

## Faculty Meeting Minutes 3/1/24

### Attendance

David Anderson, Matthew Biberman, Karen Chandler, Joan D'Antoni, Paul Griner, Karen Hadley, Timothy Johnson, Frank Kelderman, Mark Mattes (*Notetaker*), Robin Mozer, Megan Poole, Marie Pruitt, Susan Ryan, Mary P Sheridan, Stephen Schneider, Sarah Strickley

### Undergraduate Committee

Shared efforts to move students from "intended English major/minor" status to "declared English major/minor." Developing an optional paragraph for syllabi explaining process for officially declaring the English major/minor.

### Graduate Committee

Requested updated faculty bios that can be used for promotional/recruiting purposes. Email request forthcoming.

### Request for Feedback on Annual Merit Review Process

Susan Ryan requested feedback on possibilities for revising the merit review process in light of college-wide questions about 1) the need for conducting the labor of reviews when no merit raises have been allocated for the last seven years, 2) the sheer number of documents to upload and data to manually input

Discussed inconsistencies in the level of attention that A&S depts give to the review process and the distributions of ratings by dept personnel committees

- In light of these inconsistencies, and in consideration of the future possibility that a merit raise pool will be made available, faculty discussed the possibility of developing a formula for allocating funds to each dept that is not dependent on comparing/contrasting the merit evaluation scores between departments.
- Discussed the pros and cons of developing a single schema for assessing merit across A&S depts

Discussed pros and cons of 1 year review vs. 3 year moving window

Discussed possibility of 3-year moving window format for assessing Research and Creative Activity and Service, while keeping assessment of teaching focused on the latest year

Many faculty expressed desire to automate export of student evaluation data to merit files, as well as streamline requested data for personnel memo and evaluation summary sheet to focus on respondent/enrollment numbers and evaluation means instead of having to input data for all 13 questions. Perhaps the streamlined data request could be used for annual reviews, while the more granular data sets could be made available when a file is submitted to the A&S review board

Broached need for coordination of the AWP with merit review procedures in order to acknowledge and potentially mitigate “labor creep” on the former