

3-16-2011

## Minutes, Professional Standards Committee Meeting, Wednesday, March 16, 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, Professional Standards Committee Meeting, Wednesday, March 16, 2011" (2011). *Professional Standards Committee Minutes*. Paper 44.  
[http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as\\_ps/44](http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ps/44)

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: March 16, 2011**

### **Attendance:**

- Members: Claire Strom, Steven St. John, David Charles, Richard James, Marc Fetscherin, Emily Russell, Joshua Almond, Dorothy Mays.
- Dean of Faculty Representative: Interim Dean Deb Wellman
- Guest: Giselda Beaudin

### **Meeting Convened: 3:00 pm**

### **Announcements:**

- Approval of last week's minutes: Minutes approved.

### **New Business:**

- Faculty Compensation for Field Study
  - Giselda provided a handout of current compensation structure and gave a brief synopsis of the relationship between compensation and field study content. Her program is seeking clarity on the compensation structure that can be communicated to the faculty, a model that addresses the different categories of Field Study.
  - Deb – I suggest that the cap should be 12 students [for a single faculty leader] instead of 15. So it would be 8-12 students for one and 13-24 for two.
  - Giselda – We're happy to do that. Other faculty voiced similar opinions. We inherited this cap. It would, however, impact costs and enrollment. In practice, what I see most common is one person taking a small group of 6-8 or two faculty taking larger groups of 10-15.
  - Claire - Would you be okay if we adjusted the caps to 12 and 24, then?
  - Giselda – Yes, I'm happy to do that. In practice we don't have any that go out with more than 24 so that is not really an issue.
  - David – What would be the cost impact?
  - Giselda – I believe that's already factored that in. It does not impact college budgetary issues but it will impact total cost for the students.
  - Deb – I'd like to suggest that we can still make exceptions if need be on a case-by-case basis.
  - Giselda – We can certainly do that but I would insist that be done in conversation with Dean of Faculty.
  - Emily – I don't think there should be a change in compensation between 12 and 14 if only one person is leading.
  - Deb – I see different figures for Maymester.
  - Giselda – Yes and I'd like some input on that issue.
  - The Committee recommended \$4,000 standard.
  - Dick – One question, why is "Short-term" 8-30 students permitted to run with only one faculty?
  - Giselda – Short-term programs receive structural support from a provider host institution, so they can run effectively with just one faculty member.
  - Claire - Maybe if they're not teaching, then the duration of the trip becomes more important?
  - Giselda - That makes sense. We find that credit is a good indicator of length.

- Emily – I think it might be that the “no credit” compensation is a little low and “short-term” is a little high.
- Claire - One credit is how much time?
- Giselda - Three or four days on site. They’re really rare
- Claire – So two credits is really the minimum length then for a field study.
- Giselda – Short-term is a limited category. There are currently only two programs that run in that category and one looks like it may be reevaluated.
- Emily – In the other category, the increase in price based on number of students is triggered by another faculty member’s involvement.
- Marc- I think a 4 credit field study should be a minimum of 21 days. I don’t think you need a minimum or a maximum. I think we should do that with credit, as well.
- Committee expressed concern over the compensation being tied to number of days and the possibility of extending a trip an additional day just to get the bump in pay (a 15 day trip for \$2200 versus 14 for \$1800).
- Dorothy – What if it is a flat fee for the first week and then an additional \$100 per day?
- Claire - I like that, a per-day compensation for the “No Credit” courses. For the “No Credit” field study, I think there should be a base rate of \$1500 for 5 days and then \$100 per-day for each additional day. Double that for 13-24 students – (\$3000 flat rate with \$200 for each additional day). So we’re changing that and we’re changing the student caps from 8-15 to 8-12 and 16-30 to 13-24.
- Emily moves that we recommend adjusting the No Credit compensation to a flat rate (for 8-12 students = \$1500 for 5 days then \$100 per-day for each additional day; for 13-24 students = \$3000 for 5 days then \$200 per-day for each additional day) and that we adjust the caps from 8-15 to 8-12 and 16-30 to 13-24. David seconds.
- Motion passes.
- Discussion of setting up a meeting time to discuss grants.
  - Claire - We have approximately 44 or 45 grants to review.
  - Emily posed the possibility of breaking down the workload for review.
  - Steven - Since PSC has ownership of these, maybe we should look at the forms and edit the application for next year. Maybe we determine what information it is that we really need, thus reducing the size of each particular grant, limiting them next year so that they are not 15 pages.
  - Josh pointed out some of the inherent flaws of parsing out the workload.
  - Marc suggested a two-part process where we read and rank them individually, then collate those rankings and discuss them as a group – specifically ones that are outliers or that may be contentious for some reason.
  - Meeting scheduled 30<sup>th</sup> 2-6pm

**Adjourn 4:00 pm**