

The PSC meeting convened on Friday February 15, 2019 at 1:30 pm.

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

1. The minutes from 2-1-19, with some changes, were approved electronically before today's meeting.
2. Discussion of Classics Studies Department's evaluation standards, submitted to PSC 12-13-18. Committee chair Madlung will contact the Classics Department to communicate the committee's suggestions and questions, which are the following:
 - The committee discussed how the evaluation process happens, as there is little detail in the language of this document. It was resolved that there's no need to add specifics unless where the process addresses an aspect not present on the Code.
 - Committee members noticed the line on page 1 "All tenure-line members of the department shall participate in the process." The language does not include "not on leave." Noting that the Code (p.12 chapter 3) doesn't offer specific language on whether colleagues on leave participate or not, and neither does the User Guide, the committee concluded that "not on leave" does not need to be added. However, the way the sentence is stated could be taken as mandatory participation even when on sabbatical. The committee is requesting clarification.
 - The Teaching section (p. 2) states that "evaluation by one's colleagues [...] must form the basis for the department's judgement, and describes student evaluations as "an inherently flawed means of assessment." The committee asks the department to consider the impact of this statement (that student evaluations are flawed and maybe not important) on the evaluatee, given the requirement to include student evaluations on the file, and its use by department colleagues to determine teaching effectiveness (User Guide p. 15, Code Chapter III, section 4a). One suggestion is to change the language from "flawed" to "limited."
 - The Professional Growth section (p. 2) states "The Classics Department believes that..." The committee requests that the CD look at the language around that sentence and offer an alternative.
 - Also in page 2, regarding publications needed for promotion to Associate Professor, there's no mention of publication expectations for tenure evaluation. The committee asks the department to clarify.
 - Similarly, clarification is requested regarding the minimum requirements for promotion, stated as "at least one peer-reviewed paper or book manuscript." Since these are two very different products, should they be treated as equivalent? Other than those forms of publication, is the department open to different formats? Finally, regarding "a second manuscript required for promotion to Full professor, does it need to be peer reviewed as well? If the manuscript is a book, is it also subjected to the peer-review process?
 - Last line on page 2 "accepted disciplinary standards" is vague language; it is not clear if the "disciplinary standards" refer to Classics or to the specific field of that particular evaluatee.

- In Advising section please avoid use of gendered language, by adding the pronouns *them* and *their*.
 - Add the names of all members involved in crafting the document, in addition to the chair, at the bottom of the document.
3. Update on other departments' evaluation criteria documents: several departments have confirmed that they are sending their documents soon.

Meeting adjourned at 2:20 pm

Respectfully submitted,
Pepa Lago Graña