

1-26-2011

# Minutes, Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee Meeting, Wednesday, January 26, 2011

Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee

Follow this and additional works at: [http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as\\_ps](http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ps)

---

## Recommended Citation

Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee, "Minutes, Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee Meeting, Wednesday, January 26, 2011" (2011). *Professional Standards Committee Minutes*. Paper 39.  
[http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as\\_ps/39](http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ps/39)

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](mailto:wzhang@rollins.edu).

## **PSC Meeting Minutes: January 26, 2011**

### **Attendance:**

- Members: David Charles, Emily Russell, Joshua Almond, Marc Fetscherin, Steven St. John, Dorothy Mays, and Claire Strom.
- Dean of Faculty Representative: Don Davison
- Guests: Alicia Homrich; Pat Lancaster

**Meeting Convened: 3:00pm**

### **Announcements:**

- Minutes approved

### **Old Business:**

- Don - Recommends that if we like the proposed graduate school CIE, then we solicit Paul Harris' input.
- Marc - Since not everyone was here when we started this process [last year], can we ask folks what we took out and what we put in?
- Alicia - We took out hours per week (varies from person to person and is thus not relevant); moved discrimination and breach of ethics to the end; went through goals of course and into professor characteristics. We kept that pretty similar until we got to tolerant, supportive and available. We took those out.
- Claire - I liked learning environment. I think ours [A&S CIE] does a good job with that.
- Alicia - We added in reading and writing, syllabus is there, as well as policy and organization. We took out all of section 9. We uniformly did not believe that was relevant to graduate work. Kept knowledge, interest, and skills; then into breach of ethics; then went with overall ratings of course and professor, and added unique sections for those classes/departments that needed unique questions for accreditation or specific discipline related information.
- David - I wish that we had something similar in the day school where the professor had a chance to tailor questions about his or her specific classes or areas of growth. I like that.
- Pat - I'm wondering if we could get equivalent numbering between the two forms (undergrad and masters), just for consistency.
- Alicia - People really didn't like having that #3 question on the A&S. That's why it got moved further down the form.
- Claire- I think IT can move that. I think that's a question for Paul.
- Don - Yes, but its handy if they match up. I think it would be desirable if they are more consistent but, yes, that would be a good question for Paul.
- Marc - I have a question: What is the rationale for taking out "enjoy the professor"?
- Alicia - Because it is more important whether the teacher is a good professor and not whether or not they were well liked. They're being asked to evaluate the learning environment. Their personal affinity for a particular professor is not relevant.
- Marc - And question #2 about the number of hours, what is unique in the graduate program that is different? I think it can demonstrate balance.

- Don - We actually had a question about that, as well. It is something that I look at when I evaluate tenure and promotion. I think it would be helpful to include it.
- Alicia - We disagreed. We have instances where that really isn't at all applicable. For example, we are a clinical program where students are acting in the professional realm in which it becomes difficult to assess the number of hours that are "class time" and clinical time.
- David - I see it more as a means to track my expectations such that I don't see myself being compared to a history course but rather giving insight to the reality of what I am expecting from my students.
- Claire - Maybe it's not for comparison but for person reference?
- Emily - I think it needs to be pointed out that not all of these would be interpreted in the same way. It isn't a one size fits all. What was the process for creating the CIEs that we have now? When we encounter these issues, how do we sort it out? Is greater weight given to those who teach the class or those who use the CIE for evaluation or does it fall to PSC to sort out and hold some sort of standard?
- Alicia - Ours had both quantitative and narrative measures. The thing with evaluations is that they can be discussed.
- Emily - Why no question #9?
- Pat - Again, our thought was that it was a question that was more attuned to the undergraduate experience. It is not relevant to our expectation of teaching at the graduate level.
- Marc - Why did you take out "tolerance and availability".
- Alicia - Those were perceived as redundant
- Claire - If you want to run the one question we had reservations about by the team and then take it to Paul Harris. Then what do we do Don?
- Don - Lets see what Paul says then do one more reading in PSC then send it to the administration for final review and approval.
- Marc - I suggest adding a survey/evaluation for advising and a survey/evaluation for honors thesis and/or independent studies.

**Meeting Adjourned: 4:00pm**