

10-22-2009

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee Meeting, Thursday, October 22, 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, October 22, 2009" (2009). *Professional Standards Committee Minutes*. Paper 75.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ps/75

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.

22. October 2009

PSC Meeting Minutes

4:00 p.m. in Bush 257

Attendance:

Meeting called to order at 4:00 p.m. Josh Almond (JA), Eric Blosssey (EB), Marc Fetscherin (MF), Laurie Joyner (LJ) Thomas Moore (TM), Anca Voincu (AV).

Peer Review of Faculty

LJ: How to follow up with peer review? EB will look and prepare a 1 page summary. How to evaluate scholarship also? What makes a good faculty member? EB will draft a proposal. AV suggests to put that into tenure and promotion evaluation.

Feedback to Administrators

TM hands out a second draft of policy for feedback to administrators (attached). The following questions were discussed: What is the ideal period to evaluate, one or two years? Who do we do this for? Who should evaluate the Dean of Crummer and Holt? Are all eligible? LJ if academics and A&S is at the center of Rollins College, it should be applicable to all Deans at A&S at least. Faculty should be given the possibility to give feedback even if they do not use it. Is it feedback or review? TM agrees that there should be some mechanism to provide feedback on all A&S administrators. LJ sees this as a leadership accountability measure. Use feedback and make feedback loop to create a culture of excellence. TM addresses two key questions, who to evaluate and when? How many administrators? President? Provost? Dean of Faculty? Dean of Students Affairs? Dean of Admission? Dean of Chapel? As well as Dean of Crummer? Dean of Holt? TM feedback is important but also the response to the feedback. LJ should not all A&S deans be evaluated? MF agrees as well as others, also raise the issue that not all faculty might be equally knowledgeable about each Dean's activities. Some Deans (like Dean of Faculty) have more interaction with faculty than others due to their job description but also their personality. TM how many questions should be asked? JA questions about perception is important. TM suggest that all three A&S Deans as well as the 2 senior administrators should be evaluated. Holt and Crummer are special cases. TM emphasizes the timing issue, when and how often? MF why not at the end of the academic year? LS see this feedback as possibility to response and outline the success and challenges. TM quantitative vs qualitative questions? MF why not both, but not too many questions, maybe 3 qualitative and 2-3 quantitative questions. EB supports this. AV shares her experience with students, they often do not understand the evaluation and prefers qualitative questions more. TM job description is the base for

evaluation, give feedback in some form and over summer administrators can draft a response. AV suggests feedback every year, but response to feedback every two years. MF supports this, but suggests that maybe they might give some kind of response every year also in written and posted on the intranet, but more formal and open feedback (in faculty forum for example) every second year.

Next Steps

1. Get a statement of all senior administrators before the end of Spring Break. Short job description and self assessment (1/2 page). Each senior administrator should also propose a few questions they would like to see in the senior administrator evaluation (this does not mean the PSC has to use them).

Discussion will continue at the next meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Guiding Principles for Faculty Feedback to Senior Administrators

Purpose

To develop a system that provides for a regular and candid flow of information between the faculty and senior administrators concerning each administrator's performance in the aspects of the position that affect the faculty. This system is mainly intended for the purpose of providing to provide constructive suggestions/feedback about that the administrators can reflect upon and respond to, with the ultimate goal of improving the effectiveness of the administration and the relationship between the faculty and the administration. the administrator's performance.

Goals

The goal of the system is to provide a method for administrators to receive feedback directly from the faculty at large, and for the faculty to have some method to inform administrators of the faculty's opinions of their administrative performance on matters directly relating to their interaction with the of importance to the faculty. These matters may include such as: such things as the educational process/ and program;; student life issues directly related to the educational program; as well as employees (mainly faculty) matters/issues pertaining to salaries, promotion and tenure.; and issues concerning the interaction between the administration and the faculty.. This mechanism will also provide an opportunity for the faculty to hold administrators accountable for their decisions as well as , and for administrators to identify concerns relating to their performance and to reflect on and respond to these concerns.

Guiding Assumptions

- 1) The process will be undertaken in a spirit of collegiality, with the intention of assisting in the professional development of the administrator and improving communication between the faculty and administration.
- 2) The mechanism will include feedback from the entire faculty.
- 3) If a questionnaire format is used, the questions will be developed in a spirit of cooperation between the faculty and administrators. However, the faculty will have the final responsibility for deciding what questions will be asked.
- 4) A small number of faculty (probably the Executive Committee)(maybe an elected faculty body, committee?) will have access to all of the information provided by the faculty at large and will be responsible for summarizing the feedback.
- 5) EachThe administrator will respond to the feedback in writing. Their report will include a statement of actions they will commit to take following the review. This response will be available to all members of the faculty and the faculty will be given the chance to comment on the written response in some way.
- 6) The feedback mechanism will be a periodic event that will not necessarily be linked to the period of evaluation.