Faculty Evaluation Task Force Minutes for Mon. April 17, 2017
Kirkwood Station Brewing Company, 3 – 5 pm

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

1. Approval of Agenda
   The agenda was approved.

2. Approval of Minutes
   The minutes were approved, with one correction.

3. Feedback through Governance Process / Implications
   We discussed the feedback which we’ve received on the proposed faculty evaluation system as it works its way through the governance process. At the April 10 CAC meeting, some faculty expressed support for the proposed system as is. Other faculty expressed concerns, focused primarily on two features of our system: (1) the fact that forms and data generated during the evaluation process cannot be used in promotion binders, and (2) the fact that the evaluation system does not generate any summative artifacts to be placed in HR personnel files. During CAC, a faculty member proposed an amendment requiring that student evaluations conducted as part of the formal evaluation process be placed in promotion binders. The amendment was voted down.

   At today’s Task Force meeting, we reaffirmed our support for the fully formative system which we have put forth. We need to remind faculty that in their promotion binders, they can include assessments and evaluations generated outside of the formal evaluation process. In addition, we need to explain that a summative document resulting from the evaluation process does not constitute the kind of substantive defense against student complaints which some faculty believe it would. We will continue to provide context, clarify, and answer questions at the remaining governance meetings, both local and district-wide. Emily, Doug and Jeff noted that there is support for the system on the NEA Executive Council. The consensus on the Task Force was that having the NEA Executive Council’s formal support would be valuable, and that a vote on the proposed system should be placed on the next Executive Council meeting agenda (April 28).
4. Additional Feedback from Deans / Implications
   Ame has kept the deans in the loop regarding development of the evaluation system. She recently sent them an email requesting any additional feedback on the system they might have. One individual had questions regarding the role of the deans, which Ame answered. There continues to be broad support among the deans for the new system. After the April 10 CAC meeting, a dean approached Andrew with concerns regarding the lack of summative artifacts in HR files. Andrew explained the position of the Task Force on this issue.

5. To-Do List
   Jeff shared a list of tasks which our group needs to accomplish if/when the new system is approved. We will begin these tasks during Summer 2017. Additional tasks will be added to the list as needed.

6. Schedule Next Meeting
   Our next meeting will be held on Tues. May 16, from 2 – 4 pm, on the Meramec campus. Room TBA.

7. Adjournment
   The meeting adjourned at 4:30 pm.