



lead to more reliable outcomes, and lesser opportunity for bias. Matthew commented that he had just completed the tenure process, and when we think about how this tool might be used, ty of cases, but how it might be used in borderline

punitive). Is the lens growth process? Carolyn commented that we should acknowledge excellence, but the

has disproportionately affects probationary faculty. Excellence needs to go somewhere else, and disconnect it from the evaluation. A Foothill faculty commented that tenure processes can be more challenging.

Che

w

process, and that needs to be separated from the J1 evaluation. Kathy Perino suggested that if the body desired, we could bring the topic of excellence into the narrative. Tenure and review the evaluation process. Kathryn Mauer commented that if there is no motion today, advice is J1, or make a motion to remove it. Kathy also reminded the body that the J1 instrument is used for every faculty evaluation, probation, part-time, and full-time (3 yr eval).

seconded. After the roll call vote (DA 16 Yes, 3 No, 2 Abstain) Kathy commented that coming out of this process was a strong sentiment that the evaluation process is (can be traumatic) and that if faculty have ideas to bring to FA. There was a motion to adjourn the District meeting (Donna first ?, Rosa Nguyen second).

The joint meeting was adjourned at 3:30 p.m. Next meeting at Foothill College is May 1st

