

Faculty Affairs Committee
January 21, 2014 (Updated on February 25, 2014)

Present: Abhijit Biswas, Poonam Arya, renee hoogland, Delores Dungee-Anderson, John Vander Weg, Ellen Tisdale

Absent: Elizabeth Puscheck, Derek Wildman, Deborah Walker

Absent with notice: Linda Beale, Ewa Golebiowska, Mary Sengstock, Lobelia Samavati, Beena Sood

The meeting was called to order at 12:38

Approval of Minutes: Unanimous (hoogland, Arya)

Discussion Regarding Peer Evaluation of Teaching

Discussions in this meeting mainly revolved around Peer Evaluation of Teaching (PET). Vander Weg noted that in November-December, 2013 the Policy Committee discussed PET. He also noted that the administration is waiting for AAUP's side of the 2N committee.

Delores Dungee-Anderson and renee hoogland volunteered for the PET Committee.

Vander Weg said that PET (1) should be a faculty driven process in terms of when, how, what, and how it should be carried out, (2) should be helpful for the person teaching, (3) probably identify a mentor for the person, and (4) is not a part of the P&T process.

hoogland raised the issue of whether it will be hard to determine "who" will evaluate, and that the evaluation could involve a lot of work. Vander Weg agreed that the mechanics of actually conducting of PE could be difficult.

Biswas asked whether PET will be related to the faculty member's annual evaluation, and whether there were any incentives or penalties associated with the evaluations. Dungee-Anderson asked whether all faculty members will be affected by PET. Tisdale asked if a department could opt out of PET, and expressed concerns that PET could end up being punitive. Similar concerns about the evaluation resulting in punitive actions by chair (for example) were expressed by hoogland. Arya asked about where the report will lie eventually (i.e., with the chair or the dean).

Vander Weg responded the PET was for full-time faculty. He also noted that departments (possibly) cannot opt out of the PET process, and noted that he understands the "fear" associated with this process.

hoogland and Biswas again expressed concerns that the PET could be used during the P&T process, and Biswas noted that there is a chance that the PET could be used against the faculty during the P&T process.

At this time Vander Weg noted that he has heard from some departments about (e.g.) timing of evaluations. For example, one department pre-tenured faculty members are likely to be evaluated in the 2nd, 3rd, and 5th year, and this department views the PET as a useful tool for pre-tenured faculty. Another department noted about faculty going up from Associate Professor to Professor should undergo PET.

Arya again raised the issue of “connection” between PET and P&T and noted that article XXIV has the provision of setting up a mentoring committee, and asked why that process cannot be used instead of having another layer of evaluation.

Dungee-Anderson asked if the contract specifies how PET will be used, to which Vander Weg responded “no”.

Discussion Mentorship Survey

The discussion then shifted to “mentorship survey”. Vander Weg noted that the mentorship survey was done three years ago and Dungee-Anderson asked if anything resulted from the discussions about mentorship survey from last year (2012-2013).

New Business

For “New Business” Arya asked about the student representative on the committee and Biswas raised the issue of gradual increase in size of the “visitors” parking area in parking structure 6.

Meeting was adjourned at 1:17.

Respectfully submitted,

Abhijit Biswas
Chair