

PSC Meeting Minutes for February 7, 2020

Members present: David Andresen (Chair), Jim Jasinski, Suzanne Holland, Andreas Madlung, Laura Behling (Provost), Jennifer Utrata (notetaker)

1. The committee discussed a question from Provost Behling regarding a request, in the form of an addendum, from a department with a candidate under review. The committee was unanimous in its recommendation, which was shared with the Provost.
2. Minutes from the last meeting, when Chair was absent, were approved.
3. The Chair solicited feedback from the committee on priorities for the remainder of the year given that there have been more emergencies requiring the PSC's attention than in previous years. The timeline for when we will receive revised evaluation standards from several departments remains unclear. Discussion ensued as to how we might focus on improving the use of SET during remaining meetings in light of the PSC's research and recent national recommendations from professional associations.
4. Members discussed a range of options: potential revisions to the buff document, changes to the form (including a name change), and keeping the work of improving SET to the whole committee rather than dividing into subcommittees for the sake of efficiency. Discussion ensued over changing the form vs. focusing on revisions to the buff document. Members agreed that the PSC's priority should be on providing guidance to the FAC and to the department chairs for using SET as awareness of the varied problems with SET grows on campus. One member suggested going through PSC minutes from previous years to focus our efforts further.
5. Provost Behling said one idea might be to follow the FAC's recommendation from last year about improving patterns of class visitation. Discussion ensued as to how to improve patterns of class visits for candidates up for tenure and promotion, since currently much of the burden falls on the evaluatee. The use of more numerical language in the buff document was discussed as well as other options such as training head officers on the issue of bias in SET. Provost Behling reminded members that much of the buff document amplifies the code, yet it has not been approved by the faculty.
6. One member suggested that we deal with SET as a priority, allowing it to be our default work, and another suggested a decision-making tree. In terms of the regular work of reviewing revisions to departmental evaluation standards, the Chair suggested that some work could be done outside of the room, circulating standards by email. Discussion ensued as to how efficiently handle the considerable regular work of the committee while also focusing in a sustained way on revising the use of SET.
7. The committee moved to a discussion of contradictory language regarding streamlined reviews. Issues of confidentiality and various head officers were discussed and the option of asking for legal counsel's view was raised. Members thought that evaluatees under streamlined review should be able to get copies of documents from the FAC.

8. Members then discussed the issue of team-taught courses and which evaluation forms evaluatees should use when they are from different departments. Members were unanimous that evaluatees should use whichever form they would like, in this particular case appendix B, noting that this is perhaps another point requiring further clarity in the buff document.
9. Reviewing the Economics Department's revised evaluation standards was postponed until next week due to time considerations.

Adjourned 3:02

Minutes submitted by Jennifer Utrata