

9-2-2010

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee Meeting, Thursday, September 2, 2010

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, Thursday, September 2, 2010" (2010). *Professional Standards Committee Minutes*. Paper 48.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ps/48

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: September 2, 2010
Approved 9/2/10

Attendance: Claire Strom, Steven St. John, Joshua Almond, Dick James, Marc Fetscherin, Emily Russell, Dorothy Mays, Carlee Hoffman, Don Davison, and Jonathan Miller

Meeting Convened: 4:00pm

Administrative Business:

- Claire elected to serve as president
- Josh volunteered to serve as secretary
- Members agreed that regular meetings for the fall semester will be held at 7:30am on Tuesdays

Announcements

- FEC is asking for new members to help with tenure and promotion reviews
 - Claire reviewed the PSC proposed changes to the bylaw
 - Total number of members to be calculated using a formula based on the total number of reviews
 - Don refreshed the committee on the history, indicated the issue is still open
 - Don recommended contacting Thomas Ouellette to determine how to respond or resolve
- Claire gave a rundown of EC meeting news
 - AAC will deal with issue of grade inflation
 - According to faculty survey, the issues most important to faculty relate to having more time, salaries, and better IT

Old Business

- Evaluation of Teaching
 - Claire suggested we ask EC to appoint new subcommittee
 - Emily agreed, pointed out that there are multiple entities addressing the issue simultaneously and that it might be better if there were one, distinct committee to coordinate the process.
 - The committee recognize various constituencies that have a vested interest in the process: FEC, Zimmerman, AAC, FSC and/or the Appeals Committee, and the Dean's office; Don also suggested including Lee Lines and Steve suggested John Houston and Paul Harris
 - Claire will meet with Karla and Tina to get grant schedules
 - Don will check up on recommendations that PSC had made to the Dean concerning the internal grant process and language
 - Marc pointed out that we need to schedule the meeting for fall FYRST grants; Claire wanted to wait until all members were present and we'd gotten the schedules from Karla/Tina
 - Don asked PSC members to attend a new faculty development presentation on Oct. 14 at 3:30pm in the Bieberbach Room to talk about the internal grant process
- Evaluation of Librarians
 - Dorothy presented info collected from peer and aspirant schools. Surveyed 22 institutions: 11 have faculty librarians but only 3 have tenure track faculty. She pointed out that if you extend that out nationally beyond just our peer/aspirant institutions that

- 51% of institutions have faculty librarians and the trend suggests that more schools are moving that direction. Those faculty librarians that aren't tenure track have the same rights as faculty but not all of the same benefits; all have levels, sometimes titles, and promotional cycles similar to faculty but with different criteria. The 3 institutions with TT faculty librarians all replaced teaching with librarianship. We are the only one that tries to reconfigure what librarians do under the guise of teaching.
- Claire asked if librarians go through promotion and tenure and merit pay here just like faculty, how does that work elsewhere?
 - Dorothy said that TT librarians go through the faculty tenure and promotion system, while non-TT librarians are evaluated by the head librarian/department
 - Jonathan provided the committee with a description of current library system
 - Dick suggested simplest solution might be to change the language in the tenure and promotion process for librarians from teaching to librarianship.
 - Claire pointed out that if we want to be a top-quality institution and attract/retain top-quality librarians, tenure helps as tenure offers stability.
 - Dorothy pointed out that librarians publications are a bit lighter because they have a 12 month work commitment
 - Marc pointed out that either we adapt and try to evaluate the teaching activities of the librarian (workshop, in-class) or we might change the evaluation rubrics. However, if the rubrics have to be changed, probably the handbook/bylaws need to be changed which requires a faculty vote. This has a significant risk that faculty might discuss not only the rubrics of assessment of the librarian but their status also (tenure track/faculty status).
 - Josh asked for help in understanding how the librarians roles are different and more faculty-oriented than those of other academic support departments
 - Steven suggested we not debate the issue of faculty status but focus on the specific issue surrounding merit pay process for librarians. Committee agreed
 - Jonathan noted that FEC has real problem with looking at librarianship
 - Emily suggested two courses of action: 1. That we change the bylaws to reflect librarianship instead of teaching and that we change the instrument of evaluation accordingly and, 2. That we give it to the librarians to define the criteria to give to FSC
 - Claire asked Dorothy to look at the bylaws to see where changes would/should be made
 - Don pointed out that, based on the discussion, we are considering creating two different sets/criteria for evaluation.

Meeting adjourned: 4:58pm