

3-26-2013

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee Meeting, Tuesday, March 26, 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, March 26, 2013" (2013). *Professional Standards Committee Minutes*. Paper 20.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ps/20

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, 3/26/2013

Present:

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

Discussion:

RE revisions of course evaluations (note: all questions are rated 1-5):

PROFESSOR

Carlee from SGA: Like the “overall” Q:

- My overall rating of the professor is:

Discussion RE “fairness,” “feedback,” etc. Resolution on:

- This professor provides effective feedback.

Discussion RE “prepared” vs. “organized”

- This professor prepared the material and the individual classes well.
- This professor effectively engaged students.

James: recommends moving offline, as well as introducing the evaluations to class about definitions of terms

Carlee:

Discussion about “respect,” “safe space,” etc.

- The professor promoted an environment in which students were respected.

Discussion about availability/accessibility outside of class.

- This professor was willing to help me outside of class.

Discussion about other questions, and whether they are subsumed under the above:

- 1) Effectively explained the material. (subsumed under “effectively engaged”).
- 2) Effectively explained expectations for assignments (subsumed under “prepared” or put in qualitative comments).
- 3) Demonstrates knowledge of the subject matter. (questionable for students to effectively answer)

Open ended qualitative question:

- Use this space to describe the professor’s strengths and weaknesses and/or clarify your ratings above.

COURSE

Discussion:

Should we do yes/no questions here, with one qualitative question at the end? Answer: yes/no.

Discussion about a lot of different possibilities, including the potential *use* by the FEC of these questions (especially vs. professor, above).

- Did this course challenge you in a positive way?
- Was this course interesting?
- Did this course teach you something new?