

2-18-2010

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee Meeting, Thursday, February 18, 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, Thursday, February 18, 2010" (2010). *Professional Standards Committee Minutes*. Paper 65.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ps/65

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.

Minutes of the Professional Standards Committee

February 18th, 2010

The meeting was convened at 4:05 p.m. in Bush 105 by Thomas Moore.

In attendance were: Erich Blossey, Marc Fetscherin, Claire Strom, Anca Voicu, Josh Almond and Laurie Joyner.

Minutes of February 4 meeting were approved with changes.

Announcements:

The Holt program directors have been invited to talk about CIEs at the next meeting.

The student collaborative scholarship proposals are due March 1. These are a lot easier than the other grants to approve, therefore no special meeting will be scheduled. Consideration of grants will be part of the regular meeting on March 18.

Feedback to senior administrators

Strom met with Dean Hater concerning the proposed feedback to administrators. She saw no problems with any of the policies. Strom has a meeting scheduled with the provost before the next meeting. Blossey met with President Duncan and reports that he does not seem to be open to the proposal. Duncan considers this to be an evaluation, not feedback. He noted his concern that the faculty does not understand the roles of the vice president at the institutional level and reiterated that the trustees are the ones who evaluate senior administrators. He wants some knowledge base developed for the faculty to explain the roles of the vice presidents and the president, considering the substantial “outside” responsibilities.

A discussion continued noting that the intention of the feedback is not to necessarily provide holistic feedback, but feedback that is to be used as a positive tool to open dialog between the faculty and administration. This should be seen as more of a ‘voice’ of the faculty. It was decided that the issue will be sent back to the EC after Blossey and Strom have met with the remaining two administrators.

Joiner asked for guidance from the committee on her input into the process. It was agreed that she should respond based on her principles and on her actual experiences. Insight on both aspects will benefit of the committee.

The discussion ended with several comments, including: the possibility of letting the administrator decide whether to share the responses with a faculty committee; the feedback is really about perceptions on what the faculty thinks, not an evaluation of the overall job performance; a question about whether Duncan is trying to indicate that there is not a strong sense of confidence that faculty are aware of the strategic pursuits of the college; administrators

should respond to feedback even if they do not disclose specific details; the overall perception of the administrators by the faculty is very important.

Evaluation of Teaching

It was pointed out that thus far there has been no discussion of blended learning.

The role of teaching in evaluating librarians was discussed. The librarians are faculty members, therefore one-third of their evaluation is actually based on teaching. However, as a rule they do not teach (there are occasional exceptions). Jonathan Miller noted in private conversation with Moore that there is confusion among the library faculty regarding the evaluation of teaching. A discussion of the role of librarians as teachers ensued. Strom volunteered to do some research on the subject and report back to the committee.

The current state of the discussion on evaluation of teaching was then summarized. The committee has agreed that there should be some method of student assessment, peer assessment, and self assessment. We have not agreed upon objective standards.

Blossey noted that he would welcome help with working on this. He opined that we first need to clearly establish the standards aspect of the proposal with clear definitions. Without those, none of this will work.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.