assign “grades” of complete/incomplete -- or indeed any grades at all. The evaluation process should be designated as “not completed” only if the faculty member has made little or no effort to engage in the evaluation process. In this case, the dean and faculty member should work together to establish a timeline and plan for the faculty member to complete the process. Engagement includes setting goals and working in good faith towards meeting them, even when these goals are not achieved, however that may be measured. The heart of the new system is growth: reflecting on why certain goals were not met is as much an opportunity for growth as achieving them.
Further salient points are listed below. These will likely prove to be important to faculty as we present the new system:

- Moving from a “carrot and stick” approach to one based on internal motivation would represent a true cultural change at the College. We would be moving from a culture of punishment and reward to a culture of growth.
- Given this change, deans and faculty members would need to be trained in the use of the new system. If a dean were to use the system in punitive fashion, faculty would need to address this issue with the dean and/or provost.
- This change in culture could allow some faculty members and deans to build better, more collaborative relationships.
- “What about identifying problematic faculty behavior? Can a purely formative system do this?” Problematic behavior doesn’t show up in the current, summative faculty evaluation system. However, such behaviors do show up in many other areas, and are addressed outside of the current evaluation system.
- “What about identifying positive faculty performance?” Since the new system is purely formative, results of deans’ observations could not be included in a promotion binder. Allowing this would compromise the integrity of the new evaluation system’s formative nature. However, faculty could ask their deans to observe them outside of the evaluation system, for purposes of promotion. While allowing student evaluations into the promotion binder would not be problematic (since students do not supervise faculty), faculty could also choose to conduct separate student evaluations for purely promotional purposes. Naturally, faculty would be free to discuss in their promotion narratives the professional growth they achieved during the evaluation cycle.
- It is essential to create clear instructions for the new system. These will help ensure consistency across the district, and serve as guidelines for faculty members and deans.
- As agreed upon earlier, we need to tie the evaluation narrative to the College’s strategic initiatives. One way to do so is to include boilerplate language in the new system’s instructions.

4. Reports from Service Week Q&A Sessions
   MC (small number of faculty in attendance) and W: Becky and Dusty reported that faculty are comfortable with the new system thus far. FV: Scott noted that drop-in sessions were not held during Service Week on his campus. He gave a brief presentation at the Joint Division meeting. FP: the session was canceled due to weather. It may be rescheduled.

5. Other Topics
   a. Andrew noted that the pause in the faculty evaluation system was approved. The next cycle will begin in August 2017.
   b. In order to have Governance approve a new system by Fall 2017, we would likely need to present the system at the March CAC meeting. Andrew proposed the idea of presenting a
“skeletal” version of the system at the March meeting, with more specifics to follow at a later CAC gathering. The initial release would include the philosophy behind the system, along with its main components. The second release would include details: forms for data sources, etc. The idea is that with this two-phase approach, we would know sooner rather than later that the foundations of the new system had been approved. We could then complete the specifics of the system relatively quickly. However, a number of task force members felt that in order for faculty to approve the system, they would need to see it in its entirety. We will return to this issue at our next meeting.

6. **Topics for Next Meeting**
   a. Governance: Present new system in phases, or wait until completed?
   b. Discussion of data sources: Which ones should be included? Mandatory? Optional?
   c. Subcommittees

7. **Schedule Next Meeting**
   Next meeting: 2 – 5 pm on Fri. Feb. 3, 2017, at the Forest Park Campus. Room TBA.

8. **Adjournment**
   The meeting adjourned at 4 pm.