

## Professional Standards Committee Minutes – February 20, 2017

Present: Jennifer Neighbors (chair), Garrett Milam, Amanda Mifflin, Suzanne Holland, Matt Warning, Kris Bartanen, Fred Hamel, Denise Depres and Amy Odegard.

1. The committee approved minutes from the January 23, 2017 meeting.
2. The chair noted that we have a full agenda for the remainder of the term. In addition to the ongoing work on evaluation of team-taught courses, committee members are engaged in several other tasks. Jennifer Neighbors, Amanda Mifflin and Kris Bartanen are working on an *ad hoc* committee to evaluate the implications and establish procedures in response to the new policy on faculty sexual misconduct. Amy Odegard and Garrett Milam will be examining the recently-submitted revision of the Math/Computer Science departmental evaluation standards. Denise Depres will be annotating the literature compiled by Matt Warning on biases in student evaluations.
3. The chair brought to the attention of the committee ambiguous language in the proposed review cycle/guidelines for departmental evaluation standards. The committee approved revised language stating that faculty can choose to be evaluated under the existing departmental standards or the most recent previous version, so long as the most recent previous version was in effect on the date when the faculty member's tenure-line appointment began. This change, and the final draft of the evaluation memo, was voted on and approved. It will now be sent to the Faculty Senate.
4. The committee continued discussion of evaluation options for team-taught courses, including three draft evaluation forms prepared by Suzanne Holland and Fred Hamel. One theme in the discussions was the tension between capturing the unique contributions of team-teaching while maintaining cross-course fairness and equity in faculty evaluation. Committee members agreed that the current evaluation form does not elicit reflection on the experience and efforts in team-taught courses, but were concerned that a revised evaluation form might not provide sufficient information to assess an individual's performance, particularly from the point of view of reviews, and that using different forms for different courses might be at odds with ensuring that uniform standards are applied in evaluation. A committee member suggested that the PSC could provide guidance to faculty evaluators and the FAC on how to interpret the feedback from the team-taught form. A committee member offered that another option might be a team-teaching addendum to the existing evaluation form. This option was debated with some wondering whether students would write thorough responses on an evaluation of this length. The committee also considered whether the addendum would be mandatory for team-taught courses or left to the discretion of the instructor. Fred and Suzanne will be working on another draft evaluation option to present to the committee at the next meeting.

In the course of this discussion the committee was made aware that labs in the sciences are not evaluated separately from the courses with which they are associated. The committee felt that the PSC might want to look at the evaluation of labs at some point in the future.

Minutes submitted by Matt Warning