

2-19-2013

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee Meeting, Tuesday, February 19, 2013

Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee

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

Recommended Citation

Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee, "Minutes, Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee Meeting, Tuesday, February 19, 2013" (2013). *Professional Standards Committee Minutes*. Paper 18.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ps/18

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.

Professional Standards Committee Meeting Minutes, 2/19/2013

Present:

Gay Biery Hamilton
Joan Davison
Carlee Hoffmann
Julian Chambliss
Ted Gournelos
Kathryn Patterson Sutherland
Robert Vander Poppen
Dominique Parris
Julia Foster
James Zimmerman
Robert Smither

Discussion:

Student Faculty Collaborative Research Grants (two different versions of the forms floating around?)

Course evaluations

- Separate course and faculty evaluations?
- Length?
- Online, offline?
- Time in the semester?
- Get rid of percentile ranking?
- James:
 - Authenticity of results?
 - Motivation for evaluations?
 - Importance of in-class vs. online.
 - Percentages: grade to a curve, or a standard? P&T in bylaws is a standard, not a curve. It is also arbitrary.
 - SACS and DLT? Maybe this is a good way to make the evaluations useful.
- Dean Smither:
 - Without scantrons and a databank, it's difficult to assess.
 - Robert VP: admin assts could upload?
 - Julian: assessments at the same time as the exam? Or an assigned date and time using a similar method?
 - VP: set aside one time for the whole college?
- Dominique: importance of anonymity

- Ted: maybe this reflects a broader problem with the style of evaluations as negative for faculty and students
- VP and Ted: does this mean we should back away from College standardized evals?
- Joan and Julia: this is exactly what we do within our majors for seniors. Why not each semester?
- James: maybe that's a step too far for now, but we should move as much as possible in that direction
- Discussion about student perception of words vs. faculty perception, drawn from Carol Lauer's work.
- Discussion about cutting down the multiple part questions.
- Discussion about verifiability and validity of data. Why ask more than once?
- Discussion about letters vs. numbers.
- Discussion about narrative vs. quantitative.
- Carlee: bring it up with SGA? Joan: yes.
- Ted will make template. 5 quant course, 5 quant professor, 1 qual each
- Discussion: Should these include the overall? Last question of the 5.
- Discussion Re timing:
 - can't be too early! Need to have done the "aha" moment.
 - Can't be too late, or students have "zoned out."

Discussion about proposal for merit for visitors, artists in residence, etc.

- Should visitors be automatically given merit?
- Should professors that do the same work as visitors be given merit, or be evaluated on scholarship and service as well?
- Lecturers etc submit a statement to the department, department sends a letter to the Dean
- "merit system" vs. "demerit system"
- PSC votes in the affirmative that we recommend the proposal from the Dean of Arts and Sciences regarding the processes for merit raises for visitors, lecturers, etc, and sending it to the Executive Committee (unanimous)
- Dean Smither: this needs to be laid out in the Faculty Handbook (controlled by the Provost)

Joan: raised the point that in the \$20,000 limit it might not be good to include sabbatical.

Discussion regarding that point. Decided that faculty are exempt from the \$20,000 rule during sabbatical.