

The PSC meeting convened on Mon Oct 22, 2018 at 4:00 pm.

Present: David Andresen, Kris Bartanen (Provost), Fred Hamel, Jim Jasinski, Pepa Lago-Grana, Andreas Madlung (Chair), Amanda Mifflin, and Paula Wilson.

1. Minutes for the October 1, 2018 PSC meeting were approved.
2. Continued work on additional charge 2: Review and clarify the evaluation process for non-tenure-line positions, including visiting faculty members that stay beyond 3 years.

The committee reviewed proposed changes to the Faculty Evaluation Procedures and Criteria document section entitled Evaluation of Visiting Faculty developed at the Oct 1, 2018 meeting and discussed via subsequent email. The committee unanimously approved the following proposed language:

Evaluation of Visiting Faculty

For those visiting faculty members whose appointments are renewable and continue beyond the second year, evaluations normally occur at the end of the first and second year and are performed by the head officer of the department, school, or program. In each year, a copy of the report is sent to the individual evaluated and to the Dean. At the end of the first year, this document is for informational purposes and no further action is required; however, the Professional Standards Committee urges evaluatees to initiate interaction with the head officer and/or colleagues for constructive utilization of this evaluation process. At the end of the second year, this evaluation may serve as a basis for renewal of contract, when applicable.

If the appointment is renewed beyond the second year, an evaluation will be conducted by the head officer at the end of year 3 and every three years thereafter, with a copy of the report sent to the individual and to the Dean. At the time of the sixth-year review, a full departmental review will be completed. Instructor and Course evaluation forms from the two semesters preceding the review years will be included in the evaluation file.

In all reviews of visiting faculty members, the evaluation criteria and procedures of the department or program will serve as the basis for review.

Chapter II, Section 5 of the *Faculty Code* authorizes the university to determine not to reappoint faculty without tenure for any reason not forbidden by the *Code*.

3. The committee discussed a query submitted by the Psychology Department regarding addenda to faculty evaluation letters submitted to the head officer. Current departmental policy in the Psychology department reads as follows:

“Individual faculty members who submit letters to the head officer may provide the head officer with addenda to those letters no later than two days after the deliberative meeting. Within a week of receiving addenda, the head officer will inform the evaluatee in writing of the names of individuals who submit addenda and , in the case of a closed file

only, will provide the evaluatee with a summary of the content of addenda. Department members who submit individual letters to the head officer may not submit addenda to the Dean.”

The department’s query continued:

“Thus, our current practice is to provide the names of addenda writers to the evaluatee in the case of both closed and open files (which could link the identity of a letter writer to content). As we consider the advantages and disadvantages of this process, we wanted to check what the parallel practice is regarding addenda submitted directly to the Dean in the case of a closed file. The evaluatee receives a summary of the content of the addenda. Does that summary include the names of addenda writers -- or just the number of writer?”

After extensive discussion, the committee agreed to the following three points in response to the department’s query:

- (1) Although addenda are not addressed in the Faculty Code, your current departmental policy is consistent with the policy followed by the Dean’s office, which is to treat addenda as letters to the Dean and FAC (Faculty Code III.4.c.3).
- (2) Although the department’s existing policy is to provide the evaluatee with the name(s) of anyone submitting addenda, the confidentiality of addenda author(s) can be preserved by modifying departmental policy.
- (3) The committee is concerned that the department’s existing policy prohibiting “members who submit individual letters to the head officer” from submitting “addenda to the Dean” may be inconsistent with the Faculty Code.

4. The meeting was adjourned at 4:55pm.