

---

**From:** Sara Solnick <Sara.Solnick@uvm.edu>  
**Date:** Friday, October 21, 2016 at 10:48 AM  
**To:** Nathalie Mathieu-Bohl <nmathieu@uvm.edu>  
**Subject:** Re: Revised JS greensheets

Thanks for your comments.

I asked for comments by Thursday morning so I could incorporate them into what I hoped would be a final version. I will see what people have to say today but we don't have a lot of time to make more changes and review them.

I think that by stating where he is departing from our expectations, it is clear that we expect the standard model to be presented fully and fairly. But we could expand on that if people agree it is needed.

The issue of time management is mentioned several times. It is stated as a fault with all three classes. I don't think this should be put on the same level with problems related to presenting models because, in theory, the time management can be fixed. Even though it should have already been fixed, I just don't think it looks good to point to this as a deciding factor. **The content is really why we are out of patience and not willing to let him continue.**

I also think that we can and should refer back to the previous greensheets and the FSC and Dean's comments, BUT we can not bring in things from the supporting materials to the previous greensheets that were not mentioned in the greensheets. That looks like we are hunting for anything to attack him with, if we bring up things that were not specified in those summary documents. We might say that in the meeting it was discussed that the peer observations noted some of the same deficiencies that had been observed previously, because this was said at the meeting.

The teaching evaluations are mostly, and especially for recent classes, near the average, sometimes better and sometimes worse. But we don't expect everyone to be better, which would be impossible anyway. The teaching evals are not the problem. **They are acceptable. Nobody in the meeting said that the teaching evals were disturbing to them. I think it would look bad to say there is something wrong with them and it would open us up for rebuttal, since there are faculty whose evals are even worse who aren't considered a problem-- because those faculty have good peer observations and are teaching good economics.** !

5