

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well

Humanities Division

Division Minutes

2-23-2015

HDAC meeting minutes 02/23/2015

Humanities Division Advisory Committee

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/humanities>

Recommended Citation

Humanities Division Advisory Committee, "HDAC meeting minutes 02/23/2015" (2015). *Humanities Division*. 13.

<https://digitalcommons.morris.umn.edu/humanities/13>

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Division Minutes at University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. It has been accepted for inclusion in Humanities Division by an authorized administrator of University of Minnesota Morris Digital Well. For more information, please contact skulann@morris.umn.edu.

HDAC Minutes

Feb. 23, 2015

Present: Wojtaszek, Graham, Eckerle, Odello, Carey, Breneissen, Roberts

The meeting was focused on final revision of the PRT document and the accompanying explanatory document in preparation for the Division meeting scheduled for

Our discussion took into account input from the chair and assistant chair in an effort to finalize some elements of the proposal that were problematic either for the committee or the division leadership. The following were the areas of discussion:

Questions related to the explanatory document:

1. Is the PRT process for term faculty necessary according to the division 7.12 statement? No; the 7.12 covers procedures for tenure track and tenured faculty. But it is required under the U of MN policy

Evaluation of Teaching: Twin Cities, Morris, Rochester

C. Peer Evaluation of Teaching

Peer review should include assessment of the instructor's knowledge of the subject matter, general contributions to departmental teaching efforts, and any other teaching contributions. (see Appendix for best practice guidelines.)

1. Peer review process.

- a. Every academic unit should have a documented process for peer review of every instructor's teaching efforts and contributions to teaching, both for purposes of promotion decisions and for teaching-based salary increases.

2. Can we make the number of recommended reviews per year more flexible to accommodate fluctuations? We chose to suggest a maximum of three per year, to allow for lower number when appropriate and accommodate the occasional request by a faculty member "out of sequence" (for example, one who wants to be considered for promotion in a given year).

3. Who will have the responsibility of reviewing and evaluating the PRT files for term faculty? This was an ongoing discussion among the committee, with arguments made for this being the job of the division chair, assistant division chair, discipline coordinators or the PRT committee. The committee agreed that the most logical designation would be the assistant division chair, when one is designated (since this is not necessarily a consistent position in the division), and, when one is not designated, the PRT Committee. In the second case, however, it is still unclear whether the members of the committee would be allowed access to the SRTs for faculty under review. This will require some further discussion and investigation.

Questions related to the PRT document:

1. What is the most reasonable timeline for term faculty under review?

2. Who receives and reviews the PRT files for term faculty?

3. What recourse does the term faculty member under review have, and how is it different from the process for tenure track and tenured faculty?