

2-2-2011

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee Meeting, Wednesday, February 2, 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, February 2, 2011" (2011). *Professional Standards Committee Minutes*. Paper 40.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ps/40

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.

PSC Meeting

Minutes: February 2, 2011

Attendance:

- Members: David Charles, Richard James, Emily Russell, Marc Fetscherin, Carlee Hoffman, Steven St. John, and Claire Strom.
- Dean of Faculty Representative: Deb Wellman

Meeting Convened: 3:00 p.m.

Announcements:

- In Josh's absence, Steven St. John volunteered to take notes.
- The minutes of January 26 were adopted with great enthusiasm.
- Claire noted that she consulted Paul Harris about the Graduate course and instructor evaluation forms tentatively approved by PSC last week, but that Paul "had some problems" with the form.
- Marc requested that his comment of 1/26 ("I suggest adding a survey/evaluation for advising and a survey/evaluation for honors thesis and/or independent studies") not be forgotten. Claire resolved to add this issue to the rolling agenda.
- Claire announced that one grant had been submitted one week after the deadline and that the faculty member requested the grant be reviewed nonetheless. Claire followed up with the faculty member asking if there were grounds for an appeal but learned that the faculty member had simply gotten the deadline date wrong. David and Marc both expressed a willingness for the committee to be lenient in cases where extenuating circumstances were present, but that did not seem to be the case here. Claire and Emily agreed and noted that there was no point to a deadline if it were waived in every case. Deb requested a vote on the issue. Emily moved to reaffirm the commitment to the deadline, David seconded. Vote carried 7-0.

Old Business

- Bylaw Revisions: Tenure and Promotion
 - Claire reintroduced the issue of the Bylaws regarding Tenure and Promotion, following feedback provided by Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) on the draft previously created in PSC. The Bylaw revisions were somewhat extensive, primarily in reorganizing the document into dedicated sections for each type of formal review (Annual Review, Mid-Course Review, Tenure, Promotion to Rank, and Post-Tenure review). Although this reorganization creates some redundancy, it allows a candidate to scrutinize a dedicated section of the Bylaws rather than collect various pieces of information spread across multiple sections. Claire asked PSC to look over FEC's input in three sections: first, their comments on the re-organization, second, on the specific timeline being recommended, and third, to be delayed for a future meeting, a host of potentially more contentious revisions such as the new proposition to add an extra FEC member in years where the number of candidates is large.
 - Deb – I think the reorganization will be well received. (General agreement from PSC.)
 - Claire – Then let's move on to the timeline. FEC has suggested some dates different from our draft, and they also suggested a procedural difference. They have the candidate, not the

chair of the Candidate Evaluation Committee (CEC), informing FEC when the CEC has been formed and of its membership.

- David – This seems like a lot to ask of the candidate. There can be a steep learning curve in understanding the tenure and promotion process. Did they have a rationale for this change? Is there a history of problems when this task is left to the CEC?
- Claire – I don't know. I know that FEC has been emphasizing the responsibilities of the candidate throughout the evaluation process.
- Deb – We could certainly change this (back) to having the CEC inform FEC by June 1 that the CEC has been formed. (General agreement.)
- Emily – FEC recommended the procedure and the date change – they suggest June 1 but we had suggested May 1. Our rationale was that the CEC should be formed before graduation understanding that during the summer faculty may not be on campus and could be difficult to get hold of.
- Claire – Another issue about the dates was raised by Joan Davison. She suggested that the deadline for candidates to submit materials to the Dean and CEC for annual reviews that we suggested – December 15 – is too early. Candidates in their first year would not have been able to review their first semester course evaluations. She suggested January 15.
- Deb – We could compromise and go with January 1. This would allow the candidate to review the course evaluations but still allow the committees time to start work over winter break.
- Emily – Regarding Annual Reviews, the text we have in the Table (specifying the timeline for Annual Reviews and Post-Tenure Review) implies that the candidate submits materials to the Dean and the CEC, but I believe for Annual Review these go only to the CEC, not the Dean.
- Deb – That's correct. The Table has to be modified somehow. The materials do go to both places in the case of Post-Tenure Review, so that's right, but only to the CEC in the case of an annual review. That line of the table is trying to do too much.
- Dick – We've got to be careful as we're fixing the language in the Table that we're also being consistent in the text proper.
- Emily (after scanning the text relevant to Annual Review) – It looks like the Annual Review text is fine.
- David (conveyed two typographic errors to Claire)
- Claire – I can take these revisions and fix up a new draft of the Bylaws.
- David – I move we transmit this draft with the changes discussed to Executive Committee. (Emily seconds.)
- Draft approved with revisions, 7-0.

New Business

- Faculty Compensation Policy: Field Study
 - Claire announced that Giselda Beaudin (Director of International Programs) has been working on a proposal for a new faculty compensation policy for faculty teaching on a field study or serving as a program administrator. Giselda provided a 2-page document with the proposal and a backgrounder on the current policy. The document notes that "We are not currently following the compensation policy for the few programs we offer where faculty act as the program administrator but do not teach – this suggests that this policy is not working well." A second reason for revising the policy is "Currently, we make no differentiation for length (of the field study) or number of credits."

- Claire then pointed out that one loophole in the draft was “No Credit Service Learning (any length)” would be compensated at \$2500 – the “any length” was designed to emphasize that even long duration trips would only be compensated at \$2500, but could be read as indicating that even a one or two hour experience would be compensated. She recommend this read “No Credit Service Learning (two or more days)”.
- Marc – What’s an example of non-credit service learning?
- Claire – For example I take my class to Apopka, but it is within a particular class, so there’s no credit offered specifically for the field study. That’s already part of the class.
- Dick pointed out another loophole in the proposal: The ranges for Credit-bearing field studies are \$2500 for 2-4 days (1 credit) and \$3000 for 8-14 days (2 credits) – what happens if the field study is 5-7 days?
- Claire suggested that the 2-4 day range be extended to 2-7 days.
- Deb suggested that there might be a line missing to include cases like intersession, where a field study can be as short as 5 days but still carry 2 credits for the student.
- Marc – I don’t feel like we have enough information to make a decision. For example, what’s the financial impact of adopting these changes? What do our peer institutions do?
- Deb – Giselda has looked at those factors in generating this document.
- David – I’m a little concerned that the rubric is focused on the trip’s duration, but two field studies of the same length could differ a lot in terms of faculty responsibilities. It seems like this should be based on contact hours.
- Claire – Presumably the Academic Affairs Committee is dealing with those kinds of issues when they approve courses to bear a certain number of credits.
- Emily – How are field studies compensated when they are embedded in a course in a Fall or Spring Semester? For example, in one of my classes I plan to take students on a field study during Spring Break.
- Deb – Those fall in the “No Credit” category and would be \$2500.
- Marc – It seems like a straight per diem system would work. \$250 a day or something along those lines.
- David (agreeing) – But maybe with some sort of base pay to acknowledge the prep work involved in setting up the field study.
- Claire – I will meet with Giselda about these issues and see if I can get some specifics about the financial impact, peer institutions, and the other suggestions we’ve raised.
- Claire – I suggest we adjourn at this point.

Meeting Adjourned: 3:47 p.m.