

9-10-2009

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee Meeting, Thursday, September 10, 2009

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, September 10, 2009" (2009). *Professional Standards Committee Minutes*. Paper 72.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ps/72

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
Minutes from September 10, 2009
12:30 p.m. Bush 105

Next Meeting: Thursday, September 24, in Bush 105

The meeting was convened at 12:30 p.m. in Bush 105 by Thomas Moore. Other faculty members present were Erich Blossey, Marc Fetscherin, Emily Russell, and Claire Strom. Dean Laurie Joyner was present as was student member Steven Harkey.

1. Emily Russell was elected PSC secretary until December 2009. The committee will elect a new secretary for the spring semester.
2. We decided to meet every Thursday from 4-5 p.m. in Bush 105, beginning September 24 and continuing until December 3.
3. We voted to approve the new members of the Cornell Selection Committee: Dick James, Ken Taylor, and Rachel Newcomb.
4. Old Business
 - a. Evaluation of administrators: we discussed how we might move forward after the suspended process of the previous spring. T. Moore discussed the possibility of changing our language to "Faculty Feedback" in conversations with administrators and faculty. E. Russell, continuing from PSC last year, agreed that "feedback" was well within the spirit of the proposals from the previous year. She also emphasized that AAUP guidelines and the intent of the previous committee was to ensure that faculty could have a clear sense of the process and the assurance that follow-up on their feedback would take place (even though the actual results of the feedback must have very limited distribution). Please review 2009 PSC recommendations for Faculty Feedback of Administrators (attached). T. Moore will continue the discussion with R. Foglesong (President of the Faculty), R. Casey, and L. Duncan.
 - b. CIE
 - i. P. Harris has completed the tutorial on CIEs and PSC will serve in the beta testing group. Harris has requested that testers comment on printouts of the tutorial and return to Paul Harris (Box 2760) by October 30.
 - ii. Following a PSC recommendation that both FEC and CECs receive access to CIEs online (see Minutes 11.11.08), there appears to be a gap between this recommendation and current practice. IT has not been able to provide online access to CECs and the electronic copies of CIEs circulated to FEC lack numerical data. We agreed that "access to evaluations" includes both quantitative and qualitative data. E. Russell wondered about current candidates under review and agreed to follow up on the issue of online access.
 - iii. At the end of Spring 2009, PSC identified the need for changes to CIEs to address areas of faculty concern. The most pressing issues seemed to be 1) the need for evaluations for field study courses, 2) adapting questions as appropriate for lab and studio courses, 3) individual instructor evaluations for team taught courses, and 4) the timing of the administration of intersession and field study evaluations. In addition to

PSC members, Paul Harris, Katie Sanchez (IT), and Toni Holbrook are contact people on this issue. M. Fetscherin will take over leadership from E. Russell.

- iv. Questions of use and emphasis of CIEs in evaluation have been moved to a New Business agenda item called “Teaching Evaluation.”

5. New Business

- a. Teaching Evaluation: E. Blossey described a national trend in the diminishing importance of student evaluations in the review of faculty. We began a discussion of different ways Rollins might revisit the question of the “use and emphasis” of CIEs and the frequency of evaluation of tenure-track faculty. Suggestions included a greater emphasis on peer evaluation, on locating CIEs within a rubric of 360 degree review (including evaluation by alumni), and training for students in evaluation. E. Blossey will take leadership within the committee on this issue.
- b. Open Access Journals: Jonathan Miller from Olin Library is interested in PSC feedback on online access for faculty publications. C. Strom described some of the concerns about open access among journal editors. J. Miller will follow up with the committee.
- c. L. Joyner notified the committee of additional faculty development funds available and we discussed possible ways of distributing the money, including travel for conferences for a peer-review paper or presentation and international travel to conferences. M. Fetscherin suggested reserving some money for the following year. We tabled the issue until a later meeting.

6. The meeting was adjourned at 1:30.

Respectfully submitted by Emily Russell

Attachments:

**Professional Standards Committee
Recommendations for Faculty Feedback for Administrators**

Article VII, Section 1 of A&S By Laws: “The Committee advises the President and Vice Presidents on the administrative structure of the College of Arts and Science, including the creation and elimination of administrative positions and the appointment, evaluation, and professional development of administrators.”

I Administrators/Directors to be evaluated on a 3-year rotational basis
(4 one year, 4 the next, 1 year off)

- President *
- Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs *
- Dean of the Faculty *
- Dean of Hamilton Holt School
- Dean of Student Affairs
- Dean of Admissions
- Director of Olin Library
- Director of Cornell Fine Arts Museum

- * to be evaluated Spring 09, remaining administrators/directors to be evaluated Spring 2010, where appropriate.

- Feedback will not be solicited for administrators in interim positions or serving in their first year in the position.

II Availability of feedback results

- Administrators being evaluated
- Executive Committee; rationale: rotating body of faculty elected by whole faculty
- Response by administrator/director to evaluations to be made available to faculty (see IV Timetable/Process, below)

II Instrument: IDEA Center, Kansas State University:

<http://www.theideacenter.org/>

- Rationale
 1. external, neutral surveys
 2. professional survey center
 3. confidentiality of results

- Cost: \$200 per administrator + \$1.50 for each recipient of survey; faculty on continuing contracts are asked to participate.

- Paid for Spring 09 from the Executive Committee budget

IV Timetable/process (this timetable was not followed in Spring 09, but this is what we recommend):

- Order surveys: ASAP
- By March 1: PSC/Exec Comm notifies administrators/directors to be evaluated
- By March 1: PSC emails faculty to tell them to expect surveys and explain process
- March 16-27: surveys available online for anonymous faculty responses
- By March 27: administrators/directors write self-evaluation, to be made available to Exec Comm (adopted from UCF administrator evaluation process)
- By April 13: Results of survey received by administrators/directors and President of Faculty
- Before end of semester: administrators/directors discuss results with Exec Comm
- By September 1: administrators write response to evaluations, comparing with self-evaluation, and make available response on Foxlink to faculty

For a valuable analysis of faculty evaluation of administrators, see Lawrence, S. Poston, Marshall S. Clough, Robert K. Moore, B. Robert Kreiser, "Faculty Evaluation of Administrators," *Academe*, Sept./Oct. 2006, vol. 92, iss. 5: 101-109.