

3-4-2010

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee Meeting, Thursday, March 4, 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, March 4, 2010" (2010). *Professional Standards Committee Minutes*. Paper 67.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ps/67

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.

Professional Standards Committee

Draft Minutes – March 4, 2010

4:00 – 5:00pm

Bush 105

Thomas Moore convened the meeting at 4:01pm. Faculty members present were Joshua Almond, Eric Blossey, Marc Fetscherin, and Anca Voicu. Student member Billy Kennedy and Associate Dean Don Davison were also present.

1. Announcements:

- a. Moore updated the committee on the status of the PSC proposal for feedback on administrators, relaying an update from Claire Strom. Strom met with Provost Roger Casey about the proposal and he seemed to express support for the proposed approach. Given the Provost's positive response, she has scheduled a meeting with President Duncan to see if he might reconsider his position. Blossey met with Dean Joyner. She expressed concern over the narrative portions of the feedback but otherwise fully supports the proposed process.
- b. Moore briefed the committee on Faculty/Student Collaborative Scholarship process. He will send the committee members basic information on selection criteria and procedures, as well as copies of the grants themselves. Committee will review the grants and rank them. Members will submit these rankings to Moore by 3/17. We will then decide which grants should/should not be funded and discuss any issues relating to the grants at the regularly scheduled 3/18 PSC meeting.
- c. Given the number of big-ticket items still on our to-do list, Thom suggested the Evaluation of Teaching be broken down into 3 sub-committees. Committee agreed.

2. Old Business

- a. CIE Issues: Almond updated committee on meeting with Katie Sanchez of IT. IT provided brief overview of process and indicated things that would be easy, quick solutions and which might take more time. Talked about their desire to have consistent start/end dates to evaluations. Overall, they are willing to implement changes. It's now up to PSC to figure out what those changes might be. Moore recapped the plan for Graduate Program Directors to provide suggestions for CIE revisions for their respective programs.
- b. Feedback to Administrators: Blossey reiterated need to curb personal remarks in the narrative portions of survey.
- c. Blended Learning: Jim Small, Chair of AAC, has told Moore that they are not ready to move on blended learning, yet. In turn, PSC has indicated that we will not render any decision until AAC gives its blessing so, for the time being, the blended learning proposals will remain tabled. Moore indicated that there are only two proposals pending.
- d. Evaluation of Teaching: Given Moore's aforementioned proposal to divide the workload into three sub-committees, the committee agreed that Strom and Blossey would continue to pursue the peer evaluation component; Fetscherin, Voicu, and Student Rep Kennedy will work on the student assessment element; while Moore and Almond will address self-assessment. Blossey will send Fetscherin and Voicu the information on student assessment he has so far collected. Stressed that we cannot lump people together. Interpretation is important. Fetscherin expressed concern that, given the effort to standardize the assessment process, is it a bad idea to diversify? Blossey pointed out that it is the

usage of the information that is the concern. What do you do with it? Using it to penalize (for things such as merit pay) is wrong. There are additional things, such as the degree of difficulty for a course that we don't take into account. There was some discussion about capturing the relationship between the number of hours of a class and the resulting grades. Davison thought it would be a simple process, with only two vectors: grades and hours. Moore wondered if they maintain a link between R# and evaluation, thus undermining effort to protect anonymity of student. Suggested we should look into that. Moore announced that he will leave the Evaluation of Teaching on old business while the sub-committees continue their work. Committee agreed to present findings/suggestions of sub-committees at the March 25 meeting.

- e. FEC By-Law changes: Marvin Newman submitted a request for changes to the by-laws. All changes are additions. Moore went through each of the proposed changes in turn, giving a brief overview of the new verbage.
 - i. Submissions of materials electronically or by CD: Voicu clarified this is in regards to Tenure and Promotion. Davison revealed history behind the EC's discussion of issue. Related to submission of materials via the web and some of the issues (access, security, timeliness, and reliability) that presented. Tenure and Promotion timeline is tight. CD expedites that process, helping to make it significantly more efficient. Fetscherin inquired as to the feasibility of creating faculty portfolios on a server. Faculty could then just upload research and provide links to evaluations. Moore expressed concern over access. Davison pointed out that the creation of a such server space would be a more ambitious approach. The CD is low tech and more immediate, providing an effective solution that would positively impact the process right away. Fetscherin was concerned about digital process. Digital format is tough as things have to be converted. Specifically CIE's. Moore responded that CIEs aren't the issue. It remains a matter of access. Pointed to English as an example of the concern and potential issues that surround open-access to CIEs. As a counter-point, Davison said that Poli-Sci invites all members of the department to join the CEC and that they do not have a problem sharing teaching evaluations. This is standard process in Poli-Sci and the CIE results inform the teaching evaluation discussion among the members of the CEC. Nonetheless, the committee agreed that access to CIE's was an area worthy of further discussion.
 - ii. Mid-course materials: FEC wants to move mid-course material submission deadline to the Dec. 20 preceeding mid-course tenure review. These materials will need to be submitted to Dean and FEC by the Dec 20 date, with a decision rendered then by May.
 - iii. FEC Committee: FEC requesting to add members if Tenure and Promotion candidates exceed 16. If there are 17 candidates for review, FEC wants to add one additional member; if 18 or more, then FEC would add 2. Davison brought up concerns over continuity. Normal FEC service is 3 years, with (ideally) two members of the committee rotating out every year. These additional appointments would be for one year only.
 - iv. T&P Criteria: FEC wants every department to review their Tenure and Promotion criteria every 5 years. Fetscherin asked that if a new faculty member comes in and then their T&P criteria change, do they get to

choose the old criteria or the new? Moore said they can do either, their choice.

- f. Moore said he would forward on the specific FEC By law changes request so we can look it over more thoroughly and make an official decision on the changes at our next meeting, 3/18.
3. Moore magnanimously adjourned the meeting 45 seconds early.