

4-1-2010

## Minutes, Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee Meeting, Thursday, April 1, 2010

Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee

Follow this and additional works at: [http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as\\_ps](http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ps)

---

### Recommended Citation

Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee, "Minutes, Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee Meeting, Thursday, April 1, 2010" (2010). *Professional Standards Committee Minutes*. Paper 69.  
[http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as\\_ps/69](http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ps/69)

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](mailto:wzhang@rollins.edu).

Professional Standard Committee—Minutes  
April 1, 2010, 4:00 – 5:00 p.m.  
Bush 105

The meeting was convened at 4pm by Thomas Moore. Faculty members present were Marc Fetscherin, Emily Russell, Claire Strom and Anca Voicu. Dean Laurie Joyner and Billy Kennedy were also present.

- 1) Announcements: Congratulations to student Justin Wright who was awarded a Goldwater Scholarship.
- 2) Old Business
  - a. Consideration of request for not administering a CIE: C. Strom expressed concern that as we move to emphasize standardization of CIEs across the school, especially in graduate course, do we want to exempt an A&S course? L. Joyner responded that yes, CIEs are important, but this is an exceptional course and the traditional CIE is not appropriate. She also approved the precedent set in this case where the faculty member suggests an alternative instrument for evaluation, an option that we have suggested should be made available to graduate programs as well.
  - b. Feedback to administrators: L. Joyner is meeting with L. Duncan to clarify the relationship between feedback and administrative evaluation and will report back on this question. T. Moore offered that PSC was asked to offer input on the provost's evaluation, but not other administrative offices. We amended the draft document to reflect our expectation that the administrator will respond to the faculty, but the mode of that response is left to his or her discretion. T. Moore will review the draft and follow up with the deans, provost, and president. Our goal is to have the current document approved by the EC and ready for next year's PSC to formulate questions and implement the plan.
  - c. Blended learning grants: We will review the current proposals at an upcoming meeting. L. Joyner notes that the current proposals, reflecting a limited Request for Proposals, have little substantive data for our review. PSC has been concerned about legal questions of ownership over course content; the issue was raised with AAC, but they did not take it up. If PSC is concerned about this question, it should be entered under new business.
  - d. FEC bylaw changes (see attached): T. Moore notes that some of the requested changes are not bylaw changes and we reviewed the document to identify the best approach to each section. Section 3, requiring electronic submission of materials is an administrative policy, not a bylaw and can be approved without faculty vote. Changes regarding dates of submission and number of members of FEC are definitely bylaw concerns (see Section 6). Policy regarding submission of departmental tenure criteria is not currently covered in the bylaws (Section 2), but should be considered given that the bylaws represent our strongest chance to institutionalize this practice. The final request (Section 6) specifies that meetings of the FEC must be confidential, because all meetings involve personnel discussions even when candidates are not present; this policy will override the open access policy voted on by the faculty last fall. J. Almond clarified that FEC

meetings are currently closed and minutes are not recorded? T. Moore responded that meetings involving personnel discussions are confidential by law. L. Joyner will follow up with the college's lawyer regarding the implications of these policies.

- e. CIE issues and update on graduate classes (Almond/Russell)
- f. Evaluation of teaching (subcommittee reports)
- g. Changes to grant administration: During our spring review of grant proposals, we found several areas that could use revision. C. Strom and E. Russell described the value in offering feedback to candidates regarding their proposals, especially in cases where an expenditure was excluded as against the policy. We discussed the current wide-spread expectation of 100% funding and noted that this approach to grants is both inconsistent with other extramural grant procedures and with strong competition for limited resources here at Rollins. Many noted that other competitive grants do not offer reasons for lack of funding. J. Almond argued that offering rationale for denied funding opens grounds for appeal. He cited employment decisions and other funding bodies that do not follow that practice; he continued, if we believe that decisions are made on a rational basis by a qualified group of peer reviewers (like the PSC), appeals shouldn't be required. M. Fetscherin offered the perspective that we are a learning institution and supported the proposal to offer feedback. L. Joyner placed the discussion in the context of a larger problem of contested values at Rollins where individuals disagree on the value placed on certain criteria—in particular, what is the role of peer reviewed scholarship at our institution? We do not all agree. C. Strom argued in favor of feedback, noting that we cut people's money for specific reasons without offering rationale; that information would be valuable to applicants. We should give opportunity to learn and grow. M. Fetscherin brought up concerns of administrative load. J. Almond said that many on campus feel that "I applied, I should get"; this position falls back on the notion that previous committees did not hold the criteria to the firm standard that this group has. L. Joyner argued that we need to be consistent and not have a shifting bar as the committee rotates, noting that the role of administration can be to hold that line. E. Russell noted that other concerns reflected in that meeting were: 1) proposals for course development grants involving domestic travel slip through the cracks; 2) we might tie per diem to State Department or submit receipts for expenses (like other funding for conferences, etc); 3) question of repeat applicants, are external grants available and applied for—should applicants submit results? The committee needs to have a method of reviewing outcomes of past grants; 4) budgets need to be detailed and comprehensive, proposals can exceed \$5000, but only max \$5000 will be funded. E. Russell and C. Strom will write up a draft memo of recommendations to the dean's office for our review.

T. Moore adjourned the meeting at 5pm.  
Respectfully submitted by Emily Russell.  
Attachment (1)

FACULTY EVALUATION COMMITTEE PROPOSED BY LAW CHANGES: DRAFT  
10/09

All of the following additions should be inserted in the last sentence in the respective numbered section (identified below) of ARTICLE VIII if the By Laws of the College of Arts and Sciences.

Section 3: Notwithstanding any provision contained in these by laws to the contrary, all written statements, reports, and documents submitted to the Dean of the Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) by the Candidate Evaluation Committee (CEC) and by candidates for tenure, promotion or in the case of mid course reviews must be submitted electronically or by compact disc. All reports, letter and responses by candidates to the Dean of the Faculty, the FEC and/or the CEC must be submitted electronically by email or compact disc. This provision must become effective on January, 1 2010.

Section 6: Normally, mid course reviews are scheduled in the Spring term. All materials designated for review for the purpose of mid course evaluations must be submitted to the Dean of the Faculty and to the FEC on or before December 20 of the year immediately preceding that term or at such other time as shall be designated by the CEC and the FEC in cases where the mid course review, because of special circumstances, shall be held at an earlier time. The CEC letter must be submitted before December 20. FEC must submit its recommendations to the Dean of the Faculty, the CEC, and the candidate by May 1.

Section 6: In those academic years when the number of proposed candidates for promotion, tenure, or mid-term review exceeds a total of seventeen, the Executive Committee of the Faculty of the Colleges of Arts and Sciences will appoint an additional member of the faculty to serve on FEC for that academic year; in those academic years when the number of candidates exceeds eighteen, the Executive Committee will appoint a total of two additional faculty members to serve on the FEC for that academic year. Those appointed under this section must be full professors and tenured members of the College of Arts and Sciences. They shall enjoy the same privileges of other FEC members with whom they shall serve. All appointments hereunder shall be subject to ratification by the faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences.

Section 2: The respective Chairs of all of the departments of the College of Arts and Sciences have executed a document dated August, 2009 in which they have acknowledged the next immediate academic year in which their respective department is required to review and submit its Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to the Dean of the Faculty and the FEC. The dates provided in that document must govern. Thereafter the department Chairs of each respective department of the College of Arts and Sciences must review and submit its criteria for Tenure and Promotion every five years, or prior to that time at the discretion of the departments. All criteria must be submitted to the Dean of the Faculty and the Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) electronically by email or compact disc.

Section 6: Meetings of the Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) must be confidential, regardless of subject matter under consideration, and may be attended only by the duly appointed members of the FEC. Provided, however, candidates for tenure, promotion, and mid course reviews shall attend meetings in which said candidates are scheduled for FEC interviews or at such other times at the request of the candidate or FEC. Other persons, may at the invitation of the FEC and who are otherwise permitted to be consulted by the FEC in these by laws, may

attend meetings of the FEC to which they are invited, including, but not limited to the Chair of the Candidate Evaluation Committee (CEC), administrators of the college and outside consultants. This by law supersedes all other by laws or faculty handbook rules which may be contrary.