

4-15-2010

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee Meeting, Thursday, April 15, 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, April 15, 2010" (2010). *Professional Standards Committee Minutes*. Paper 70.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ps/70

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 Standard Committee—Draft Minutes
April 15, 2010, 4:00 – 5:00 p.m. in Bush 105

The meeting was convened at 4pm by Thomas Moore. Faculty members present were Erich Blosssey, Emily Russell, Claire Strom and Anca Voicu. Assoc. Dean Don Davison and Billy Kennedy were also present.

- 1) Announcements: E. Russell and A. Voicu are rotating off the committee and elections for new members will be held at the full faculty meeting on April 28. The associate dean's office, along with the PSC, is hosting faculty conversations on the role of research at the college. I. Alon has requested these discussions among the faculty as part of the larger stated goal of moving the college from "good to great." The first conversation is Monday, April 17 at 12:30.

We will hold our final meeting of the year on Wednesday, April 28 at 3pm. New PSC members will be invited to that meeting.

2) Old Business

- a. Blended learning grants: C. Strom asked for EC to craft a statement on the ownership of blended learning courses, and recommended that ownership should stay with the faculty member who develops the course. We approved the two proposed blended learning grants, but noted that the call for proposals left us little to go on in making the decision.
- b. Feedback to administrators: The president, provost, and deans have all expressed approval of the proposal as it stands and the EC will take up the issue next week. L. Duncan asked that the phrase "at some point all administrators will be included" be changed to "all appropriate administrators." We agreed to make this change.
- c. FEC bylaw changes: We continued our discussion of the bylaw changes requested by the FEC (see attached). Regarding the request for occasional additional FEC members, the goal of the new proposal is to distribute the workload among the faculty liaisons in observing classes and writing letters. The proposal is currently written, "EC will appoint an additional member"; we recommend changing it so that the EC will include an extra member to the slate of candidates approved by the faculty if necessary. C. Strom and T. Moore expressed reservation about the practice of EC simply appointing members. We agreed that the timing of candidates announcing their intent to be reviewed could (and likely already does) precede the EC putting together the slate for faculty approval. We believe there are currently six members of the FEC, although there may be five with an alternate—the current bylaws might not be accurately reflected online. C. Strom suggested that we might set a minimum of five cases per FEC member and allow EC to add other members when anticipating an additional workload. D. Davison expressed concern that if we leave it to the discretion of the EC, there might be a lack of cohesion from year to year in their assessment of the committee's need for additional staff. He then suggested a guideline where, for every x number of cases, there needs to be y individuals on the FEC, but no less than five. T. Moore

added that since FEC members serve a three year term, the additional candidate on the slate needs to be designated as an annual member. C. Strom asked, what would be a reasonable number of cases? We agreed that one person for every three cases seemed appropriate, with the caveat that there can never be less than 5 members of the committee. D. Davison will review the current bylaws and we will adjust the language accordingly.

We then discussed the proposal to include the FEC review of departmental criteria for tenure and promotion to the bylaws. C. Strom asks, if our concern is compliance with an existing policy, can we expect a difference in adherence between the bylaws and the handbook? D. Davison answered, the current policy is that departments cannot get a new faculty line until their policies have been reviewed, but argued that the bylaws are a stronger statement given the need for discussion and consent of 2/3 of the faculty. T. Moore will follow up with M. Newman to update language and we will vote at future meeting.

Following consultation with the college's lawyer, the final proposal asserting the confidentiality of FEC meetings was approved.

- d. Changes to the grant process (Russell): We discussed revisions to a memo outlining PSC recommendations to the dean's office (see attached). T. Moore suggested adding: "If you have received an internal grant for three years, you need to demonstrate that you have applied for an external grant of equal value." C. Strom asked, are these grants available in every discipline? And noted that in history they aren't available. E. Russell added that grants available in the humanities tend toward longer research projects that would likely include a residential component and the expectation of course release; what is Rollins' position on these kinds of grants? If they fall outside of expected leaves, would Rollins support such a leave? E. Blossey suggested a change to wording, "strongly encourage application to external grants." C. Strom suggested that one way of addressing this issue would be to have future grants linked more strongly to past accomplishments and proposed final product. We discussed the uneven nature of requests for funding across departments and noted, for example, that while faculty artists are heavily funded, they are also very productive. E. Russell asked, is it possible for there to be a discretionary pool specific to the art department that would divert their funding requests away from the common pool where they are disproportionally represented? E. Blossey observed that while some departments have materials budgets, these funds are specified for work with students. D. Davison noted that our conversation is part of a larger goal to move cultural expectation and mindset, shifting to greater emphasis on peer-reviewed publication. We agreed to return to the memo at the next meeting.

The meeting was adjourned by T. Moore at 5pm.
Respectfully submitted by Emily Russell.

Attachments (2)

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.

Memorandum

To: Dean Laurie Joyner

CC: Joshua Almond, Erich Blosssey, Marc Fetscherin, Billy Kennedy, Karla Knight, Thom Moore, Emily Russell, Claire Strom, Anca Voicu

From: Professional Standards Committee

Date: April 5, 2010

During our review of the professional development grants (including Critchfield and Ashforth Research, Individual Development, Course Development, and Cornell Research Grants), the committee noted several elements of the program guidelines and administration that might be usefully revised. Below, please find a list of our concerns with suggestions for possible improvements.

- 1) The grant proposal form only asks applicants to list dates of previous awards. We suggest that this section be revised to include the phrase: "Please briefly describe the outcome of previously funded projects." In assessing current proposals, particularly from perennial applicants, it would be helpful to know what had been achieved from previous funding.
- 2) In reviewing proposed budgets, we often got the sense that figures were reverse engineered to match a specific total amount. Given that the committee often chooses to cut individual items in a budget—in order to spread funding across several worthy proposals or because the requested expenditure is not allowed—it would be very useful to have an accurate accounting of total expected expenses and other sources of revenue. The current instructions ask: "Please review Permitted Expenditures section and provide as much detail as possible. Be specific about what costs will be incurred for travel, telephone, staff support, photocopying, etc. This budget will be for one year only." We suggest the addition of the following sentence: "Your proposed budget should reflect your actual anticipated permitted expenditures for the project, even if this figure exceeds the allowed maximum of \$5000. Please also reflect other sources of revenue." Similarly, in the initial paragraph of section E under "Eligibility," we suggest adding the following lines: "In order to successfully allocate partial funding, the committee must have a complete picture of the total expected budget. Please give a detailed accounting of allowed expenditures, even if this projected total exceeds the funding maximum."
- 3) We found that the decade-old per diem of \$100 rarely matched the expected costs of travel. We suggest that applicants provide a good faith estimate of their actual proposed expenses (those uncertain of costs in their proposed locale could be directed to consult the US Department of State's annual suggested per diem rates). Then, since reimbursement will not exceed the initial amount awarded for the grant, awardees should submit receipts following the same process used for all other faculty travel.
- 4) In the current distribution of funding pools, proposals for course development grants involving domestic travel slip through the cracks. Current per diem limits on lodging and transportation may limit faculty members' ability to match these scouting trips to the expected itinerary to be taken with students. Proposals 2 and 3 above would also successfully address this problem.
- 5) It would be helpful if projects that are cut or not funded at all receive some explanation so that faculty members can be more successful in subsequent years.

Comment [ER1]: Added 4/15

Comment [ER2]: Added 4/15

Deleted: Offering feedback?

- 6) We finally suggest that a cover e-mail be included with the call for next year's proposals detailing any of the accepted above changes and reminding faculty of the competitive nature of these grants. While we believe we have been enforcing both the rule and spirit of these programs in our decisions this year, we also recognize that our awards may have strayed from the past culture of funding at Rollins. We want to be mindful of the growing pains that can result from apparent deviations from institutional practice, even where those decisions are in line with written policies.
- 7) If you have received an internal grant for three years, you need to demonstrate that you have applied for an external grant of equal value.