

PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS COMMITTEE MINUTES

March 31, 2015, 8:00 a.m., Wyatt 226

Present: Kris Bartanen, Geoffrey Block, Douglas Cannon, Betsy Kirkpatrick, Tiffany Aldrich MacBain (Chair), Andreas Madlung, Mark Reinitz, Amy Spivey

The meeting convened at 8:03 a.m. and the minutes of March 24 were approved with minor corrections and some discussion of the final item, “Archiving of committee minutes.” What remained unclear was whether a typed name constitutes an “electronic signature.” MacBain offered to contact Cindy Matern of Human Resources for clarification on this question. Reporting on Matern’s response in an email to the PSC on April 2, MacBain informed the Committee that in the case of review, a typed name constitutes an electronic signature.

The Committee next addressed the Course Assistant Guidelines for Physics and heard reports from Madlung (Physics) and Cannon (Psychology).

PHYSICS: The discussion of the Physics Course Assistants Guidelines focused on an issue of non-compliance to the Code interpretation (Code Appendix, pages 40-41) in the section of the Physics Guidelines labeled “Grader Duties.” Since work evaluated by Course Assistants *must* be graded objectively to comply with the Code, the PSC asks that the word “usually” be deleted from the following sentence: “Work evaluated by course graders [usually] will be graded objectively using a grading key provided by the instructor. . . .” In a second request, the Committee recommended for clarity that the Physics Department capitalize the words “Grader” and “Laboratory Assistant” throughout. Postscript: On April 6, MacBain reported that Physics made the corrections, and the final document had been submitted to the Academic VP’s office.

PSYCHOLOGY: Discussion of the Psychology document led to the following recommendations. The first is that Psychology add a brief section concerning the supervision and evaluation of student assistants in order to comply with points 1, 7, and 9 of the Code Appendix, pages 40-41. Since this section of the Code refers to “Requirements for Departmental Guidelines for Course Assistants,” the Committee decided to also ask the Psychology Department to change their heading from “Teaching Assistant Description” to “Course Assistant Guidelines.” The Committee also decided to request that Psychology remove the salary information on their revised document. Finally, when these changes are completed, the Committee agreed to request that Psychology resubmit the revised Guidelines for final approval.

The Committee then launched a discussion of the following Senate charge:

Charge: Clarify questions that have arisen about the faculty evaluation process as a result of the initial implementation of Moodle evaluation sites.

- a. **Rationale:** The implementation of Moodle evaluation sites has raised questions that are as much about the overall process as they are about e-files,

which offers opportunity to clarify process questions for evaluatees, head officers, and evaluators, including:

- (a) Should all administrative assistants be asked to scan Instructor and Course Evaluation Forms, rather than making photocopies? Any revision to PSC-approved protocol for administration of and management of forms?
- (b) How are outside letters to be handled? Does the head officer, evaluatee, or administrative assistant add them to the e-file?
- (c) Should evaluatees upload Instructor and Course Evaluation Forms?
- (d) What still needs to be provided in hard copy?
- (e) Do departments whose timelines differ from the norm (e.g., Psychology requires their files to be submitted to the department six weeks ahead of due date; Religion guidelines allow the evaluatee access to the file after it is submitted) need to come into alignment? Where is it written that files are due to the department four weeks (20 working days) prior to being due to the FAC?
- (f) Additional questions contained in the FAQ prepared by Lauren Nicandri.

In preparation for this discussion Dean Bartanen sent an email to the PSC in which she outlined how the buff document (pp. 2, 13, 17, and 24) addresses due dates for files and various issues that need to be addressed in implementing the electronic submission of evaluation files on Moodle in a manner that successfully emulates and parallels the current paper process. Some of the above points had simple answers, for example “Yes” to item (c). Other items required more discussion. To aid this discussion, Dean Bartanen guided the Committee through a document prepared by Technical Services called “Faculty Evaluation Resources and Guidelines for Electronic Submission.” Discussion centered on whether the implementation on Moodle could accommodate varying times for submission and other deadlines and potential difficulties Technical Services might experience in attempting to meet varying department requests. The Chair offered to contact Lauren Nicandri of Technical Services and to report back at the April 7 PSC meeting concerning Nicandri’s response to questions about deadlines for removal of evaluatees from Moodle evaluation sites and perhaps other complications brought about by varying department requests. The PSC will continue this discussion at the April 7 meeting and, after we agree on our response to the charge, will clarify and incorporate all changes brought about by the electronic submission process into the Buff Document.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:51 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Geoffrey Block