

2-9-2011

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee Meeting, Wednesday, February 9, 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 9, 2011" (2011). *Professional Standards Committee Minutes*. Paper 41.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ps/41

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 9, 2011

Attendance:

- Members: David Charles, Dorothy Mays, Richard James, Emily Russell, Marc Fetscherin, Carlee Hoffman, Steven St. John, and Claire Strom.
- Dean of Faculty Representative: Not present.

Meeting Convened: 3:00 p.m.

Announcements:

- Minutes from 2/2 approved with minor corrections.
- Dorothy reported that the committee reviewing teaching evaluations is ready to move the process forward to the faculty.
- Deb is working on collecting materials for PSC's discussion of pay structures; thus far it appears there is not a lot of uniformity.

Old Business

- Bylaw Revisions: Tenure and Promotion
 - Claire brought to the committee a revision of the Bylaws regarding Faculty Appointments, Tenure, and Promotion. The first major revision was whether sabbaticals should be granted only with the approval of the Dean and contingent on work being done during the sabbatical.
 - Marc: What is motivating this change?
 - Claire: Requests are coming from the Dean's office and certain departments such as English that the sabbatical involve a plan for scholarly work. Currently the post-tenure evaluation requires a Faculty Development Plan, though what this is isn't really specified.
 - Marc: Is there a consequence for not meeting this goal?
 - David: A small consequence in that work during sabbatical can be considered when reviewing future internal grants.
 - Emily: In my discussions with colleagues, sabbatical was viewed not as a reward for work done but rather an opportunity to stage future scholarship.
 - Claire: Dean Joyner did deny a sabbatical on the basis of a lack of a plan. That decision was not really permissible by the current Bylaws. I (Claire) personally believe that it is ridiculous to simply get a semester off every six years.
 - David: Is this the time for this discussion? This might hold up the rest of the Bylaw revisions.
 - Claire: All we are saying (now in the revision) is that there must be a sabbatical plan and that the CEC can look at your syllabi and course evaluations can be reviewed in the context of a post-tenure evaluation.
 - Marc: According to the handbook, this is already clear that the sabbatical is centered on scholarly work. In fact we should model what the handbook says to be more inclusive of Divisions where "research" isn't the primary professional development activity.
 - Emily: I think that inserting language about "professional development" will just be codifying a practice that is standard.

- Marc: We should add (like the handbook does) examples of what constitutes professional development – research, performance, teaching elsewhere, etc.
- Claire: The next issue is inserting language enabling a Candidate Evaluation Committee to solicit evaluations of the candidate's scholarship from experts at other institutions, so long as that is stated clearly in each department's tenure and promotion criteria. (General agreement with Claire's language.)
- Claire: The next issue, requested by the FEC, was to expand the FEC by 1 person for every three candidates up for tenure and promotion over 18. An unresolved issue is that if this person is selected during the year in which he or she serves, it will be almost impossible to provide that member with a course release.
- Marc: I think it is clear that the new member could bank this course release.
- David: Or in many cases there would be time to make changes to a member's course schedule in the Spring.
- Dorothy: Could an alternate always be added to the slate voted on by the faculty? To be used if needed?
- Marc: This makes sense – 6 plus one alternate.
- Claire: The idea of an alternate was shot down last time this was suggested.
- Claire: The final issue is that there are – somehow – 2 appeals committees in the Bylaws – an all-faculty committee (Article VI) and an A&S one. The Provost has recommended that we maintain the All-Faculty committee (it is the one that is actually operational and has been in use) and the reference to an Appeals committee in the A&S Bylaws should be deleted. In comparing the committees, they seem to be quite similar in all respects.
- Claire: Okay, I will make these changes and take these to Executive Committee.

New Business

- Faculty Pay
 - Deb was going to bring us materials on this but since she is not here we will deal with this in a future meeting.

Meeting Adjourned: 3:49 p.m.