

18 April 1997

Dr. Betty Capaldi
Provost
235 Tigert Hall
Campus

Dear Betty:

I'm responding to your memo of April 3 concerning Sustained Performance Evaluation, in which you asked us to report back on the procedures we will adopt in our college. Let me report that we find the April 3 draft generally acceptable for the SPE process as we envision it in CLAS. We will likely develop a few refinements this fall before we start the process, and we still have a few questions that we will want clarified, but the general framework of your memo is sufficiently broad as to permit its general adoption.

The points still to be addressed at some time are:

Could we do more than 1/3 of the cases the first year? Once the system is set up and in place, we may wish to consider a larger fraction.

Item C. The chair is designated to prepare the information for the assessment, but a question could arise as to who makes the decision about what to include in the assessment package. If there is disagreement between the faculty member and the chair, how to settle this. We intend to develop some CLAS guidelines about typical portfolio contents for SPE to aid chairs and faculty in these matters.

Item D. Who will appoint the SPEPC? What will be the composition of this committee? What is the chair's role in this committee? Can existing standing committees be used for the SPEPC?

Item F. If a score of 3 on a teaching evaluation is ranked as average, can any score above 3.0 really be designated as unsatisfactory, even though it may be far below department and college averages? How will the "resources" be obtained to meet PIP requirements? Another concern/question here is how Article 16 will be implemented into the SPE process? This is a quite broad Article.

The College Office, in conjunction with the department chairs, will be considering these and other aspects of the SPEC this fall to obtain a final document for implementation in CLAS.

Sincerely,

Willard W. Harrison
Dean

WWH/eb