

11-30-2010

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee Meeting, Tuesday, November 30, 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 30, 2010" (2010). *Professional Standards Committee Minutes*. Paper 62.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ps/62

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 30, 2010

Attendance:

- Members: David Charles, Richard James, Emily Russell, Joshua Almond, Marc Fetscherin, Carlee Hoffman, Jill Jones, Hoyt Edge, Paul Harris, Susan Libby, and James Zimmerman.
- Dean of Faculty Representative: Interim Dean Deb Wellman

Meeting Convened: 7:30am

Announcements:

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

Old Business:

- Report from Subcommittee on Teaching Evaluation.
 - Summative Evaluation
 - Jill - Decided against rubrics. The entire subcommittee all agree with the material presented in their summation. Concerning summative evaluation, we felt informed peer review would be most beneficial. Thought there needed to be faculty trained on peer review and that anyone sitting in on classes to do this should observe at least two classes.
 - Emily - James based on your workload, how feasible is it for you to take on such a significant amount of training?
 - James - This is aligned to my mission so I feel happy to support it. If it were half the faculty all at once over one semester, it might be a bit much but otherwise, it's okay.
 - Jill - That was the first recommendation we made.
 - Marc - Those two visits per person is two per year? Is it every year or is it every third and sixth year? (Subcommittee indicated 3rd and 6th)
 - Paul - I think as long as departments are meeting the minimum criteria they can do whatever they want. Purpose of this is to get information prior to an evaluation period. Not sure if it would be feasible for every person to have every class visited every year.
 - Hoyt - We have not talked about the formative evaluation but we think that aspect would better capture that consistent behavior.
 - Marc - Is there a vision that we can have in the future
 - Susan - Just to emphasize that these recommendations are in addition to what is already being done.
 - Paul - At least, initially, we're probably looking at a smaller cohort to do the training and doing the evaluation and we think that's going to put a strain on the system. In the teaching evaluations we currently use, we have numbers + comments. If you are using one without the other then you aren't using it properly. The concern we have is that people aren't being trained to use that tool correctly or aren't choosing to use the tool correctly.

- o Formative evaluation
 - Paul - Point of clarification: you can't opt out of summative evaluation.
 - David - Is this identical to what Barbara Carson is doing?
 - James - I can answer that. What Barbara Carson is doing right now is the first stage of that process. Formative is completely confidential. You don't have to share it with FEC. This is your opportunity to get constructive criticism that might look detrimental on the summative side.
 - Jill - What Paul and James impressed upon us is that you can't do formative and summative reviews at the same time, they have different goals and purposes.
 - Dick - It does say peer review (Subcommittee unanimously agrees that it should just say reviewers)
 - Marc - A question about the word evaluation.
 - James - If evaluation is the word you're reacting to, the formative evaluation can only be additive it is entirely separate.
 - Paul - I think Marc's right. Our terminology is problematic. It carries a scary connotation to some.
 - Josh - Why don't we take a cue from our administrators and call the formative evaluation "feedback".
 - Paul - I think one of the primary motivations for this is that currently on campus there's too much emphasis on summative and not enough on formative. The result is that we're less a culture about improving good teaching and more about assessing that teaching. The current system discourages experimentation because there may be deficits between evaluations and comments.
 - Jill - Under summative evaluations of teaching we talked about the mission. I wonder if this should be move higher up.
 - Both subcommittee and PSC agreed that there seems to be disconnect between what the institution values (ie: mission) and what it considers for merit.
 - Paul - We have 5 or 6 years of CIE data there are a lot of questions that we might have about class sizes, gender and other aspects that no one is looking at. I think that's pretty important and i think it connects to all sorts of problems that we've been having including retention. We have multiple problems.
 - Dick - I think that is multiple problems when you get into these kinds of checklists. Have you guys thought about ways of evaluating administrators?

Meeting Adjourned: 8:30am