

4-24-2012

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee Meeting, Tuesday, April 24, 2012

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, April 24, 2012" (2012). *Professional Standards Committee Minutes*. Paper 31.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ps/31

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.

Present: Joan Davison, Julie Carrington, Julia Foster, David Charles, Dorothy Mays, Emily Russell, Barry Levis, Robert Vander Poppen.

- 1) We were joined by new members Ted Gournelos and Julian Chambliss
- 2) FSAR: We want to revise it to slim it down and make it less onerous to submit. Joan asks if Institutional Research need any of the data. She believes that when the AFAR was originally developed, it was being used in various capacities such as accreditation. No one on the committee knew if this information was needed for reporting reasons. Joan also wants to know if we need a form like this for assessment purposes. In the past, it WAS used for merit pay, but going forward we will be using a different form for merit pay. The new merit pay form asks only three questions, pending faculty approval in the next meeting. Bob is more than willing to slash the amount of paperwork. F&S is also working on this.

Finance & Services have slimmed down the proposed FSAR. We suggested an addition to section 2) (d) which currently lists "Courses taught for Honors, RCC, RP" We suggest the inclusion of service-learning and community engagement work.

We expressed frustration the duplication of work between the FSAR, merit, and pre-tenure annual reviews. Must we do the narrative every year? Can we combine some of these? Barry suggests we find out if it used somewhere else. If not, can we just drop it altogether? Joan will ask what this is used for.....and suggests that we cut everything else. She notes that it is difficult for the committees to make meaningful revisions to the FSAR until we know how these forms are used. Robert moved that we approve the proposed FSAR for this year's use.....it passed....with the addition of the C.E. and Service Learning.

- 3) Setting An Agenda for Next Year's committee:
 - a. Discussion for collaborative research. We had problems this year about length of the proposals, the amount of work it takes to assess them, our lack of information about the strength of the students, and no knowledge of the budget. The Provost doesn't know if she will be assigned responsibility for collaborative research, but if she does, she is open to reassessing this. Joan thinks this is a priority. We may also want to consider the lop-sided nature of the awards along disciplinary lines. Is the process slanted toward the sciences? The sciences tend to have a semester or two of prep, and the applications from the Social Sciences and Arts don't have this sort of run-up. Also...does the end-result need to be a co-authored peer reviewed article? Perhaps in the other disciplines there are other appropriate results that should be considered. There are also some problems in Critchfield. If we address the Ashforth and Critchfield, we'd have to move very fast because people submit those forms early in the fall.
 - b. How we tabulate labs in terms of hours and how it effects teaching loads (many of the science faculty teaching labs teach 2-2 rather than 3-3 in light of their lab work.) How

will labs be accounted for in the new curriculum? PSC will need to consult with the Curriculum implementation committee and Bob Smither's Strategic Planning Committee. We discussed contact hours in disciplines such as Theatre, musical performance and CMC. There seems to be no uniformity across the departments, and sometimes not even within departments.

- c. Promotion and tenure changes. There have been changes to the A&S bylaws calendars for the procedures and timelines to submit these forms. CPS wants to permit people who are ready to come up at the 5th year. A&S has concerns about a sense of equity. Not all of last Spring's proposed amendments for T&P were voted and implemented on....they were tabled in light of the creation of CPS. So this is still a potential issue, but do we want to open it up again? Barry suggests there are issues relating to FEC and the perception that FEC may be telling departments how to evaluate their candidates, and are in fact creating standards of its own and wanting departments to meet them. We believe there does need to be a discussion between PSC and FEC to make sure FEC is not creeping forward into dictating how the process should look, the form of letters to be submitted, etc. Maybe there should be some standardization, but it is not up to FEC to mandate this without approval of the faculty.
- d. After a *fantastic* year of leadership, Joan was unanimously voted to be chair of next year's PSC.