Faculty Evaluation Task Force Minutes for Fri. Feb. 3, 2017  
Forest Park Campus, FP SC025, 2 pm

Attendance: Deborah Char, Syed Chowdhury, Scott Gevaert, Layla Goushey, Becky Helbling, Doug Hurst, Andrew Langrehr (co-chair), Ame Mead-Roach, Emily Neal, Lonetta Oliver, 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. Opportunities for further faculty input
   We will hold campus sessions for faculty when further details of the new evaluation system are in place. We discussed conducting another survey, but after deciding on approaches to Governance a bit later on in the meeting, we decided an additional survey wouldn’t be necessary.

4. Consensus Building
   a. Probationary faculty
      Andrew noted that the new evaluation system presupposes a certain level of competence and professionalism among faculty. He wondered whether evaluation for probationary faculty should contain a summative component. Such a component would also generate official documentation for any job performance issues that might arise during the probationary period. If new faculty successfully move to continuing status, they would also move to the purely formative system. This idea has support in the Joint Resolution, which states (in IX A. 1) that “[d]uring this probationary period, extensive administrative analysis and evaluation of [new faculty’s] professional performance will take place.” There was consensus in favor of a probationary system, and several approaches to implementing it were discussed. We will return to this issue after the evaluation system for continuing faculty is more fully developed.
b. Phased approach to approval in Governance
   - Andrew clarified the phased approach to approval in Governance which he introduced at our last meeting. We would present the main features of our proposed system to CAC, along with draft versions of forms for data sources (student evaluations, etc.). After some discussion we decided to proceed in this way, but to bring the new system to the Mar. 6, 2017 CAC meeting as an information, rather than action, item. We will lodge the item at a later CAC meeting, perhaps in April. In addition to the campus forums, this will give faculty time to review and comment on the new system. At some future point, the fully developed system will be presented for a vote. Given timelines, we may need to do a soft rollout of the system before it receives final approval.
   - Ame will educate the deans on the new system, perhaps in conjunction with Bob.
   - We need to incorporate continuous improvement language into the new system, so that faculty understand the system can be revised as needed.

   We decided to return to these questions after forms for the data sources are more fully developed.

5. Subcommittees to work on data sources
   a. Necessary?
      We agreed that subcommittees are the most efficient way to proceed.
   b. Formation of/timelines for subcommittees
      We created a list of the subcommittees we needed, and prioritized them. Data source subcommittees are the priority right now. Everyone on the task force is a member of one such group: Self-Reflection, Student Evaluation, or Dean/Chair. Each group will work on a form for their data source, and present their progress at our next meeting. We need to make substantial progress on the data sources as quickly as possible, since the agenda-setting meeting for the Mar. 6 CAC meeting is Mar. 1. Jeff will send the list of subcommittees and members to the task force.
6. **Schedule Next Meetings/Topics for Meetings**
   
a. Our next meeting will be held on Fri., Feb. 17 from 1:30 – 4:30 pm on the Meramec Campus. Room TBA. Subcommittees will meet first, then present to the entire group.

   b. The following meeting will be held on Fri., Feb. 24 from 1:30 – 4:30 pm on the Meramec Campus. Room TBA. At this meeting, we will prepare for the Mar. 6 presentation to Governance, and address other issues as needed.

7. **Adjournment**
   
The main meeting adjourned at 4:30 pm. Subcommittees met briefly afterwards.