

9-24-2013

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee Meeting, Tuesday, September 24, 2013

Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ps



Part of the [Educational Administration and Supervision Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee, "Minutes, Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee Meeting, Tuesday, September 24, 2013" (2013). *Professional Standards Committee Minutes*. Paper 3.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ps/3

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Arts and Sciences Minutes and Reports at Rollins Scholarship Online. It has been accepted for inclusion in Professional Standards Committee Minutes by an authorized administrator of Rollins Scholarship Online. For more information, please contact wzhang@rollins.edu.

PSC Meeting

Sept. 24, 2013

Committee Members

Committee Chair & At Large Rep., - Julian Chambliss JCHAMBLISS@Rollins.edu

CPS Liaison, Communications - Ted Gournelos TGournelos@Rollins.edu

At Large Rep., Physics - Anne Murdaugh AMURDAUGH@Rollins.edu

At Large Rep., Political Science - Julia Maskivker JMASKIVKER@Rollins.edu

At Large Rep., Philosophy & Religion - Eric Smaw ESMAW@Rollins.edu

Humanities Rep., Modern Languages - Alexander Boguslawski
aboguslawski@Rollins.edu

Sciences Rep., Biology - Fiona Harper FHARPER@Rollins.edu

Social Science Rep., Anthropology - Gay Biery-Hamilton Gbieryh@Rollins.edu

SGA Rep - Emily Hendrix EHENDRIX@Rollins.edu

Expressive Arts Rep., Theatre & Dance - Kevin Griffin kgriffin@rollins.edu

Meeting called to order: 12:30PM

In Attendance:

Anne Murdaugh, Alexander Boguslawski, Fiona Harper, Gay Biery-Hamilton, Emily Hendrix, Julian Chambliss, Eric Smaw, Paul Harris (guest) Kevin Griffin

Agenda

- 1) Continuing Discussion of Course Evaluation
 - a. Paul Harris, Psychology (12:30)
 - b. James Zimmerman (1:00pm) ---Cannot attend.
 - Questions if CIE's should be separated between A&S and CPS, interpretation of data, how FEC uses data, student understanding of CIE's and their importance. Faculty & student dissatisfaction with current CIE's.

- Paul: (bit of history) open ended evals can be interpreted differently, Admin push for quantitative evaluation form. First version was not clear, and worked on new creation. Paul developed current CIE & tutorial for it. Is linked on the CIE page.
- Fiona suggested may want to make the tutorial more obvious on the web page so it is utilized.

Paul: students never really believed it was anonymous and that may be an issue for them. Can't just create a form with no understanding of how to use it. So Paul created the tutorial so people can develop an understanding of how to utilize data and how to record it in other graphs to improve understanding. What has not been done was any systematic survey of student feedback or how many faculty use the system, know the tutorial exists, etc. He is concerned that we do not "throw away" almost a decade of collected data just to create a new system.

Initial creation of current CIE was to protect Jr. faculty from skewed information. Good for evaluating "personal" aspects of teaching and for development of course material. Tutorial does outline that there are certain ways the information should not be used or interpreted or it can be skewed negatively.

This is a “customer satisfaction” survey. When something is a problem it is because something is consistently in the bottom 10th percentile and that aspect should be reviewed and improvements developed. While not the only factor, the belief is what students think about a course is important and needs to be considered along with peer faculty evaluations.

The CIE does not work well for everything; lab courses, some art & theatre courses, small seminars courses, DIS courses, etc.

Paul would like to make sure as changes are implemented that there is a solid mythology behind it.

Fiona: what is best way to evaluate the other courses? Paul stated the use of “words” would be the better survey evaluation method.

The idea of withholding grades for students was not a faculty decision and there was some discussion of proposing this form of “coercion” be removed.

Paul: the system was supposed to be evaluated every 5 years and it has not been and there should be regular reviews of the data; how each area uses the CIE’s. Students, faculty, dept. chairs, FEC, etc.

Gay: would Paul be willing to help PSC develop a survey of the CIE for students and he agreed to help.

Paul: feels if students understood the seriousness of the evaluations for professors not fully tenured they would better appreciate the reason for the CIE's.

Fiona: used to take time to explain the importance of the CIE and strongly encourage them. She has not done so as strongly now, but will return to doing so.

Paul: suggested a smart phone app be created for the CIE for easier student access and possible improvement of their desire to complete the CIE.

Paul: redundant "feel" can be addressed. Questions need to be asked... are the categories still relevant? Does one need to come out, be added? Are questions still relevant? If using a scale can it be done with fewer questions? If scale is reliable then fewer questions will not negative impact the results. Feels it is time to re-evaluate the CIE.

Katie in IT is a good source for questions regarding the IT issues. Dean of Faculty office is good for questions of when the CIE's go out, how upper admin. Reviews them(?)

Gay asked Emily her opinion from a student perspective

Emily: did not fill out all of them due to the time it takes to do them and the time frame the CIE was

given – right when she was working on her final projects/papers.

Fiona: it is better to evaluate in class or during a quiet, reflective time? She has had some evaluations which have confused her with another professor when done out of class.

Paul: doing them in class suggests the professor considers them important and will take class time from class to have them done, but professor needs to be out of the classroom.

Emily: there needs to be an administrator or other professor to sit in the room to help give a “presence” to keep the students “on task.”

Paul: if timeline extends beyond 2013-2014 academic year he would be happy to get back on PSC and work on all of this (after his sabbatical).

Julian: some practical aspects can be addressed right away and some longer term evaluations need to be covered by upper administration.

Need to make the tutorial a priority and make it clearer that it should be utilized in the interpretation of the information.

Gay: having a “colleague swap” to cover giving the

CIE's in class should be suggested and implemented in order to indicate the value of the CIE to the student.

Eric: why not allow discussion during the evaluation?

Fiona: to insure the data is not "skewed" because a student that has not talked to their peer before hand is not influenced within the moment by that information.

Julian: consider as a committee what we feel are the more immediate concerns to possibly be addressed and what are questions for long term?

Fiona: survey of faculty regarding if they even know about the tutorial and show them where it is.
Get Paul to help with app and survey.

Julia: We should definitely update the "tech" of the CIE. Would like to see the info not related to other professors across campus but to her own specific courses and not have her percentiles skewed as they are compared to other professors.

All agreed that there needs to be an evaluation and update of the CIE system.

2) Finance and Service Committee Salary
Discussion -- PSC Support

Udeth Logo will be generating a report to be shared with the faculty covering compression, gender equity, and merit pay issues related to college income.

Hoyt was glad to receive our support and letter.

3) Student Faculty Collaborative Scholarship
Discussion

Julian: spoke with Christopher Fuse regarding our question. He is in agreement that there could be a sub-committee to evaluate these grants and will work with PSC to set this up.

Fiona: Chris is also willing to rank the submissions, to make sure they are meeting all criteria before reaching PSC in order to streamline the process. He will rank them this year.

4) Grants Update _ Sabbatical Round

Julian: sabbatical grants deadline is this Friday.

There are possibly as many as 12 grants submissions. Access to the material is on the PSC

blackboard. Both Fyrst and Critchfield. We should have them reviewed by the next meeting. Those applications currently on Blackboard are for those going on sabbatical at the end of this year. This will be the main (and only) agenda item for the next meeting.

Meeting Adjourned: 1:46 PM