Commission Members Present: R. Queen (presiding)  
A. Bond (A/P Senate), L-A. Krometis (Faculty Senate), T. Schenk (Faculty Senate), E. Kaufman (Faculty Senate), R. Blieszner (Dean), B. Jones (Staff Senate), L. Learman (Dean), D. Hindman (Faculty Senate), R. Weiss (Faculty Senate), Ron Fricker (ex officio).

Absent: C. Boyd (undergraduate senate representative), A. Fox (Graduate/Professional Student Senate), A. Kinnaman (Faculty Senate), A. Nelson (Faculty Senate)

Guests:  
Emily Kim (Faculty Affairs), E. Plummer, Aimee Surprenant (Dean – Graduate School)

R. Queen called the meeting to order at 10:30 a.m. A quorum was present (50%+1 of current membership = 8)

1. Approval of Agenda. Members of the commission moved and voted unanimously to adopt the agenda.

2. Approval of Minutes. Minutes from the 11/29/2021 meeting were voted on and approved electronically.

3. Old Business. E. Plummer discussed updates to departmental promotion and tenure expectations, which was connected to a larger discussion on SPOT evaluations facilitated by R. Queen. Several concerns about the reliability and validity of SPOT scores were raised, which included instances of students marking items incorrectly, inclusion of survey questions irrelevant to teaching (e.g., physical classroom attributes), incorrect interpretations of SPOT score statistics at the department level, and the issue of separation between rating professors and rating courses. Some suggestions from the commission included the use of multiple sources of data for accurate assessment and influence on P&T (i.e., not limited to only SPOT scores), disconnecting environmental questions from surveys, developing best practices or educational tools on survey result interpretations, looking to other institutions for positive examples of SPOT implementation and use, and readdressing the issue of gender/minority disparity in ratings. The commission was in consensus that SPOT should not be removed altogether as a tool, but that it should have limited use in the context of P&T, in addition to the fact that there are significant adjustments that need to be made. R. Queen agreed to review the
suggestions and choose some key ideas to bring back and continue working on in future meetings.

4. **New Business.** A. Surprenant shared updated information on the graduate school registration process. Several commission members agreed that an initial lack of clarity around the messaging has caused some misunderstandings in some departments. However, the current explanation of changes regarding system management clarified the necessity for change, as it was understood that the updates were not due to a lack of individual competence. This topic will likely be discussed again in a future meeting. E. Kaufman then opened discussion on the Faculty Senate Committee on Reconciliation, which has not been operating in a limited capacity for several years. One suggestion was raised to dissolve the committee and shift that service to the Ombud’s office, which would require significant amendments in the faculty handbook. However, a final decision was made to contact Jack Finney for his input, as well as Kay Heidbreder to clarify and understand the historical use of the committee as well as any possible legal aspects to the committee about which the CFA may not be aware. R. Queen shared news that the Faculty Senate Constitution will have its first reading on February 18, 2022, which will following the first reading in the Faculty Senate and is needed for the progression of the Shared Governance revisions. Finally, R. Queen alerted the commission that one member of the CFA was needed to serve on the Faculty Service and Leadership Awards Committee, which will include one meeting in February, and opened for volunteers to contact her if interested.

6. **Adjourn.** The commissioners moved and voted unanimously to adjourn at 12:00 p.m.

**Next meeting: February 4, 2022, 10:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.**