

10-4-2011

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee Meeting, Wednesday, October 4, 2011

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, Wednesday, October 4, 2011" (2011). *Professional Standards Committee Minutes*. Paper 34.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ps/34

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, Mike Buck and Nick Vason.

- 1) RCC and MAP-Works. Claire Strom joined the committee to discuss a program called MAP-Works, which has been incorporated into this year's RCC program. It is a questionnaire designed to identify students at risk of dropping out of school. The students must answer a series of questions, and the program generates tags (green, red, yellow) to identify At Risk students. All students are directed to show the results of their assessment to their peer mentor in a face-to-face session to discuss the report. The peer mentor may then bump the student up to someone else at the college for additional counseling.

The questions on the survey ask about study skills, drinking, socializing, number of hours studying, etc. Use of this instrument has generated a lot of concern. Are we violating student privacy? Participation in the survey is mandatory, although there are no penalties if a student refuses. We are concerned about IRB and informed consent....both on behalf of the students who are being surveyed, and the peer mentors who are participating. The peer mentors have no formal training in counseling, and are we opening ourselves up to liability if something goes badly? Also, it does not appear we have any means to guarantee the privacy of the data generated from this survey.

One RCC faculty member thought the results generated by MAP-Works is poor, as the survey flagged well-adjusted students as "at risk." There was concern about continuing decay of privacy issues on campus. RCC professors got a list of ALL students this year who had disability issues, whether they were in their classes or not.

There was universal agreement that the sudden introduction of MAP-Works is problematic and should be brought to E.C. This may be a Student Life or AAC issue, but we are "generally alarmed" and don't want to waste time before getting it before E.C.

The discussion of RCC and the role of peer mentors generated another discussion regarding expectations of peer mentors, reporting lines among Rollins faculty, staff, and peer mentors, and the assignment of grades for peer mentoring service. We do not believe that most peer mentors have a good understanding of who assigns their grades (the instructor? Mario? Meghan?) There was also concern that expectations for peer mentors have been evolving over the summer. They arrive in August and are presented with a different set of responsibilities than what they signed up for in the Spring. Joan would like to bring this before the AAC to get clarification so the students know what their responsibilities are, who will be evaluating them, and what criteria is used for evaluation.

- 2) Research Misconduct Policy. Continuing a discussion from last meeting, we reviewed The Policy on Research and Scholarly Misconduct. Major concerns:
 - a. Section E provides for the investigating committee to "take custody of all research records and evidence needed to conduct the research misconduct proceeding," but there was no guarantee that the accused shall get a copy of the material. Rob Vander Poppen suggests the following addition: "The accused has the right to duplicate any records and evidence sequestered under the above-mentioned process." This duplicate

copy should be made available at the time the data is seized. The faculty member is not dependent upon the investigating committee to provide a copy at some unspecified date in the future.

- b. Rob also noted there is no limitation on the nature of the data that could be seized (for example, in some disciplines, samples or materials are provided by a government or agency which requires the samples to be returned at a specified date.) In such cases, he suggests a clause that would state material may be taken, “unless doing so would compromise the ability of the researcher to comply with legal obligations surrounding the materials secured.”
- c. The role of having an advisor. There was concern that the advisor may attend “permissible” meetings. Why can’t the advisor be at all meetings? We suggest removing the word “permissible.”
- d. Under section D (Reporting Misconduct) there is provision that the accuser may be anonymous. Although we agree the identity of the accuser should be limited to “those who need to know in order to carry out a research misconduct proceeding,” we want to add a clause that guarantees the accused be on the list of those who need to know. We will add language to state the accused shall have full access to the entire complaint, including the name of the accuser.
- e. In several sections we lengthened the time frame for parties to file appeals and responses.
- f. The nature of the “Draft.” It was suggested that the term “draft” is too flexible. It needs to be a complete and full report so the accused can write an appeal or response or challenge the facts in the “draft.” We don’t believe the investigative committee should be able to change their report based on an appeal filed by the accused. The report of the investigative committee should be kept in its original form, even if the appeal notes errors of fact or interpretation.
- g. We want to include language that the Final Report must contain the appeal of the accused.

Joan will incorporate the suggestions, and we will review them at a future meeting.

- 3) Discussion/clarification of field trip issue – who may lead. This topic has been pushed back to a future meeting.

Our next meeting will be October 18 when we will discuss FYRST grant applications.