

12-3-2013

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee Meeting, Tuesday, December 3, 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, December 3, 2013" (2013). *Professional Standards Committee Minutes*. Paper 6.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ps/6

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 December 3, 2013 in CSS 217.

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

SGA Rep - Jill Rondeau JRONDEAU@Rollins.edu

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

In Attendance:

Julian Chambliss, Anne Murdaugh, Julia Maskivker, Eric Smaw, Emily Hendrix, Kevin Griffin

Meeting Called To Order: 12:30pm

The Agenda.

Old Business

1. Update on Survey for Faculty

- Julian: has been working with Pat Schoknect. and it will be up and running within the next two weeks. It remains very simple and Pat added the questions from the current CIE to facilitate ease of response. The next step would be focus groups by rank.
- Ted: feels it might be worth getting a short qualitative response regarding the CIE
-

2. Results for Student Focus Group

- Julian: did talk with James Zimmerman, working on formal write up, was able to survey three classes. Basic notes are the students feel the current CIE is too long, questions are redundant, and they would prefer doing them in class.

3. Timeline for Spring CIE Focus Groups

- Julian: the opportunity window for the faculty focus groups is extremely small as it needs to happen so faculty feel they have the time to actually complete the focus group. Do we want a colloquy before or

after the focus groups?

- Ted: feels we could get focus groups within the first two to three weeks of the semester. Do these groups as a random sample by rank. We would want between 4-7 with 5 being the median. Suggest asking Karla to generate the random sample list, split into three segments per division (full, assoc., asst.). Also suggests a tenured and non-tenured random sample. However feels we need to try to limit the groups from 9 to 6 in order to prevent any significant “grasping” for focus group members.
- Ann: suggests separating the full prof. out regardless of division and randomly pool all of them. Assoc. and Asst. Prof.’s then done by division.
- Julian: will ask Karla for assistance in creating the random samples discussed
- Committee: three focus groups, separated by rank, not division with one random member from each division, per rank, one regular and one alternate except for full due to lack of numbers in this rank. Assoc. 5 primary and 5 alternates. Asst. 5 primary and 5 alternates. These both include representation from each division and CPS.

4. Faculty Compensation Issue.

- Julian: Karla did respond to our questions and was able to identify those areas that could be identified (email sent to committee).
- Ann: suggests the possibility of creating a web page that outlines the info in a single place that enables faculty to utilize the information when negotiating compensation for service considered “above and beyond” their base job duties.
- Eric: challenge in compensation for service is that there is some “market regulation” on this and if there is some initiative to create a special program, then the position (director, or coordinator for example) is quickly negotiated and is not necessarily passed by the faculty in general.
- Julian: service on a standing committee is clearly recognized by the college and easiest to translate to other faculty over service within departments.
- Ann: so to the original question – what is service and how is it compensated?
- Committee: the system currently requires individual negotiation and is dependent on several individual factors, some outlined and some not. We could create a document (which would need to be approved of course) but the system regarding tenure and the definition regarding service would need to be clarified. The criteria currently are subjective

and without clear criteria there is no way to set a “base line” for service compensation.

- Eric: it might be useful if there is some understanding that there is a form of a “business model” at Rollins regarding compensation for service and negotiation for such compensation is individualized.

New Business

1. Christopher Fuse requested we discuss the updated student-faculty scholarship guidelines and send him a response/feedback.
- Julian will email the updated info to the PSC and request we send our individual responses back to him.

HOMEWORK FOR THE COMMITTEE

- Please read over Christopher Fuse’s updated student-faculty scholarship guidelines and send your comments to Julian. Chris needs this feedback ASAP as he would like to get the info on the website as soon as possible this spring.

NEXT MEETING:

Meeting Adjourned: 1:47 PM