

11-23-2010

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee Meeting, Tuesday, November 23, 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, November 23, 2010" (2010). *Professional Standards Committee Minutes*. Paper 61.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ps/61

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: November 23, 2010

Attendance:

- Members: David Charles, Richard James, Emily Russell, Joshua Almond, Marc Fetscherin, and Carlee Hoffman
- Dean of Faculty Representative: Interim Dean Deb Wellman

Meeting Convened: 7:30am

Announcements:

- Approval of last week's minutes: Minutes approved.
- Emily will have grant revisions next week
- All bylaw revisions are with the EC and we will review them again in the spring
- Appeals committee clarification: Apparently there is a broader appeals committee for the college that trumps the PSC Appeals committee. Deb asks that we put this on our agenda for the spring [clarification of our bylaws to ensure consistency].

Old Business:

- Resolution of outstanding Critchfield grant application.
- Dick met with Pat Schoknecht about running the administrator feedback survey. Issue is if data is provided raw to the administrators, then all those demographics are going to be on each response. There's no way to aggregate it without an analyst being involved. Concern about demographics going on or being distributed universally. Do we keep the demographic information or do we turn this over to HR? Should there be an analyst involved?
 - Deb - I think we should drop it to just male/female and tenure/untentured.
 - David - Is there an issue of confidentiality for the administrators if others look at this?
 - Marc - I think the more you segment, the better you can react. The trade off is the more you segment, the easier it is to figure it out. I say do it once and see how many there are. Let's see if there is a problem first. If the smallest cell size is five, then I don't see that there is a problem.
 - Emily - I think we need to see this as a PR problem and there will be people concerned about this. We need to educate and let people know they can opt out of those questions.
 - Marc - Gender and status are mandatory; length of service and division are optional.
 - Marc talked with the President and Dean of Student Affairs for a long time. The President still needs to come back with his final ok, but he's on board. We added two questions. The only thing we took out was the funding question and replaced it with one on institutional advancements.
- Discussion surrounding feedback from chairs in regards to grant proposals
 - Deb - This is important for a couple of reasons. We have faculty who come in hired for one thing but want to do another. Chair needs to be able to put that into

perspective. I suggest a signoff and checkbox similar to something we use on independent study forms.

- o Emily - The process might be tough
- o Marc - I'm all for slim and efficient processes and this isn't it. I say it's up to the individual faculty to make the case.
- o Josh - Marc's comment about the inefficiency is good point. Something else to consider is structure of the Chairs positions here at Rollins. We just don't have the structure to make this realistically effective. This is a problem.
- o Emily - It's the candidate's responsibility to make the case. Every time we've asked chairs to weigh in, they don't. They're very reluctant. This seems to be an effort on our part to apply a broad solution to a limited problem.
- o Marc - It should be that a proposal is judged based on merit. Either it is good or not. Support it on course development but leave it off the rest.
- o David - This doesn't support faculty exploring additional opportunities.
- o Dick - Is there a way for the Dean to weigh in on proposals? Chairs are not line managers. The Dean is really the authority on line managing. Ideally I think the dept should say.
- o PSC agrees to table.

Meeting Adjourned: 8:30am