

4/6/2026 (12:40 pm)

Executive Committee Minutes

Present: Amy Brunell, Kip Curtis, Joe Fahey, Phil Mazzocco, Andrew Mueller, Agus Muñoz-Garcia, Heather Tanner, Jason Opal, Cynthia Callahan, Michelle Kowalski, Dawn Kitchen, Del Lindsey, Jaime Stima

Excused: Delaney Beuchner

1. Approval of the minutes from the last Executive Committee (EC) meeting

A motion to approve the minutes from the 3/11/26 Executive Committee meeting was made by Heather Tanner (seconded by Kip Curtis). The motion carried unanimously.

2. Dean's Updates

Dean Jason Opal reminded the updated the committee on various visits and events:

- Vice Provost Eric Anderman visited on April 3rd.
- The Research Forum and Honors Celebration will be held on April 9th.
- Buckeye Bound Days will occur on April 10th.
- The OSU Mansfield Campus Spring Graduation Ceremony on May 7th.
- There will be ab ROTC visit later in the semester.

A committee member inquired about the Cyberwing initiative, and Dean Opal replied that the project is stalled at the moment awaiting various approvals.

3. Discussion on the new evaluation rubrics

The committee discussed the faculty evaluation rubrics that will constitute a portion of the new Appointments, Promotion, and Tenure (APT) document. Agus had previously circulated via email a document with sample rubrics for consideration by the committee.

The discussion began by exploring what is meant by "exceeding expectations" with respect to the teaching evaluation rubric? Dean Opal suggested that exceeding expectations would involve (a) exceptional standardized teaching evaluations, (b) creating new courses or course materials, (c) substantially revising existing courses (d) high impact teaching practices, and (e) exceptional professional development regarding teaching. Thereafter, a lengthy discussion ensued regarding the difficulty or impossibility of making relative judgements between faculty or between departments regarding what counts as *exceptional*. Relative comparisons of standardized teaching ratings have been especially hampered as the summary item has been removed from the new Survey of Student Learning Experiences (SSLEs) and inter-course or departmental ratings are no longer provided.

One committee member noted that the SSLEs were designed to be non-comparative, and another questioned whether it was possible to define a concept such as *exceptional* in the complete absence of any comparisons. Similarly, there was discussion regarding the inherent

difficulties of converting performance into specific numeric qualities, as opposed to rough categories. One committee member suggested that whatever approach is taken, it should be transferable across revolving leaders and be understandable and justifiable outside of the campus context.

The discussion then turned to a consideration of the service rubric. One committee member suggested that instead of categorizing service into Campus, University, Profession, and Community, there should be six categories: Campus, Department, College, University, Profession, and Community. Once again, the committee focused on what would count as meeting or exceeding expectations. In terms of meeting expectations, Dean Opal suggested the following criteria:

- Serves as requested on campus committees (or some equivalent role)
- Comes to faculty assemblies and at least some outward-facing events (student or public outreach)
- Service for the TIU as and if requested
- Some Professional service profile

Activities related to exceeding expectations were the following:

- Exceptional number of appearances at student and public-facing events
- Significant leadership roles
- Creative work related to service
- High impact service activities (primarily student, campus, and community facing)

One committee asked, is the threshold for exceeding expectation higher in teaching than service? And, what are reasonable expectations for a group that is already highly productive and high achieving?

Dean Opal suggested that the university generally has high expectations for excellence, so meeting expectations should be considered a good thing. However, a committee member rebutted that being told you are meeting expectations sometimes feels like being graded on a curve.

As with the teaching rubric, an argument was made in favor of using rough categories or checklists instead of quantitative scales for each metric.

It was agreed that more discussion was needed on the rubrics.

With no further issues to discuss, the meeting adjourned at 1:45 pm.

*Minutes taken and prepared by Phil Mazzocco, Faculty Secretary.