Faculty Standards Meeting
Nov. 10, 2014

Attendees: *Allison Mackay, Chair (Fall 2014), Marcy Balunas, Morad Behandish, *Pamela Bramble, *John Clausen, *Elizabeth Jockusch, *Nancy Naples, Sally Reis , Robert Ricard, *Del Siegle, Cheryl Williams, *Susanne Yelin,

Motion to accept meetings of Oct. 20, 2014 meeting

Second: Jack Clausen

Discussion – correct spelling of Sally's name

Vote: 11-0-1

A. Announcements

> **None.**

B. Old Business

> **1. Feedback on proposed:**
>
>> **a. revision to PTR Form**
>>
>> **b. Provost guidance document for PTR**

FSC discussed mismatch between language/adjectives used in Provost guidance document and University By-Laws (e.g. 'superior' etc). Importance of service inconsistently addressed through document. Goal to reflect strongest language in By-Laws and request change for consistency.

FSC suggested that accompanying FAQ document may help to clarify some points without cluttering primary guidance document, especially with respect to letter writers. An example is how to deal with situation of potential letter writer who has been a contributor to an edited volume prepared by UConn faculty member. Sally Reis reported that FAQ is in progress based on common queries to her office.

FSC discussed issues to be resolved around hire with tenure letters. Using letters of recommendations from faculty application package would likely violate 'arms length' requirement as most faculty applicants would use closer colleagues as letter writers. Such a process would potentially not be equitable for junior faculty who cannot use disciplinary experts with whom they have a collaborative relationship. Further to this, should criteria for tenure at hire depend on the situation of the incoming candidate – former institution Research I or other; career transition at Associate or Full. Additional guidance will be sought from Deans and Dept. Heads.

FSC recommended guidance on PTR Form statement length to be 3-5 pages but no specification on how to divide between three sections. FSC expressed concern that HuskyDM is not currently in reliable shape to use as internal review document. FSC will hear additional details on developments for HuskyDM from Kumar in Jan. 2015 meeting (date to be set). FSC members encouraged to think about items from candidate vita that should be on PTR document.

FSC recommended change to highest level of reappointment from 'superior' performance to performance 'exceeds expectations'. Such a change would be in keeping with current exercise of departments to develop guidance documents for PTR that presumably will establish expectations. Other ratings would be 'competent (meets expectations)' and 'does not meet expectations'.

C. New Business

1. **Formation of SET subcommittee to address procedural issues**

Standing subcommittee to address SET issues as they arise – Elizabeth Jockusch, Allison MacKay, Del Siegle, Cheryl Williams

2. **Role of SET data – questions to address**
    → **where does SET fit into PTR? Faculty development? Post-tenure review?**
    → **use of SET; how is data used? what purposes?**
    → **what are we willing to support?**
    → **what other measures should be used for teaching evaluation – whose responsibility? Should there be a blended process with portfolio? Add peer review process? What is out there?**

Introduced as concepts to think on in preparation for future work this year to address teaching evaluations more broadly. FSC recommendation to provide some sample 'three extra questions' at SET site to trigger faculty consideration for addition to course-specific SET. Suggestion to send reminder to Dept Heads of ITL support for mid-semester formative assessment. Literature documents that mid-semester formative assessments prompt greater participation in end-of-semester and can give higher scores when faculty respond back to concerns raised.