

2-15-2007

## Minutes, Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee Meeting, Thursday, February 15, 2007

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, February 15, 2007" (2007). *Professional Standards Committee Minutes*. Paper 93.  
[http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as\\_ps/93](http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ps/93)

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 Standards Committee  
Approved Minutes from February 15, 2007  
12:30 pm CSS 249

Next Meeting: 12:30-1:30 p.m., either Feb. 27 –or- Mar. 8, 2007 TBD (CSS 249).

Introduction/Preliminaries

The meeting was convened at 12:30 pm in CSS 249 by the chair, Wendy Brandon. Faculty members present were: Don Griffin, Mario D’Amato, Ron Larned, Alicia Homrich, and Paul Stephenson.

**1. Agenda Items**

A. Old Business

- Approval of 1/18/07 minutes
- Posting good examples of Critchfield Grants and IDG applications
- Revisions to the Grant application forms

B. New Business

- Finalize CIE initiatives for spring instructor evaluations and tenure reviews
- Input on lecturer positions
- Schedule PSC consideration of travel policy

**2. Old Business**

**I. Approval of minutes (1/18/07):** The minutes taken by Alicia Homrich were reviewed and approved.

**II. Posting good examples of Critchfield Grants and IDG applications:** The PSC deliberated on which of the recent Critchfield and Individual Development Grants were of particularly high quality and selected samples, inclusive to as many disciplines as possible, to be posted on the Dean of Faculty Website. The proposals of Katie Patterson-Sutherland, Rachel Newcomb, Dorothy Mays, and Dana Hargrove were selected.

**III. Revisions to the Grant Proposal Forms:** Based on its recent work on grant reviews the PSC determined that Grant application form needed to include a clearly stated per diem limit, with restrictions (lodging, food, etc.), in front of the budget section of the document.

It was also decided that since the PSC was observing an increase in high quality proposals there will be a need for increased funding of Critchfields and Individual Development grants in the future. It was decided that such an increase be proposed to President Duncan.

The PSC decided that it would be helpful for future committees if a Rubric be established for evaluating grant proposals and that this be adhered to in order to maintain uniform standards for grant approvals. In addition, the PSC decided that it should become standard practice to prioritize a list for the Dean of faculty of grant proposals that were not funded (or under funded) and to allow funding of these if money were to become available during that funding period. Of course, funding would still be limited to only those proposals of high quality.

The PSC decided that the FYRST grant proposal form needs to be re-written.

The Tech Grant form has been revised by Wendy Brandon and Les Lloyd. Tech grant are due March 30 and April 1. They will be reviewed by PSC and Les Lloyd will be invited to participate in that meeting.

**3. New Business**

**I. Finalize CIE initiatives for spring instructor evaluations and tenure reviews:** The PSC reviewed Paul Harris’ reply regarding the CIE. Action on some of Paul Harris’ recommendations had already been initiated by Assistant Dean of Faculty Deb Wellman but the committee determined that it would be better to wait for full PSC approval before instituting any policy changes. The committee began a discussion of the proposed CIE initiatives...

D. Griffin asked who would be norming the CIE results?

W. Brandon replied that Sharon Carrier had informed her that someone would need to be hired by the college.

D. Griffin objected to hiring an outside individual to perform the norming. He stated that the norming should be done in-house, potentially by I.T. A simple program could be written for norming the CIE results each semester.

W. Brandon proposed creating a list of issues for the CIE.

1. Increasing students' narrative responses is important. One way would be to force students to add narrative comments but this was not viewed as a productive solution by the PSC as students will resent such constraints and likely offer comments that are off topic or inappropriate when forced to answer.

W. Brandon suggested that one way to boost student narrative comments would be to have classes complete the CIE a group in a computer lab

M. D'Amato responded that another way to increase narrative responses was to maintain uniformity of environment. If they complete the CIE in the same setting as they complete their homework or writing assignments then that helps to maintain a uniform environment and may increase narrative responses.

D. Griffin suggested that faculty coming up for evaluation need to specifically stress to their students the need for written responses.

A. Homrich suggested that a three point statement be distributed to all faculty when the CIE first becomes active each semester. The statement should be read by the instructor to his/her class. The statement should have the following points.

1. Students should complete the CIE in the same environment as when they are doing their class work.
2. Emphasize to the students that faculty find the narrative comments to be the most important and effective in critiquing their teaching.
3. The CIE provides the students the opportunity to improve the quality of learning and teaching at Rollins College.

W. Brandon asked Mario to write a draft of the 3 point statement.

W. Brandon noted that once the form is complete it should be presented to the faculty.

M. D'Amato noted that when presented to the faculty, it should be emphasized that this form be used as the basis for a brief discussion in their classrooms on the importance of the narrative comments.

D. Griffin noted that as part of the norming process the Dean's office should contact I.T. and ask that they establish a norming scheme that tracks the amount of narrative comments each year.

AT this point W. Brandon asked to review the list of points that should be addressed as possible changes to the CIE form.

1. Inclusion of the 3 point statement (see above)
2. The question which asks about cheating should be moved to the end of the CIE.
3. Wording of question # \_\_\_\_? Which includes the phrase "critical thinking" should be changed. This was a request from S. Phelan. to change the phrasing to "creative thinking" or something reflecting that.

D. Griffin noted that a wording change such as that on the CIE would have to be brought to the faculty.

M. D'Amato suggested that S. Phelan give the PSC an example of exactly what wording he would like to see for that question.

## **2. Addressing the Format for the Normed CIE report.**

The PSC recommended that a one page summary be distributed to each faculty member and to the Dean of faculty.

D. Griffin suggested that H.Edge and Paul Harris meet and come up with a summary form, develop it, and once I.T. comes up with something that will work (a norming program) then PSC will meet with them to see if it will work.

A. Homrich added that she liked P. Harris' idea of allowing faculty to type comments on the CIE which allows them to be stored with report. This enables faculty to type a response to the CIE results which can be helpful when they come up for review.

D. Griffin noted that I.T. will need to design such a capability into the CIE

W. Brandon commented that she will ask Les Lloyd to create a schedule that shows when computer labs are available so that faculty can bring their classes to complete the CIE. Such a schedule would be distributed to faculty at the point in time each semester when the CIE becomes active.

W. Brandon asked the PSC who informs the FEC that quantitative data is now to be included with the narrative information for the CIE?

D. Griffin replied that the chair of PSC (W. Brandon) should contact the Dean's office and the Chair of FEC to notify them that this is now the policy.

W. Brandon added that at the next Dept. Chairs meeting she would make sure that it is announced to Departments that they will receive a CIE summary and it will be normed every semester.

## **II. Input on lecturer positions:**

The PSC listened to a presentation by M. D'Amato regarding his research into the situation of lecturers at Rollins and AAUP guidelines. M. D'Amato used the Dean of Faculty's website to compile a list of active faculty and highlighted all those who were full time lecturers. Overall the college has 14.56% of its faculty as full time lecturers which is within AAUP guidelines. However some Departments are higher than AAUP guidelines allow (notably Modern Languages and International Business).

D. Griffin noted that if the college were to strictly follow AAUP guidelines, there would be Departments that would either have to fire people or give them a tenure track line in order to be in compliance. He noted that if this was to be implemented it would impact the college broadly because if you require the implementation of tenure lines in those departments where lecturers are exceeding AAUP limits then there will be fewer tenure track lines that could be opened in other departments on campus. This also impacts salary for everyone else on campus.

The PSC decided that this is such a broad issue that the new incoming Dean should address it next year at the earliest time point possible and that no immediate action should be taken regarding the status of lecturers other than to allow them to continue as they are currently doing.

At this point time was running short and two alternate dates were proposed for the next PSC meeting. Either Feb. 27 or March 8.

As a last IRB order of business it was recommended that the IRB board report directly to the Executive Committee.

Review of Travel Policy was placed at the top of the agenda for the next meeting.

## **4. Adjourn** The meeting was adjourned (1:45 p.m.)

Respectfully submitted,  
Paul Stephenson, Recording Secretary