

9-14-2010

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee Meeting, Tuesday, September 14, 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, Tuesday, September 14, 2010" (2010). *Professional Standards Committee Minutes*. Paper 50.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ps/50

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 14, 2010

Attendance:

- Members: 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): Thomas Ouellette

Meeting Convened: 7:30

New Business:

- Discussion about FEC requests:
- Dates:
 - Thomas – Previous discussions surrounding midcourse reviews indicate the reviews taking place sometime in the spring. It does not specify a deadline date. If you are going up for tenure, the submission date is 9/30; for promotion to full professor the deadline is 10/15. The FEC decided last spring the deadline for midcourse material submission should be the end of semester or Dec. 15, but this deadline had not been codified. The perception is that the midcourse is being moved to the fall, which is not the case. Materials are due end of fall but all reviews are still scheduled for spring. The FEC suggests keeping the deadline of candidate materials at end of semester (Dec 15) and making the deadline for department to submit their materials on Feb 15. The first scheduled midcourse review is in mid-March.
 - Dick – So we need to determine when specifically is the end of semester?
 - Deb – Are the formal evaluation/annual reviews on the same schedule? I'd like to tack the formal annual review to the same schedule.
 - Thomas – It is helpful to separate them [midcourse v. tenure & full] by semester.
 - Emily - If the deadline for the submission of candidate materials is Dec. 15, then the candidate has not had a chance to see the fall semester CIEs.
 - Thomas – We can leave it the way it is just for this year or we can extend it for this year with the understanding that we'd revisit the determination/evaluation of the dates later on when we look at all the dates.
 - Dick – Emily 's got it right. The issue is the fall CIEs. When does the candidate get access?
 - Deb – They typically can get access after the 15th.
 - Thomas – I'd be inclined to make the submission date the first day of spring classes.
 - Deb – That doesn't give the dean a chance to review them over the break.
 - Thomas – I thought that was okay with you. I'm just looking at the best option for this year.
 - David – Would it be helpful to have it as a calendar date?

- Emily – That can be problematic. The grant cycle has moved to non-calendar date deadlines (ie: third week in sept) in order to avoid the shifting semester dates.
- Steven – I think it's beneficial to set a firm date. I think being sensitive to the candidates need to review and account for the fall semester CIEs is important.
- Deb- What about the Friday before Christmas?
- Thomas – I am concerned about the distribution and collection of materials when school is not in session.
- Marc – What about keeping the 15th and making an exception for first years?
- Deb – I think if we are looking to include fall CIEs, then Friday Dec 17 would work. That would give the candidates a little extra time to review and reflect upon their fall CIEs.
- Dick – Thomas, would you include in the letter to the candidates that part of the consideration behind this is for the inclusion of their fall CIEs?
- Steven – Can the candidate submit an addendum?
- Thomas – Yes they can but that's more often applied in regards to their face-to-face meetings. So if the candidates submitted their materials by Dec. 17, then the letters from departments would go to Dean's office by Feb 15. Another thing PSC needs to look at are how materials are submitted and whether or not they submit them simultaneously to the department, FEC, and the Dean of Faculty. There is also some concern about material format.
- FEC Membership:
 - Thomas (cont...) - One final point about adding an extra member to the FEC on busy years: our suggested formula would be that once we reach 18 candidates, we'd add an extra member to the FEC. Asking each liaison to do 3 cases per year is a lot. If we go beyond that, we really need more members. The thing to remember is that, in the old days, this was not an issue because midcourses didn't happen. Most of the cases before FEC this year are midcourses and they require more time and attention b/c they need to be more pointed. We are asking that if we meet or exceed 18 cases, we get to add an extra member. The issue of partiality can be addressed by alternating who gets to sit on each review/case.
 - Dick – Is it three per year or just one more candidate when we get to 18? Is it a new FEC member for every additional three cases, (ie: at 21 we add 2, at 24 we add 3)?
 - Thomas – No. It is our suggestion that we add just one.
 - Marc – Does this additional person vote for just one year or are they on there for 3 years?
 - Thomas- My suggestion would be for one year. Hopefully, we'd have someone who'd served on FEC before. It was very hard, though, to fill the current committee.
 - Josh – Do we have a pool strong enough to fill an additional vacancy?
 - Marc – So, we are talking about one member serving one year.
 - Deb- Voted on and approved by the faculty, of course. This would be a change in bylaws and it would have to be approved by the faculty first. We might be able to do that simultaneously.

- Emily – Is there ever a situation when seven [FEC committee members] would not be enough?
- Thomas – I think FEC would be thrilled with this incremental change. It would be such a shot in the arm and a significant difference to the workload [for the better].
- Dick – Is there any way to predict what the load is going to be for the next two or three years?
- Deb – Since Laurie has been here, there have been more hired as visiting professors than as tenure track. I think this might be the last huge year.
- Dick – Before we go to full faculty, it might be handy to know that number [who will be up for midcourse, tenure, or full review] so that we can say that this will only kick in during these situations over these x-number of years.
- Thomas – (Back to the dates) Did we decide on Feb 15 as the date?
- Dick – Right now we have Dec 15 for the submission of candidate materials and Feb 15 for the submission of letters from their CEC. You'll announce this how?
- Thomas – That seems like a good date. When you relook at the overall dates, I think you'll find that Feb 15 is a good date for that submission of CEC support.
- Dick – Is this first one a bylaw change?
- Thomas – I think it is. What do you think Deb?
- Deb – I do think it needs to be a bylaw change.
- Emily - Does it make sense to wait until you see what the experience is like this year before changing the bylaws?
- Thomas – I think this doesn't have to be a change to the bylaws this year. It's just clarification [to the candidates] of what they've already been told. Afterwards, I'd like to re-examine/re-evaluate the overall dates.
- Dick – Then the immediate issue would be to bring a bylaw change to the faculty for when the number of candidates exceeds 18, an additional member may be added to FEC.
- Josh – That needs to be officially offered as a motion.
- David – I move to amend the bylaws
- Dorothy – I second.
- Steven – I volunteer to craft a draft of the official language.
- Thomas – You'll want to look at that section of bylaws for reference.
- Emily – That's section 6 of section 6.

Old Business:

- Teaching Evaluations
 - Dick - Claire wants to continue the discussion surrounding the formulation of a subcommittee to analyze teaching. Potential committee members have been identified. They include James Zimmerman, Paul Harris, Lee Lines, FEC alum, Dorothy Mays. We are missing expressive arts and humanities representatives.
 - David – Is this something that should include student involvement?
 - Steven – That might be good idea since they're filling out the CIEs.
 - Dorothy – I'm not sure that's beneficial. This is more about peer review. Students already get the chance to offer reviews and evaluate their professors through the CIE itself.

- Deb – Dana Hargrove might be a good candidate for the expressive arts.
- Dick – What about the humanities?
- Emily – Who’s been on FEC before?
- Deb - What about Lezlie Laws?
- Dick – What we’re asking EC is that we think this subcommittee would be more effective at addressing this issue and that these are the folks we recommend. We did suggest FSC should be involved.
- Marc – But it should be an FSC alum, right?
Dick – Yes.
- David – But have they existed long enough for FSC to have alum?
- Dick – Yes, I think so. So the subcommittee has good divisional representation and also includes representatives from the two standing committees that have the greatest investment in the results of teaching evaluations – FSC and FEC.
- Emily – Merit pay is a good example of successful subcommittee work.
- Marc – We have had a lot of discussions around teaching evaluations. I think those discussions would be beneficial to this new subcommittee.
- Dick – I will look back at the minutes and try to get a comprehensive model/idea of the issues at hand.
- Emily – I’m also willing to go back through the minutes and try to collate all the issues we wrestled with and some of the ideas we came up with.
- David – Could you forward those to current members so we can catch up?
- Emily – Yes.
- Marc – We should dedicate some time to transition the work that PSC did to the new committee. That way they don’t end up reinventing the wheel. We should not only give them our materials, but then converse with them for a half hour or so at one of our meetings.
- Grants:
 - Marc - Just one quick question about the grant applications. Nothing mentions a support letter for Critchfield or other grants. For Fyrst you need it; but not for any other grant.
 - Emily – In practice (as opposed to the letter of the policy) grant applications are accompanied by a letter from the department/chair, but you’re right. The language is ambiguous for some of the grants. It is mentions that you have to have a letter for a course development grant, but not for any research related grant such as Critchfield.
 - Deb - Yes, in general, a support letter/e-mail from the department chair is only needed for departmental related grants such as course development grants.

Meeting adjourned: 8:33am