

CEPP Meeting Minutes

04.15.2021

Zoom Conference 4:10-5 pm.

Attendees: Sophia Paulino Adames, Peter von Allmen, Andrew Bozio, Sean Heaney, Jina Mao, Feryaz Ocakli, Michael Orr, Mahesh Shankar, Leigh Wilton

Guest attendees: Members of ATC and PC, including ATC chair Mary Crone Odekon and PC chair Barbara Black.

Scribe: Mahesh Shankar

Minutes will be approved via email.

- 1) Discussing CEPP's proposal for reforming the teaching evaluation process towards a more holistic model with representatives of ATC and PC.
 - Chair of CEPP contextualized the current effort at reforming the teaching evaluation process, and the document with handbook changes under discussion.
 - Members of ATC and PC asked questions about CEPP's thinking re: evidence which "may be included" as part of student evaluations of teaching, and whether CEPP has thought about what would/would not be mandatory. CEPP members clarified that the committee has not resolved that issue yet, and have left it open for the conversation with ATC/PC and other stakeholders. CEPP does believe, however, that these are important elements of the evaluation process since there are some things that students are uniquely placed to comment on.
 - PC member asked how does one "demonstrate" commitment to combatting racism, sexism etc. CEPP member explained that one could think of various ways of doing that, for example, teaching statements; curriculum/readings; training that is informing teaching etc.
 - CEPP member also pointed out that the committee would like to come up with an understanding of "holistic" teaching which aligns with what PC/ATC value in their processes.
 - ATC/PC member expressed concern that the edits might be too long, and might lead to people reading it being bogged down in excessive details; as opposed to the benefits of the brevity of the original document. Suggested considering if there might be areas which could be pared down.
 - ATC/PC member suggested that the section of peer evaluation was confusing about what candidates would/would not submit in their file, which CEPP might work at clarifying.
 - ATC/PC member suggested using bullet points for purposes of brevity and clarity, such as in the PC document. ATC/PC member also suggested that CEPP ought to look at whether language here aligns with language on page 131 about promotion. Member also suggested that statements from annual reports might also be explicitly included in the document as another piece of evidence about self-reflection.
 - ATC/PC member also explained that the holistic nature of evaluation does happen in those committees, but that there might be a messaging problem which does not communicate that sufficiently.

- ATC/PC member clarified that they would like to keep student evaluations a mandatory part of the overall evaluation process.
- CEPP member clarified that one reason to avoid bullet points, in CEPP's thinking, is to keep the language more general and capacious, with a specific list to be provided elsewhere, for instance in specific ATC/PC documents.
- ATC/PC member emphasized that the spirit of the document in general is in line with what ATC/PC are trying to do.
- ATC/PC member had a question about the last paragraph (self-reflection) – whether the long paragraph is exhaustive or prescriptive. CEPP clarified that these are examples drawn from earlier in the document rather than an exhaustive or prescriptive list.
- ATC/PC member suggested that CEPP should work quickly on what peer evaluation looks like, in order to avoid anxiety in faculty about what is being looked for in such evaluations.
- ATC/PC member suggested that more specificity may be better, for example a more detailed definition/description of what we mean by equity.
- CEPP member acknowledged role of students in these deliberations.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00.