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**Faculty Personnel Policy Committee**

**MINUTES**

January 29, 2020

3001 Seidman Center

3:00-5:00 PM

Present: Marie McKendall (Chair), Tonya Parker (recorder), LeShell Palmer Jones, Sean Lancaster, Douglas Montagna, Jagadeesh Nandigam, Nancy Schoofs, , Kim Ranger, Maureen Walsh, Steve Schlicker, Pei-Lan Tsou, Ed Aboufadel (ex officio)

Not Present: Greg Cline

1. Approval of agenda – Agenda approved by consensus
2. Approval of minutes of 15 January 2020 – Minutes approved by consensus

3. Chair’s report

* No report

4. BOT 4.2.3.2 Charge (pg. 4)

* Delayed until Tom Butcher arrived.
* Tom B. returned 4:54pm
* Items tabled until next meeting.

5. BOT 4.2.5 Charge (pgs. 5-6)

6. Feedback from FTLCAC about teaching charge (pgs. 7-9)

General Questions

* Forms will be in faculty handbook
* Yes, they would be included
* Piloting the course portfolio makes sense. Assume pass this year, Pilot in fall for decisions in winter for wider distribution in following fall.

Peer review of course portfolio

* Flexibility? Not really, the items are appropriate for the portfolio.
* Range of training, no problem.
* Formative v Summative evaluations
  + Peer teams need not be the same throughout.
  + Advisor as a part of formative team? Recommended.
* Yes, all individuals eligible vote in personnel action.
* Additional workload: external reviewers as a possibility.
* “will” to “should” – not supported. Reasonable adjustment for those who bring in years toward tenure.
* Chart could be added to provost site.
* Would the course portfolio be part of contract renewal/P&T documents? No. The evaluation from the peer group would go into the P&T documents. Confusion so change term to “portfolio” to “course folder or dossier”

Peer Review Instruments

* When does the change require UPRC review? Use common sense, substantial changes should be reviewed.
* Yes, if approved by UPRC.
* Yes/No questions, not supported.
* N/A on forms?
* Effective/Very Effective – assumed to be excellent? Yes.

7. LIFT score charge (pg. 10)

* Metanalysis that condemns the use of SETs.
* Phillip Baty holds adjusted median back, decision made at UPLIFT.
* How do we want to use LIFT for decision-making?
  + No support for eliminating LIFT.
  + No support for continuing as is.
  + Support for only one-third weighting.
  + No support for use only for formative – only faculty and chair see.
    - LIFT scores should corroborate with evidence from other sources
  + Is there a place for LIFT data in summative evaluation?
    - Only really revealing problems in 3-5% of professors.
    - Regulate use of data.
    - Concerns about poor teaching performance must be brought up in writing before being addressed at personnel decision.
      * Behaviors and Reflection as focus not the numbers of the LIFT
    - Qualitative comments – cannot use in isolation, should be corroborated other evidence from other sources.
    - Numbers should never be used in isolation. What about the 90% in the middle? Stop differentiating the ‘middle’ via numbers. Cut-off points? Deciles?
* 4% of personnel decisions are in the negative. 3 of 4 had a yes at some level.
* Require to include with FAR review process?
  + Delay until actually charged with this.