

The PSC meeting convened on Friday, April 12, 2019 at 1:30 pm.

Present: David Andresen, Provost Bartanen, Fred Hamel, Jim Jasinski, Andreas Madlung (Chair), Amanda Mifflin, Paula Wilson

Absent: Pepa Lago-Grana

1. Discussion of response from Classics chair Eric Orlin (regarding changes to evaluation guidelines requested by PSC).

The PSC suggested that Classics revise the use of “inherently flawed” to describe student evaluation forms in the department evaluation guidelines. Eric Orlin responded on behalf of the department to reaffirm their desire to keep the language as stated, as supported by peer-reviewed literature and a presentation by the PSC in 2018. The PSC agreed that the language chosen by Classics is consistent with the wording published by the PSC in the User Guide and is acceptable. However, the PSC does recommend that departments use the following language regarding student evaluations of teaching provided on p. 15 of the User Guide in order to maintain consistency across departments: “Because of concern that evaluation forms invites bias, head officers of faculty reviews, department colleagues, and the Faculty Advancement Committee should use them with awareness of potential limitations and in the context of multiple forms of evidence of teaching effectiveness.”

2. Review SOAN departmental evaluation guidelines

The PSC reviewed the departmental evaluation guidelines submitted by SOAN. Suggested changes/comments are as follows:

1. Use formatting of the name of the User Procedures document so it's not confused as two documents.
2. p2: Use of “instructor” vs “faculty”
3. First bullet on p3: is the intention for all faculty members to do two visits, or two visits total?
4. p3: Is it not always relevant to record dates and times of class visit? Clarify what makes a visit relevant or not if keeping that language.
5. p4: Reconcile the last sentence on p4 with first bullet on p3.
6. p4: Do publications need to be peer-reviewed to be acceptable? Are these listed in any particular order of importance, or are all weighted equally? Is the second bullet from last considered professional service or growth?
7. Replace any instances of his/her to be non-gendered or just take out pronouns.
8. A PSC member noted that they liked the sentence on “departmental encouragement and support.”

2. Review Geology departmental evaluation guidelines.

The PSC reviewed the departmental evaluation guidelines submitted by Geology. Suggested changes/comments are as follows:

1. Line 4: “or otherwise” could be clarified
2. Line 10: Current wording implies that department only looks at student evaluations to assess teaching. We suggest something along the lines of “review of teaching effectiveness, including materials and student evaluations.”

3. Line 14: This paragraph is not entirely accurate—please revise.
4. Line 60: Should read “department chair and dean”.
5. Line 78/80: delete “for”
6. Line 84: “career” should be “ongoing”
7. Line 86: Clarify what makes tenure-line faculty “available”
8. Line 106: Suggest that evaluatee sign letter to “acknowledge receiving letter” rather than as “recognition of the content”.
9. Line 138: plan “courses”, not “course”
10. Be consistent with “dean” vs “Dean” (line 12, 60, 61). We suggest using “D” as default.
11. Line 139-159: Are items b and c required or meritorious? Or is just publication meritorious and “activities” in category b are required? Does meritorious mean required? Please clarify.
12. Line 158: Use of the University’s sabbatical program

Adjourned at 2:26 pm

Respectfully submitted,

Amanda Mifflin