

9-7-2010

## Minutes, Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee Meeting, Tuesday, September 7, 2010

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, Tuesday, September 7, 2010" (2010). *Professional Standards Committee Minutes*. Paper 49.  
[http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as\\_ps/49](http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ps/49)

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: September 7, 2010**

### **Attendance:**

- Members: Claire Strom, Dorothy Mays, Steven St. John, David Charles, Richard James, Marc Fetscherin, Emily Russell, Joshua Almond, and Carlee Hoffman
- Dean of Faculty Representative: Dean Deb Wellman
- Visitor(s): Jonathan Miller

**Meeting Convened: 7:33**

### **Announcements**

- Memo on Granting Guidelines
  - PSC submitted recommendations; Dean's office has not yet implemented.
  - Emily suggested implementing the revisions for the coming January cycle, but not for the fall cycle as Don had suggested.
  - David asks if form is ready is it just a matter of education?
  - Claire – People applying for FYRSTs are already operating under the old guideline, the January cycles would potentially be under the new guideline.
  - Claire – Changes include looking at the final report, the chairs would offer more insight as to the needs/rationale behind the grant, we get a total budget.
  - David – Changes did not seem shocking.
  - Claire – Do we implement in January? Committee voted yes. One change was that each member of PSC takes a number of grants and reviews them for any immediate deficiencies/problems, then give the grantee an opportunity (about a week) to revise.
  - Josh – This isn't going to eliminate the questions we're likely to get about why they didn't get the grant. In fact we're likely to get more complaints/concerns.
  - Deb – Can we just not give them a check off sheet and avoid giving them the week?
  - Emily – It is good to apply standards rigorously, but we're making significant changes to a culture that is slow to change and that will likely cause problems.
  - Marc – What about an information session? These are faculty, after all, and they should assume responsibility for their application. We could do a little presentation at a faculty meeting?
  - Josh – Can we not just encourage them to attend the new faculty grant workshop in October?
  - Steven – You can also make a presentation at the chairs meeting and then ask chairs to disseminate that to their respective departments.
  - Committee agrees to encourage faculty to attend the grant workshop.
- Schedule for FYRST grant meeting:
  - Tuesday, October 19 6:30pm (tentatively in President's dining hall)
- FEC membership

- Claire – Spoke with Thomas Oulette and he did not like our rubric. Needs formula to be smaller so that they can get new members on board sooner. PSC feels that the 3+ that each FEC member is reviewing sounds reasonable. Will wait for Thomas to respond.

### **Old Business:**

- Faculty Librarians
  - Claire – recaps the issue at hand, namely: Since librarians do not teach credit bearing courses to the extent that other faculty do, and since the A&S faculty merit pay system is based heavily on the evaluation of credit bearing teaching, librarians are unable to achieve merit.
  - Emily – I think there is a way to reshape the FSARs to address the deficiencies. Though it would be unfair to create two different sets of evaluation, one could argue that it is equally unfair to try to shoehorn librarians into the current criteria.
  - Dorothy – Librarians have been operating well enough under the current system. Offered the possibility of submitting an addendum to the form that might elaborate on their activities to be reviewed by Jonathan (Director of Library Services) or the Dean of Faculty's office.
  - Marc – Who decides what meets or exceeds expectations for librarians?
  - Jonathan – Where did this come from? Who brought this to PSC? If they have been operating well enough under the current system, doesn't that suggest that the current system is working?
  - Dick – Why don't we go back to the FSAR and expand areas of the form that would allow librarians to elaborate on their specific activities? All we want is for someone to be able to make a suitable case for their work.
  - Claire – Will talk with Thom Moore to find out where/why this came forward.
  - Jonathan – Second question revolves around aspect of teaching and how best to evaluate that, which might indicate a more institutional concern over the evaluation of teaching for all faculty.
  - Deb – Faculty get CIE responses for their courses, librarians do not.
  - Jonathan – The librarians are developing a system of library instruction evaluation that collects input from students (with a modified CIE form) and from peer observation. We expect to pilot this in the Spring of 2011.
  - Claire – The concern is that as we evaluate on the current system, we're not evaluating them on the most important aspect of their role – that being librarianship.
  - Jonathan – It is important to remember that librarians are full members of the faculty.
  - Marc – Raised that question last time. How to evaluate them without raising the question of whether or not they should be faculty?
  - Dorothy – If we could add an addendum to the FSAR, it would be rather lengthy to cover all the things that librarians do. An addendum that formalizes what they do would help librarians to recognize what they do.
  - Steven – How does meets/exceed expectations work with librarians? Is it consistent across all librarians?

- Dorothy – No evaluation document is perfect but, with the addendum, they can reasonably reflect their roles.
- Marc – Currently, it seems the system works, why the change?
- Emily – If this is coming from librarians and their concerns about an inadequate system, then that is a serious concern that needs to be addressed; if not, then is this something that needs to be addressed at all?
- Jonathan – We need to consider how is this going to be treated by the audience that receives it. Is this adequate for FSC?
- Deb – If that is the case, the minutes ought to reflect that committee feels comfortable with the fact that librarians are full members of the faculty.
- Jonathan – Is this a question of promotion and tenure or is it about merit? They are separate issues (though they often get conflated).
- Steven – The addendum makes a paper trail that librarians could use as part of their appeal either to the FSC or then to PSC. Psychology has a discipline-specific addendum that members of that department can utilize to contextualize their work.
- Claire will find out where this issue came from.

### **New Business**

- Changes in Cornell Grant Structure
  - Who gets on the committee? Who gets appointed? How many years?
  - Previous award winners serve as selection committee members.
  - First change: Want to extend the number of years award winners serve – from two to three. Terms are staggered. Currently, there aren't enough members to serve.
  - Second change: Want to push back the dates. They want to push the whole process back.
  - Claire – Currently give awards in fall, which does not permit enough time for candidates to submit materials and committee to review them. Spring award works better. Tenure and promotion and Cornell grants are currently on same schedule. It would look bad if we denied tenure but gave award. Pushing it back fixes that problem.
  - Marc – What are the dates?
  - Marc – Suggests November 1 call for nominations, December 1 nominations received, February 1 materials due.
  - Committee votes yes in support of the date changes.

**Meeting adjourned 8:31am**