**Executive Committee Meeting Minutes**

**December 4, 2015**

Present: Brent Vernon, Xiao Wang, David Allee, Narayanan Neithalath, Kenn Sullivan, Esma Gel (chair), Marcus Herrmann, Shawn Jordan, Nadia Kellam, Keith Holbert (Secretary)

Absent: Cun-Zheng Ning, Arunabha Sen, Gregory Raupp

1. **Approval of the minutes of our last meeting**. Minutes from November 6, 2015 were approved unanimously.
2. **Election of new AFSE Secretary**. The voting deadline for the new AFSE Secretary has been extended to December 9th. EC members are asked to promote the election within their units.
3. **Faculty Survey Feedback**. The committee continued their discussion on this topic with a review of the faculty evaluation survey answers to the following questions:
4. What are your expectations with the faculty evaluation process?
5. Would you be interested in a streamlined version of the form? Yes/No and Explain.
6. If you wanted a shorter form what sort of data should we collect?

As a reminder, the Executive Committee has been asked by the dean to review and suggest revisions to the current Schools’ faculty evaluation process. Specifically:

* 1. What are the expectations of the annual review process from a faculty perspective (most important)?
	2. What is the potential to streamline the process?
	3. What is the meaning of the scores and weights used on the evaluation form

It was noted that the purpose of the faculty evaluations (per ACD 506-10, revised 7/1/2011) is to: *comply with Board of Regents requirements to encourage faculty to establish goals for continued academic progress; guide decisions about salary adjustments and institute the first step in the post-tenure review process for tenured faculty.*

Some discussion comments:

1. The faculty evaluations should help with probationary reviews;
2. Faculty aren’t aware of how this process works;
3. It is important that every program have a written description as a place to start. From those base documents best practices are determined;
4. Of the 8 design imperatives: “Conduct use inspired research” is the only category that applies to faculty;
5. New course development should carry more weight than student evaluations;
6. Metrics shouldn’t be the only thing that’s counted;
7. What do I need to achieve a 4 in teaching?
8. More summary statistics will be referred back to the faculty.

In response to the Dean’s charge to review and suggest changes, the EC finds that

1. The FSE academic units do not appear to have the academic assembly approved written policies required by ACD 506-10;
2. This might be an opportunity to construct a uniform college-wide document; and
3. There may be an opportunity to streamline the data collection while satisfying (per ACD 506-10, item #8) the “minimum of five distinct measurements that distinguish between the highest achievement (e.g., high merit ) and the lowest achievements (e.g., unsatisfactory)”.

**NEXT MEETING: January 8, 2016; 12 NOON**

*(second Friday of the month)*