

11-9-2010

## Minutes, Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee Meeting, Tuesday, November 9, 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, November 9, 2010" (2010). *Professional Standards Committee Minutes*. Paper 59.  
[http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as\\_ps/59](http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ps/59)

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: November 9, 2010**

### **Attendance:**

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

### **Meeting Convened: 7:30am**

### **Announcements:**

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

### **Old Business:**

- Review of Outstanding FYRST grant.
- Subsequent discussion about the role of PSC in relation to grants
  - Marc proposed members recuse themselves if they have a conflict of interest
  - Josh raised additional concerns about untenured individuals sitting in judgment of tenured applicants and the resulting vulnerable position
  - Claire asked to table the discussion until first meeting in Spring.
- David asked that the discussion surrounding Adjunct pay increases be moved higher on list.
- Feedback to administrators
  - Dean of students
    - Claire - What do we want to do with Marc's suggested questions and do we want to add or change any of them?
    - David - Point of order: there are lots of constituents in this, does our role extend beyond this committee? My question is actually focused on whether or not these forms will be used beyond the faculty as a means for eliciting feedback from other stakeholders.
    - Claire - No. And this is just our part. It is not a 360 evaluation.
    - Marc reviewed the format and nature of the survey questions. The 2<sup>nd</sup> page contains general survey questions, basic satisfaction level and why do they feel that way. Then there's a basic scale that will be standardized 1-5 or 1-7. Specific parts need to be added to. Ideally, it should have four to seven key dimensions for each one. Inspired by both political and business type surveys.
    - Dorothy - I like it. Is there a place for comments that are not represented on the survey?

- Marc - Just like the CIE's, there will be comment boxes.
- David - I think that is important to help contextualize the responses. Should we add non-applicable or don't know?
- Marc - I will add those.
- Richard - Are we going to collect any demographic information on the survey. Such as how long have you been here, or your department?
- Emily- Also, how often do you have meaningful contact with this person?
- Claire- I think that's more important than asking rank, time and place. I just worry that it will make people more unlikely to take the survey
- Marc - We could just do tenure/untentured.
- Deb - Or you could do it by rank - Assistant, associate, and full.
- Claire - Equally it might be interesting to look at a divisional representation.
- Dorothy - What about gender? I think we'd want to know if an administrator was going well with men but bad with women.
- Claire - How about just rank, division, and gender?
- Richard - Maybe you go back to tenure, tenure-track, or non-tenure track.
- Emily - What about going back to the question of time where you have a brand new professor vs. someone who's been here twenty years?
- Steven - The worry about small cell size is identity. When you have such a small population, it is easy to figure out who the person is.
- Claire - I think we should just focus on the questions.
- Steven - Then we should look at this from the administrator's perspective meaning what do they need to know to interpret the data as opposed to what we want to know about this particular administrator.
- Emily - Adding too many questions dilutes the source material. It is an intact set of criteria and shouldn't monkey around with it.
- Marc - Yes you can delete or add because it is not a factual analysis. It is an imperfect system. I already deleted questions that are not appropriate to an educational environment.
- Claire - How about adding aggressive/passive?
- Marc - Approachable/unapproachable?  
Passive/active is an important one.

- Claire - I like decisive and indecisive. I wonder about sophisticated/unsophisticated. What does that have to do with an administrator?
- David - What about transparency?
- Claire - Transparency might be a substitute for believable or honest.
- Richard - Receptive?
- Marc - Receptive/unreceptive?
- Claire - Can we add a comment box at the end of that?
- Marc - I've already done that. I also want suggestions as to what specific subdimensions are important.
- Emily - For president, maybe something about relationship with community and fundraising?
- Claire - How about strategic planning?
- Dorothy - The president always says part of his job is improving the national profile. Can we say something like that?
- Emily - Yes, improving national profile.
- Deb - Effective fundraising.
- Claire - I think academics can have a modifier. Fundraising already has one. What do we mean by the financial situation of the college?
- David - What about financial stewardship of the college?
- Marc - Community outreach, enhance academics, financial stewardship of college, enhance internationalization, leadership
- Steven - We need to ensure that the entry statement matches up with our categories.
- Claire - Please indicate satisfaction in the following categories. We are doing Dean of Students so we should do that one.
- David - do you feel that the spirit of our questions is appropriate (to Deb)
- Deb - Yes, I think the spirit of the questions is great.
- David - Part of the job of the Dean of Students is seeking connection between curricular and co-curricular activities. I think enhance academics fits well.
- Dorothy - I don't think that will communicate what we want. Maybe enhance curricular/extracurricular integration?
- David - Yes, maybe we just need to spell it out. Is there something about student support? Or student advocacy?
- Claire - What about promoting responsible student behavior?

- David - I really want something about student advocacy.
- Claire - Does it say serve as an advocate for students and student life?
- Marc - Student growth.
- Emily - Foster student growth.
- Claire - Did you get student advocacy?
- Marc - Leadership enhance academics, safety, promoting good student behavior, foster student growth, and acting as student advocate.
- Dorothy - Cultivating curricular and co-curricular activities.
- Steven - I think good communication with the faculty is an important question for all administrator feedback surveys.
- David - I think this has been the most important question of the Dean of Studs for the whole time I've been here. I think it's particularly appropriate for this position.
- Claire - Marc will send out for PSC to review. We can look it over and add/edit with suggestions. If Marc can get it out to us today, PSC members can make responses to Claire by Thursday so she can send to administrators on Friday.

**Meeting Adjourned: 8:30am**