5-2015

# Annual Report, Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee, 2014-2015

Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee

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

<div align="center">
**Professional Standards Committee**
**End of Year Report for AY 2014-2015**
**Chair: Fiona Harper**
</div>

The Professional Standards Committee is responsible for policy matters dealing with the criteria and procedures for professional evaluation, professional leave, and research and professional development for the faculty of Arts & Sciences and the College of Professional Studies. During the academic year 2014 – 2015, PSC attended to numerous requests from faculty, while also reviewing all internal grant allocations (except the new DAC grant, see below) and making recommendations to the appropriate granting administrators. Highlights of these activities are presented here; detailed minutes are available in the archives.

**Office Hours**
In September 2014, at the request of an A & S faculty member, PSC was charged with developing a standardized office hours language for the college. A subcommittee comprised of Julia Maskikver, Anne Stone and Eren Tatari surveyed twelve peer and aspirant colleges with regards to office hours to compare best practices. PSC then developed language requiring all full-time faculty to post and keep reasonable and regular office hours (a minimum of 3 h per week, in addition to appointments). Office hours should be (1) held on campus, preferably in faculty offices for confidential discussions; (2) clearly stated in the syllabus and posted outside the faculty member's office, where possible; (3) during business hours appropriate for the particular school/college. Faculty teaching in the Holt school are asked to offer office hours in the hour before Holt classes, where possible. This language was approved by both CPS and A&S faculties and is now located in the Faculty of Arts & Sciences and College of Professional Studies III Policies and Procedures, C. Faculty Policies & Procedures.

**Endorsed Cornell Distinguish Faculty Selection Committee**
PSC approved the slate of the Cornell Distinguish Faculty Selection Committee in early September 2014. For 2014 – 2015 this committee is comprised of Ed Cohen (Chair), Laurel Habgood, Gloria Cook, Rachel Newcomb, and Jim McLaughlin.

**Review of Student Faculty Collaborative Research Program (SFCRP) Guidelines**
At the request of Program Director Dr. Chris Fuse, PSC reviewed the SFCRP guidelines in October 2014. Specific questions posed by Dr. Fuse regarded the time period required for submission for manuscript and whether a collaboration in which the student either presents their work at a conference or publishes a manuscript could be considered successful. PSC approved changes to the SFCRP guidelines such that the collaboration should result in, at a minimum, a publication or artistic performance within 5 years, preferably both a publication and a presentation at a professional conference, where appropriate. Additionally, a case of plagiarism prompted the inclusion of language indicating that any work done as part of the SFCRP is bound by the academic honor code, and that violation of it may result in the surrendering of any funds awarded. Furthermore, students accepted to the program must complete ethics training provided by the program to receive their stipends. Finally, the letter indicting denial or acceptance still comes from the Provost's office, but any further inquiries will be sent to the chair of PSC. The revised guidelines were approved by Provost Carol Bresnahan in late October. PSC approved the final revisions to the guidelines on November 4, 2014

**Proposal to include student advising as option in Promotion and Tenure Evaluation (PTE)**
In late October 2014, Claire Strom, in her capacity as a representative from the 2013-2014 *ad hoc* committee on Advising met with PSC to discuss their proposal to include student advising as option in the Promotion and Tenure Evaluation (PTE) process. According to Claire, the suggestion from this *ad hoc* committee was to include language that will allow student advising to be considered under PTE requirements. The hope of the *ad hoc* committee was that this language would open up a broader discussion about advising and how it can be included in PTE consideration. PSC questioned why the *ad hoc* committee was felt advising option was now needed. Claire indicated the specifics of the new curriculum would be such that it will require more time in advising, thus such advising should be considered for PTE. A discussion then ensued as to whether a department would choose to consider advising in their PTE, and the faculty member then would choose where the information would reside in their PTE documents. The language provided to PSC from the *ad hoc* committee only included the faculty member choice, not the departmental choice whether to require advising as a component of PTE in the departmental criteria. Another question by PSC was where the *ad hoc* committee language would exist as it did not seem appropriate for inclusion in either the faculty handbook or by-laws. Claire asked if this language would necessarily want to be placed in the bylaws or would it be better placed within each department's PTE criteria. Fiona stated that the information being presented by Claire on behalf of the *ad hoc* committee then needed to go to FEC to be vetted there.

Claire then described a survey that the *ad* hoc committee was in the process of developing to ask the students about their individual advising experiences each semester. These surveys could then form evidence on behalf of a faculty member's PTE documents. PSC was very concerned by this proposal and raised specific questions, including "To whom would the results be submitted? Will they be treated like CIEs and only be available to individual faculty, CEC and FEC members? CIEs are within the current scope of PSC, would this survey then become the purview of PSC?"

In follow-up discussions between the Chair of PSC and the Associate Dean of A & S, it was determined that the Dean's office would take the lead on this initiative as it was outside of the scope of PSC responsibilities.

**Internationalization Committee (IC) Clarification**
Following up on a request by a faculty member in the A & S faculty meeting in September 2014, Ashley Kistler, Chair of the IC committee met with PSC in mid-November 2014. PSC reviewed the charge and responsibilities of this committee, the composition of the committee and how the committee is formed. According to Ashley, IC only deals with faculty international travel. The committee is comprised of 1 Crummer representative, 1 CPS representative, 3 A & S representatives. All faculty members have 3 year terms and are voted onto the committee by the respective faculties. Additionally, there are two *ex officio* members: the Director of International Programs and the Directors of International Student and Scholar Services Staff (DISSS). According to Ashley, inclusion of DISSS is helpful to confirm if the faculty has taken the appropriate steps in creation of a field study. PSC was satisfied with the composition and functioning of the IC. In particular, PSC found it helpful that Ashley was able to clarify two points regarding their funding: 1) they will not fund travel for research; this travel should be funded by Ashforth and Critchfield grant monies, 2) per a Presidential mandate, faculty cannot use Rollins internal funds (e.g. Critchfield/Ashforth/Individual Development Grants) in combination with international grant money.

PSC concluded our discussions with the Chair of IC that if exposing students and faculty to other countries and cultures is a continued focus of the college, the faculty should consider the creation of a standing governance committee to oversee these matters

**Faculty Advisory Committee for International Programs (FACIP) Clarification**
Having reviewed IC, PSC thought it pertinent to review the "other" internationalization committee. As such, Giselda Beaudin, Director of International Programs met with PSC in early December 2014 to review the charge and responsibilities of this committee, the composition of the committee and how the committee is formed. One of the concerns of PSC was that the faculty members were "appointed by AAC and CPS" and a perceived lack of transparency how the committee was formed. We reviewed the history of the "split" of the two internationalization committees such that there are now two: one focused on faculty international travel for professional development (IC above) and one focused on student international travel (FACIP). Membership of FACIP was by volunteer and appointment, not by an open vote of the faculty. PSC, in collaboration with members of the FACIP, recommended changes such that the committee structure was revised as a six member committee, with five A & S representatives (at one to be an active member of AAC and at least one a regular Holt instructor) and one CPS representative. Terms were reduced to two years from three years to facilitate more faculty involvement. As well, no more than one representative will be permitted from a single department. All representatives will be selected through a vote from the respective faculty. CPS faculty approved the final wording on January 27, 2015. A &S faculty approved the final wording on February 26, 2015. PSC also requested that as all governance meetings are open meetings, this committee should make their meeting schedule available, preferably posted on the committee website

**Diversity Advisory Council (DAC) Clarification**
At the request of another faculty member, PSC then reviewed the Diversity Advisory Council as the faculty member expressed confusion as to DAC committee composition and structure. In early February 2015, Emily Russell, Faculty Chair of DAC, met with PSC and summarized the history and make up of DAC. There is no voting procedure for membership in DAC as it is voluntary, with an open call made in the Spring semester for additional members. Current DAC membership attempts to balance fields and backgrounds of members, but "generally doesn't turn people away", according to Emily. DAC consists of both faculty and staff members (unlike the IC and FACIP above). There are two Chairs: one staff and one faculty member. There are several *ex officio* members and a variety of Directors with standing staff. A full list is available on the DAC website. Faculty members typically serve a 2 year term. Currently DAC advises the Provost, at the preference of Past President Duncan. Some members of DAC would prefer to report to the President. PSC recommends that this issue be brought to incoming President Cornwell when begins his duties.

**Development and Review of DAC Infusion Grant**
PSC assisted DAC in the development of their DAC Infusion grant application form. These grants are for promoting diversity and infusion. Details are available on the DAC website. PSC approved the DAC grant application in late February 2015. However, PSC was NOT involved in reviewing the first iteration of DAC grants. This is a departure from the typical procedure of PSC reviewing grants (per the responsibilities of PSC outlined in the By-Laws). While the DAC grants fall under the purview of the Provost, PSC also reviews other grant applications from the Provost, specifically the Student Faculty Collaborative Research grants. PSC will investigate this situation in 2015-2016 and rectify the review process to ensure grant review procedures are consistent and standard across the colleges of A & S and CPS.

**Course Instructor Evaluations (CIEs)**
At the end of December 2014, PSC received a request from a faculty member to investigate the delivery timing and structure of the CIEs. Evidently the Holt CIE evaluation windows do not correspond to day school evaluations windows in student delivery. Specifically at the end of the Fall semester 2014, day-school students taking cross-listed Holt classes had their CIE window close earlier than other day-school classes, preventing some of them from completing their CIEs on time. PSC formed a subcommittee comprising Gay Biery-Hamilton, Eric Smaw, Rosana Diaz, and Julia Maskikver to survey nine peer and

aspirant colleges about their CIE delivery system and structure. From these surveys and in consultation with the Deans offices for A & S and Holt, as well as the Director of Graduate Studies in the Holt School, PSC made a series of recommendations regarding the CIE delivery structure, as well as a change to question #3 of the CIE:

    1    Requirement for common open and close dates for CIE evaluation periods.

Holt and cross-listed A & S and CPS courses now carry the same CRN number. Since Holt typically ends 1 – 3 days prior to A & S and CPS, this situation resulted in non-Holt school student having fewer days than expected to complete the CIEs in the Fall 2014.

    2    CIE evaluation period extended to 14 days (2 weeks).

PSC unanimously agreed that 10 days was not sufficient to allow for completion of surveys. The majority preferred 21 day window.

    3    Removal of daily email reminders. Currently Rollins College emails the students who have not completed their CIEs at a rate of one email per day per class. PSC recommends ceasing this practice for a 3 semester period and re-evaluation the completion rates of the CIEs to determine whether the daily emails were effective.

    4    Remind students by email three times during the CIE period. PSC recommends that students receive one email reminder about CIEs on the first day of opening, one email reminder at 7 days, one final email reminder on the day before the CIEs close.

    5    Grade release penalty. PSC voted to keep the 10 day penalty for release of final grades for students that do not complete the CIEs.

    6    Faculty have to option to administer CIEs in class. Faculty have always had this option, but are reminded that they can administer CIEs in class. If they choose to do exercise this option, faculty must remove themselves from the room.

    7    Required inclusion of CIE evaluation dates in course syllabi.

        Spring 2015: open at 8:00 a.m. on April 14th and close at midnight on April 27th.

    8    Additional proposal to modify Question #3 in the CIEs

*If you experienced or observed any discrimination or breach of professional ethics by the instructor during this course, please describe your experience/observation:*

According to Dr. Harris, changing this question will not disrupt the reporting system as it "is not involved in computing any of the scales".

This proposal was approved by the A & S faculty on March 26, 2015 and CPS faculty on March 31, 2015.

Proposal item #3 recommended removing daily reminders for 3 semesters, then re-evaluating the completion rates for CIEs. Data obtained from IT for completion rates for all A & S/CPS/Holt undergraduate and graduate programs were Fall 2014: 75%, Spring 2014: 72%, Fall 2013: 71%. Unfortunately, the completion rate for Spring 2015, under the new system was only 46%. PSC will continue to monitor the completion rate and if this number does not return to previous values, then the daily email reminders will be reinstituted in Fall 2016.

**Addition to A & S By-laws regarding Faculty Dismissal Procedures**

At the request of the A & S EC, PSC crafted language for inclusion in the A & S by-laws to indicate the use of the AAUP 1958 statement on procedure for proceedings concerning the fitness and possible dismissal of a tenured faculty member. The language approved by the A & S faculty on March 26, 2015 and are now included in the College of Arts & Sciences Faculty By-laws, Article VIII Faculty Evaluations**,** Section G Faculty Dismissal Procedures: Hearing Committee

In cases concerning the fitness and possible dismissal of a tenured faculty member, Arts and Sciences shall follow the 1958 AAUP Statement on Procedural Standards in Faculty Dismissal Proceedings. The ad hoc Hearing Committee in charge of these procedures shall consist of four tenured faculty members with the rank of Professor.  To select the committee, the Executive Committee of the Arts and Sciences

will present a slate of faculty names to the Faculty of Arts and Sciences for approval. The committee will be convened for the duration of the procedures.

**Revisions to the Ashforth/Critchfield/Individual and Course Development Grant**
At the December 2014 A & S faculty meeting, numerous faculty members expressed concerns about the changes to the grant guidelines made by the 2013-2014 PSC. In response to these concerns, and in consultation with the Dean's office, PSC used a "blind" review process in January 2015 to review the grants submitted for that cycle. Karla Knight (Coordinator of Academic Administration) removed all identifying information from the grant applications prior to uploading the files to Blackboard for PSC review. PSC then reviewed the grants based upon their merit and submitted a ranked list of grant applications from very high to low priority for funding. PSC found this process very helpful in removing (or at least reducing) potential bias in the review. To recommend the use of the blind review process and to return to the previous grant guidelines from 2012 – 2013 that had been acceptable to faculty, PSC submitted a revised set of guidelines for approval by both A & S and CPS. As both sets of faculties approved the revised guidelines on April 23 and April 28, 2015, respectively, these guidelines will be in place for early grant applications in September 2015.

To help reduce the workload of Karla Knight in the Dean's office in removing identifying information and to better streamline the grant process, PSC Chair Fiona Harper and Secretary Anne Murdaugh met with Pat Schoknecht (CIO), Katie Sanchez (Director, Administrative Computing) and Karla Knight to discuss the electronic platform being used to prepare the grant application in May 2015. Katie and Anne will continue to meet over the summer, with an anticipated completion of the electronic application form in early November 2015, in time for the mid-January 2015 deadline for grant applications.

**Funding of Ashforth/Critchfield/Individual and Course Development Grants**
One of the issues that PSC faced in academic year 2014 – 2015 was the low funding of these grants. In contrast to previous years, in 2014 – 2015 there was no Cornell funds available and none of the money remaining from the previous grant cycle of 2013 – 2014 ($13 465.33) was available due to the fiscal state of the college. At the request of a faculty member at the December 2014 A & S meeting, PSC investigated the historical funding levels of these grants.

Since 2000, PSC has been allocated a hard money line of $67,950. Beginning in 2004 – 2005, additional money from Cornell funds (up to $40,000) supplemented the grant pool, at the discretion of the Dean. Evidently the Dean typically held back some of this money, $10,000 - $15,000 each year, to fund projects such as the RP pilot. For the past ~5 years, PSC has had ~$82,000 to allocate. In 2014-2015, as Cornell funds are not available, PSC was allocated $75,000. With the increasing pressure to publish in our disciplines to achieve tenure and to be promoted to both Associate and Full Professor ranks (see departmental criteria for tenure and promotion), and an increasing body of junior faculty, these funds were clearly stretched thin. Given that the hard budget line has remained static for 15 years while the departmental criteria for tenure and promotion have placed greater emphasis on publication, PSC formally requested that Finance and Service pursue increasing this hard budget line to better reflect the current state of the College.

**<u>Procedural Review of grants</u>**
According to the By-Laws, PSC is responsible for "reviewing all internal grant allocations" and making recommendations to the appropriate granting administrators.

**FYRST and Ashforth/Critchfield/Individual or Course Development Grants**
In early October 2014, PSC reviewed the FYRST and early Ashforth/Critchfield/Individual or Course Development Grants and made recommendations to the Dean's office for funding.

In late January 2015, PSC reviewed the Ashforth/Critchfield/Individual or Course Development Grants, using the blind process described above and provided the Dean's office with a ranked list of meritorious grant applications recommended for funding.

**Student Faculty Collaborative Research Program (SFCRP)**
Due to the ratio of grant applications to fund available, the SFCRP was able to fund all eligible grants for Summer 2015. In mid-March 2015, PSC reviewed, and approved by email, all grant applications eligible for SFCRP, based upon recommendations made by the director of SSFCS program, Dr. Chris Fuse.

**Faculty Instructional Technology Integration Grants (FITI) grants**
FITI grant applications were reviewed and ranked by PSC, in consultation with Amy Sugar and Carrie Schultz from Information Technology (IT) in late March 2015. In response to concerns by PSC in 2013 – 2014, IT provided a clear rubric with detailed reasons for their recommendations and ranking.  FITI grants are intended to encourage faculty to investigate a new technology or training for them to develop skill sets to integrate technology into their courses.  Grant base is $2,500.00 and is for time investment by faculty member.  After careful deliberation and discussion, PSC voted to support funding of FITI grants as recommended by IT.

**Open Educational Resource (OER) grant**
In March 2015, PSC reviewed the grant application form for a new grant program from the library called the Open Education Resources Grant. This grant is open to all faculty members, including adjuncts and artists-in-residence, teaching in any Rollins program, including the Holt School. The stated aims of this grant are "Significantly lower the cost of required materials (i.e. textbooks) to enrolled students in a specific course, while maintaining or improving student learning outcomes and satisfaction with the required materials. Contribute to the growing body of OER available to the global higher education community." Grants in the form of stipends of up to $3000 will be available for Rollins faculty members interested in working with a team consisting of the Director of the CAJ Institute for Effective Teaching, an instructional technologist, and a librarian to lower the textbook costs for students in a specific course using Open Educational Resources (OER.) The grant will be for three years, or three iterations of a specific course. Therefore grants could last for a minimum of three semesters and a maximum of six years.

As the deadline for the OER application deadline was April 27, 2015, PSC recommended that the deadline be earlier in future years, preferably the end of February to ensure the full deliberation and review by PSC in a timely fashion.