

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

*Present:* Fred Hamel, Jim Jasinski, Pepa Lago-Grana, Andreas Madlung (Chair), and Amanda Mifflin. *Absent:* David Andresen, Provost Bartanen (sent email comments; see below), and Paula Wilson.

1. The committee approved the minutes from 3/1/19 meeting.
2. Discussion of Psychology department evaluation standards submitted to PSC. In its discussion, the committee identified the following issues for further consideration:

A. Committee members wondered if the department evaluation standards needed to contain lengthy quotations from the Faculty Code. Including the long quotes might require the department to modify guidelines if the Code changes. The department might consider inserting a sentence in the first paragraph acknowledging that Code supersedes department evaluation standards.

B. Department guidelines require “self-reflective statement[s]” on a few occasions (line 123, 234). The committee requests clarification. Are these statements in lieu of or in addition to the Code/Procedures and Guidelines requirement for a “statement . . . including a self-analysis of your teaching” (P&G p. 18)? Does the department require two different statements beyond the personal statement in the User Guide?

C. The committee believes the department should be clearer that the stem material in points A, B, and C on p. 6 (lines 253-268) represent the department’s definition and/or extension of Code service requirement. One way it might do this is to shift the sentence beginning on line 241 (“The Psychology Department values . . .”) to after the Code quote (lines 246-251) and right before the stem material. Doing so would be consistent with Sec IV on Advising (p. 5 beginning line 209).

D. The committee recommends that the department include the material in Section VII, point 6, c, ii (p. 8 lines 353-356) in the timeline on p. 11.

E. The committee wasn’t clear why the department included the word “normally” in line 313.

F. Minor point line 329: “head office” should be “head officer.”

Additional comments were offered via email by Provost Bartanen, who was unable to attend this meeting.

p. 3: Do we want to use “Instructor and Course Evaluation Forms” at II.B.3 (which is what the forms are actually called)

p. 4, top: The requirements for class visits are set by PSC, not FAC. (FAC implements, PSC interprets the Code)

p. 8, sec. 6c: same - - FAC doesn’t set deadlines, the dates are in PSC’s document.

The only confusion I have about the document is the timeline:

File is due 6 weeks out.

Individual letters are due 15 working days (that's actually 3 weeks out, because working days are weekdays when classes are in session . . .)

Then outside letters are due 2 weeks out, which means the department has to have their letters written before outside letters even arrive.

And, the "approximately" under 6c on page 8 could be removed; it's not approximate, it's set in the User Guide.

Overall, however, I think these guidelines are a great and thoughtful model.

3. The committee discussed an issue that committee chair Madlung raised with Assistant Dean of Students Sarah Shives after a recent Posse retreat. Many students of color raised the question of how to report microaggressions on campus that fall short of issues that would go to BHERT. Assistant Dean Shives suggested that chair Madlung bring the matter to PSC to, in part, determine if PSC is an appropriate (or the appropriate) forum in which to consider these concerns. After discussion, the committee reached a consensus on four points.

A. The concerns raised by the students are important and require the institution's attention.

B. Given its mission, the PSC does not believe it is an appropriate forum for addressing these concerns.

C. As faculty (and not necessarily speaking as the PSC), committee members suggested that advisors receive better training as to existing resources to which students might turn (office of the Associate Deans, Dean of Students office, Dean of Diversity and Inclusion office).

D. Again as faculty (and not necessarily speaking as the PSC), committee members suggested that any policy response should be orchestrated by the office of the Associate Deans, Dean of Students, and Dean of Diversity and Inclusion in consultation with faculty.

Provost Bartanen included the following comments on this matter in an email to the committee:

We've tried to direct folks who don't feel comfortable talking to a faculty member or to the department chair (always first line of communication, after individual faculty member) to talk with Dean of Faculty Sunil Kukreja. Most of the concerns are addressed by him, or by me. We *always* ask whether a student wants us to move ahead to talk with a faculty member, based on "a student or students have expressed concern about x . . ." and we ask whether the student(s) want something addressed right away or after grades are turned in.

This sequence parallels grade dispute steps, as well as Faculty Code provisions on steps if a faculty member has concern about a colleague (Chapter 1, Section 4, Professional Ethics). Student Affairs staff, Michael Benitez re. BHERT on-line report form (which allow person to ask for follow-up or to just report, because they want to be anonymous), or faculty/staff members might report to us something a student tells them of concern.

We are open to suggestions, but with understanding that there has to be some protection that we don't take personnel actions based on anonymous complaints – unless of course something is so severe that the university deems it a danger (that's also in Faculty Code, Chapter 6 – “University administration originated complaint.” We can certainly explain the avenues for reporting more clearly, and hope to do so in an updated “Referral Guide for Student Concerns” for 2019-20.

Meeting adjourned at 2:30 pm

Respectfully submitted,  
Jim Jasinski