

12-6-2006

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Faculty Meeting, Wednesday, Dec. 6, 2006

Arts & Sciences Faculty

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_fac

Recommended Citation

Arts & Sciences Faculty, "Minutes, Arts & Sciences Faculty Meeting, Wednesday, Dec. 6, 2006" (2006). *College of Arts and Sciences Faculty Minutes*. Paper 60.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_fac/60

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Arts and Sciences Minutes at Rollins Scholarship Online. It has been accepted for inclusion in College of Arts and Sciences Faculty Minutes by an authorized administrator of Rollins Scholarship Online. For more information, please contact wzhang@rollins.edu.

12/6/6 Arts and Sciences Faculty Meeting Minutes

Faculty in Attendance:

V. Aggarwal, B. Allen, I. Alon, M. Anderson, G. Barreneche, E. Blossey, A. Boguslawski, B. Boles, D. Boniface, E. Bouris, W. Brandon, A. Carpan, B. Carson, R. Casey, J. Chambliss, D. Charles, M. Cheng, G. Child, D. Child, E. Cohen, G. Cook, T. Cook, D. Cummings, M. D'Amato, J. Davison, D. Davison, K. Dennis, L. Duncan, S. Easton, J. Eck, H. Edge, L. Eng-Wilmot, M. Fetscherin, R. Foglesong, E. Friedland, L. Goj, B. Gottlieb, D. Griffin, M. Gunter, F. Harper, P. Harris, S. Hewit, A. Homrich, J. Houston, G. Howell, P. Jarnigan, R. James, S. Klemann, M. Kovarik, P. Kozel, H. Kypraios, S. Lackman, T. Lairson, C. Lauer, L. Laws, B. Levis, L. Lines, S. Mariotti, C. McInnis-Bowers, M. Meyer, J. Miller, A. Moe, B. Moore, T. Moore, R. Musgrave, R. Newcomb, M. Newman, A. Nordstrom, K. Norsworthy, T. Ouellette, R. Ovist, T. Papay, S. Phelan, D. CS Richard, D. Rogers, E. Royce, M. Ruiz, M. Sardy, J. Schmalstig, B. Sherry, E. Smaw, P. Stephenson, D. Stoub, K. Sutherland, L. Tavernier-Almada, K. Taylor, L. Tillman, R. Vitray, D. Wellman, G. Williams, J. Yellen, W. Zhang, E. Zivot

Others Attending:

S. Agee, S. Carrier, S. Fischer

12:40 p.m.: meeting called to order by T. Cook

11/8/6 minutes: approved

Announcements:

I. Mickey Meyer (service learning): There are 20 RCC service learning faculty, and 65 students and faculty going to New Orleans. Life Legacy Grant of \$16,000 has been secured by Rachel Newcomb and Marvin Newman, who will be working with community partners to address loneliness in the senior population.

II. Lewis Duncan (Cornell Distinguished Faculty Award recipients): 1) Bill Boles: recognized for service to Rollins' first-year experience, including living/learning communities; as an innovative teacher; and as a scholar of 1990s British drama. 2) Lisa Tillmann: recognized for new major program in Critical Media and Cultural Studies, for service as Vice President/Secretary of the faculty, and for her interdisciplinary scholarship and filmmaking. 3) Mike Gunter: recognized as a Fulbright recipient and as an author whose work has received international acclaim.

III. Lewis Duncan (new position: V.P. of marketing): Greg Marshall appointed to two-year term

IV. John Houston (IRB): asked faculty to visit website: www.rollins.edu/IRB and offer feedback

Old Business:

I. Tom Cook (hiring into programs as well as departments): requested that issue be tabled indefinitely. Approved.

New Business:

I. Wendy Brandon/PSC (deadline for Critchfield, Ashforth, Individual and Course Development Grants): Wed. Jan. 25

II. Wendy Brandon/PSC (Course/Instructor Evaluation): motion to approve CIE form and adopt Scantron system.

PSC's concerns: 1) value of data, 2) decline in quality/quantity of narrative responses, 3) student (mis)understanding of question #4: did you experience or observe any discrimination or breach of professional ethics by the instructor? 4) nonstandard conditions under which students complete evaluations. PSC sought more information on reliability and validity and considered best means of using CIE in tenure review.

P. Harris: purposes of CIE: 1) quality improvement, 2) evaluation, 3) identification of school-wide trends. Questions regarding quantitative data: 1) how low is too low? 2) how often is too often to receive low scores? PSC stresses that individually and institutionally, we must focus on patterns. We need to train individual faculty, departments, and FEC how to use results appropriately.

D. Davison: Issues PSC task force addressed: 1) response rate: fall 2005: 68%. Response rate under old system: 87%. Faculty used variety of techniques (e.g., encouragements, rewards, punishments). IT sent out daily automated reminder to students to fill out evaluations. Students were told they would not receive final grades for two weeks if they did not fill out evaluations. Response rate for fall 2006: 90%. 2) lack of standard setting for completing evaluations. 3) concerns over quality of narrative data. Options: 1) in-class Scantron administration. Disadvantages: giving up class time, handwriting may make students identifiable. Advantages: nearly uniform protocol, high response rate. 2) On-line CIE with incentives and/or punishments.

P. Stephenson: Scantron is helpful in spotting outlier responses.

H. Edge: advantages of current system: 1) convenience, 2) don't lose class time, 3) anonymity, 4) lower cost, 5) response rate is now higher than in-class system. Change has been made: faculty can now see individual responses to help identify outliers.

S. Carnahan: Is PSC convinced of validity for purposes of tenure/promotion? P. Harris: Quality of information is far superior. W. Brandon: newer CIE offers numerical data that faculty can use to track their own progress on specific indicators and to make comparisons to college-wide data.

R. Casey: motion to divide questions of CIE form and proposed Scantron implementation. Approved.

B. Levis: Concerned about quality/quantity of narrative data with newer CIE. M. Sardy: on old form, students also had option of writing very few narrative comments. S. Phalen: it's the faculty member's responsibility to encourage students to offer quality narrative data.

D. Wellman: old form consisted of four questions: did this course contribute to your intellectual growth? was the instructor a good teacher? was this a good course? what was your level of motivation and participation?

Question called. Approved. CIE officially adopted.

Motion to change to Scantron administration.

Arguments against current on-line administration: H. Kypraios: student fatigue in doing all evaluations at once. In-class CIE highlights importance of process. D. Rogers: lack of care and time spent on on-line evaluations.

Argument for on-line administration: J. Small: faculty can skew data by how they approach evaluations in class.

R. Musgrave: faculty could utilize on-line system during class time. L. Lloyd: this would be practical for nearly every class on campus.

Question called. Approved. Motion to adopt Scantron administration denied.

Motion to retain on-line administration. Seconded. Question called. Approved. On-line administration approved.

Meeting adjourned at 2:18 p.m.

Decisions:

1. "New" CIE form officially adopted.
2. On-line administration officially approved.