

4-26-2012

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Faculty Meeting, Thursday, April 26, 2012

Arts & Sciences Faculty
Rollins College

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_fac



Part of the [Educational Administration and Supervision Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Arts & Sciences Faculty, "Minutes, Arts & Sciences Faculty Meeting, Thursday, April 26, 2012" (2012). *College of Arts and Sciences Faculty Minutes*. Paper 13.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_fac/13

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Arts and Sciences Minutes at Rollins Scholarship Online. It has been accepted for inclusion in College of Arts and Sciences Faculty Minutes by an authorized administrator of Rollins Scholarship Online. For more information, please contact wzhang@rollins.edu.

Arts & Sciences Faculty Meeting
Thursday, April 26, 2012
12:30 – 1:50 pm

In attendance: Barry Allen, Joshua Almond, Mark Anderson, Gabriel Barreneche, Gay Biery-Hamilton, Alexander Boguslawski, William Boles, Dexter Boniface, Carol Bresnahan, Jennifer Cavanaugh, David Charles, Martha Cheng, Daniel Chong, Edward Cohen, Gloria Cook, Daniel Crozier, Mario D'Amato, Alice Davidson, Joan Davison, Nancy Decker, Lewis Duncan, Christopher Fuse, Laurel Goj, Ted Gournelos, Yudit Greenberg, Eileen Gregory, Michael Gunter, Dana Hargrove, Paul Harris, Jill Jones, Sarah Ashley Kistler, Stephen Klemann, Philip Kozel, Susan Lackman, R. Barry Lewis, Susan Libby, Lee Lines, Julia Maskivker, Jana Mathews, Dorothy Mays, Ruth Mesavage, Jonathan Miller, Robert Moore, Anne Murdaugh, Rachel Newcomb, Kathryn Norsworthy, Maurice O'Sullivan, Twila Papay, Alberto Prieto-Calixto, Jennifer Queen, Paul Reich, David Richard, Dawn Roe, Edward Royce, Emily Russell, Rachel Simmons, Joseph Siry, Eric Smaw, Cynthia Snyder, Michelle Stecker, Paul Stephenson, Claire Strom, William Svitavsky, Eren Tatari, Zeynep Teymuroglu, Lisa Tillmann, Robert Vander Poppen, Martina Vidovic, Richard Vitray, Anca Voicu, Susan Walsh, Jonathan Walz, Jay Yellen, Wenxian Zhang. Guests: Sharon Carrier, Patrick Powers.

- I. Call to Order. Jill Jones calls the meeting to order at 12:37pm. Jill states that the agenda has changed. President Duncan will be joining us.

- II. Announcements
 - A. Eileen Gregory invites faculty to come view the creative writings on the walls before Bush closes on Monday.

 - B. Yudit Greenberg announces an upcoming lecture on "The Internationalization of Indian Education" by Dr. P. J. Lavakare, sponsored by the Rollins India Center. Jill Jones asks if an India Center indeed exists at Rollins and who created it. Susan Lackman states that the India Center is part of Asian Studies and the China Center. Yudit encouraged A&S faculty who are interested in India to become involved in this initiative.

 - C. Jill Jones reminds the faculty that our final meeting is next Wednesday.

 - D. "President Duncan addresses the faculty. He notes that he wishes to make an announcement of intent, but it is not a formal announcement. He states

that the administration has been working hard to achieve a seamless transition as Laurie Joyner departs from Rollins. The President states that they have already begun this transition and announced that the strategic planning initiative has been moved to the Provost's office. Furthermore, the athletic program will now (again) report to the President as is the tradition at Rollins. The President states that there will be a national search for a Vice President next year. In the meantime, he announces that Steve Neilson has been asked to serve as the interim Vice President for Student Affairs (with title change reflecting the reassignment of strategic planning responsibilities to the Provost), but that he will not stand as a candidate during the national search. Duncan states that the faculty and other important constituencies' expressed concerns were considered before making this decision and that Provost Bresnahan and Dean Bob Smither represented faculty opinion at subsequent discussions. Kathryn Norsworthy asks why the Dean of Student Affairs, Karen Hater, was overlooked for this position. President Duncan responds that the office has more responsibilities than the Dean of Students position. President Duncan states that it is a reasonable question as to whether we need two positions, a Vice President of Student Affairs and a Dean of the Students, and that the clarification of these positions and their respective roles should occur in the Fall. Lisa Tillmann asks which office campus media will report to. Duncan states that he is aware of the need to sort this out, but this has not yet been determined. Jill Jones states that from her perspective the faculty were not consulted in this process. Duncan acknowledges that it is true that there was not an all-college colloquium or a search committee formed; however, he states this is only an interim appointment and that there will be broader consultation with respect to the national search next year. Furthermore, he states that he did consult the minutes of the EC meeting. For example, he was aware of the EC's desire that the candidate be someone of faculty rank and who has certain administrative expertise. Emily Russell asks about the reporting lines of the community engagement office and whether there is a way to bring it back to its prior reporting hierarchy. Duncan states that there are certain offices that might be designated as areas of distinction such as community engagement, internationalization and that this could have further implications for reporting lines."

- III. Approve the Minutes from the last meeting. A motion is made to approve the minutes and seconded. The motion is approved.
- IV. New Business
 - A. The FEC Slate. Jill announces the FEC slate. Socky O'Sullivan will continue on and chair the committee. John Sinclair will continue on the committee. Bob

Sherry (after his sabbatical) will continue on the committee. Steve Klemann has agreed to serve as the one year alternate. Sharon Carnahan has agreed to serve as the Social Science representative. Lee Lines has agreed to serve as the Mathematics and Science representative. Eileen Gregory has agreed to serve an extra semester to cover for Bob Sherry's one-semester sabbatical. A motion is made to approve the slate and is seconded. The motion passes.

- B. Additional Announcements. Jill states that she wishes to put several rumors to rest. She states that INB did not lose accreditation. Rather INB completed a mid-term review as part of the accreditation process. Jill states that a second rumor has circulated regarding whether or not CPS faculty may go up for tenure prior to the sixth year. Carol Bresnahan states her own personal view is that faculty should be encouraged to go up for early tenure if they are ready for the tenure review. In her opinion, it is not "early" tenure because the requirements are the same regardless of the timing. Regarding CPS, she states that the CPS bylaws were drafted under a short timetable. She notes that AHFAC did not contemplate an all-faculty body to determine tenure and promotion criteria; in this sense, there is some degree of autonomy accorded to each college. She states that there is nothing that prevents the faculty from creating such an all-college structure. Jenny Queen, speaking on behalf of the AHFAC committee, states that the creation of an all-college tenure and promotion committee was the one thing that CPS considered a "deal-breaker." Joshua Almond asks what happens if a candidate for early tenure fails to be awarded tenure. Rick Vitray asks if this means that the timetables for promotion in rank and tenure would be decoupled. Eileen Gregory notes that the A&S bylaws merely state what happens "normally" and "usually," and do not therefore strictly preclude early tenure under exceptional circumstances. Nancy Decker states that she has concerns about reducing the tenure clock. She worries that this could create a bifurcated system in terms of some faculty going up early and others going later rather than a system in which we all follow the same course. Socky O'Sullivan states his concern regarding the fact that CPS did not consult with A&S regarding decisions which affect us, specifically regarding new programs and ultimately promotions. He states that one of our goals is to develop greater connections between the two colleges; however, it does not seem like having different rules for each brings us any closer together. Joan Davison wishes to state for the record that she is a bit surprised to learn that INB was not actually up for reaccreditation considering that this was the main rationale for the urgency in the creation of the CPS.
- C. The Revised A&S Bylaws: Shall we approve the revised A&S Bylaws? Jill Jones moves that the revised bylaw be approved by means of a consent agenda. That is, the revisions will be discussed in two stages and that all provisions which discuss whether or not to add CPS members to A&S committees will be considered separately from the other changes. A motion is made to approve the first set of changes and seconded. The question is called. The motion to

approve the first set of changes to the bylaws passes unanimously. Joan Davison explains the rationale for pulling the remaining changes out as part of the consent agenda. She states that there is concern among A&S faculty regarding the state of flux in the CPS bylaws and the degree of autonomy that CPS enjoys or believes it enjoys. Gloria Cook states that one point of concern that AAC has with respect to CPS autonomy is the possibility of offering dual enrollment programs which is now being discussed within CPS. Nancy Decker states that recently she has been part of the dual enrollment discussion. She states that the focus of these programs would be to offer an option for International Business majors in particular. She states that such a major would be nested in the INB department. Jenny Queen states that her concern is that these students would be earning a Rollins degree; however, the creation of these types of programs without AAC consultation undermines AAC and the spirit of compromises made by the AHFAC committee. She notes that these may be INB majors but they are INB majors earning a Rollins degree. Nancy states that she too was unclear about how this would work and that Rollins is only in the initial stages of this discussion. David Charles states that he favors maximum transparency and is in favor of decisions, including the bylaw changes being contemplated, which seek to mend the division between the two colleges rather than widening them. Joan states that she agrees with this sentiment but that her concerns go beyond a mending of fences. She states that there is a real question about how CPS operates and whether they have any accountability when making decisions which affect A&S. David Charles states that at least these proposed bylaw changes keep one channel of dialogue open. Jonathan Miller states that the Executive Council exists to handle issues such as those raised by Joan and Jenny and should be utilized; therefore disputes such as these should not preclude the faculty from adopting the bylaw changes currently under consideration. Claire Strom asks if the CPS bylaws give A&S faculty membership on their committees. Jill Jones replies that, yes, they have passed changes to their bylaws which do this. She states that while she agrees with David Charles, there is a concern about reciprocity. She questions if the system we are creating is one in which CPS faculty enjoy full autonomy in their college but also vote on our AAC and if this is really a reciprocal system. Lee Lines seeks clarification about which committees actually exist in CPS. Emily Russell responds that CPS has a tenure and promotion committee and a curriculum committee, but does not have separate committees on student life, finance or professional standards. Rick Vitray states that he agrees with Jonathan that there is a need to take this to Executive Council. Joshua Almond agrees with David Charles that communication is good. However, he states that there is a bigger problem here than just communication. He states that although we can send this to the Executive Council, this mechanism is inadequate and does not necessarily prevent bad outcomes. It does not function as a "stewarding body" that guides the college to positive outcomes. Mario D'Amato states that we need all-college academic affairs committee. Emily Russell recalls Jenny Queen's remark that the creation of such a

committee was a deal-breaker for CPS. Lisa Tillmann asks how was it that such a small number of faculty got to have a right to be deal breakers and dictate this change which affects so many of us. Socky O'Sullivan states that in his opinion the new communication major created by CPS is a disaster; he states that those that created the major did not consult with faculty in A&S that have real expertise in the subject. He states that he worries that if the two colleges go their separate ways, this could end up in a situation not unlike that used to characterize Holt; in particular he worries that A&S degrees will become of less value. He states that external parties have not embraced the direction Rollins is moving in, namely Phi Beta Kappa, Moody's and AACSB. Lisa Tillmann states that under the current system there is nothing to prevent us from creating our own duplicate majors in A&S and CPS. Joshua Almond states that this would not happen because the Executive Council and administration would presumably intervene to prevent such a clearly self-destructive initiative. Lee Lines states that looking ahead over the next five years he worries that these types of cross-college conversations could be a huge waste of our time and energies. Barry Allen states that there is an initiative in CPS to create a sustainable enterprise program. He believes that the faculty leading this initiative do not have real expertise in sustainability (unless narrowly conceived), but are going to go ahead with this program regardless. David Richard states that some of these questions came before AHFAC. Steve Klemann urges the faculty to push this issue to the Executive Council as Jonathan suggested. Jenny Queen asks which issue in particular should go before the Executive Council as there appear to be multiple concerns that transcend the two schools. Claire Strom calls to question the adoption of the second set of proposed changes to the bylaws. The motion passes; the question is called. Jill asks if there is a desire among junior faculty for a paper ballot; no such desire is expressed. The motion to approve the remaining bylaw changes passes.

- D. The Merit Pay Proposal. Joe Siry states that a memorandum has been distributed which has come from the F&S committee. Laurel Goj states that she is opposed to tabling this discussion to the next meeting since the purpose of the last faculty meeting is to celebrate those faculty that are retiring. Eileen Gregory asks what happens if we do not act on this and seeks clarification from Bob Smither on whether this is an urgent issue. Bob Smither states that he does not envision making any further raises until there is a clear faculty-approved system in place; therefore, he urges the faculty to consider the F&S proposal. Eileen motions that we approve the document. The motion is seconded. Kathryn Norsworthy states that the proposed system looks very similar to the system we used in the most recent round of salary raises and that she supports this system. Paul Stephenson states that there are some important changes in this system in that the proposal under consideration includes elected faculty members in the decisions regarding merit. David Charles states that PSC is no longer sure what the FSAR is being used for and that it would be nice to streamline the process and have fewer

forms. Bob Smither states that the FSAR, in spite of its limitations, has over the years been used for multiple purposes including awards, merit pay, and SACS assessment. He states that a new FSAR form is being developed which will hopefully streamline the process in the manner that David is suggesting. The question is called. The motion passes.

V. Adjourn. The meeting is adjourned at 1:50pm.

VI. Committee Report (submitted electronically)

Academic Affairs Committee. AAC reports that it has approved the curricular changes in the Humanities Major and Master of Liberal Studies at Holt, changes in tutoring and writing consulting training courses, setting deadlines for submission of new course proposals, and one grade appeal. AAC has also revisited the Maymester issue. Upon the suggestion of Eileen Gregory, AAC is calling for volunteers to serve on an online registration advisory committee, starting this summer. AAC is also asking for more nominations from faculty to form the New General Education Implementation Subcommittee. Please send your nominations either to Gloria Cook or Jill Jones.

ATTACHMENT #1: A&S BYLAWS



FACULTY OF ARTS AND SCIENCES
SECTION V-BYLAWS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Article	I.	<u>General Governance</u>
Article	II.	<u>Membership, Responsibilities,</u>
<u>and</u>		<u>Suffrage</u>
Article	III.	<u>Officers of the Faculty of A&S</u>
Article	IV.	<u>Meetings of the Faculty of A&S</u>
Article	V.	<u>Governance Structure</u>
Article	VI.	<u>The A&S Executive Committee</u>
Article	VII.	<u>Standing Committees of the</u>
<u>Faculty</u>		
Article	VIII.	<u>Faculty Evaluations</u>
Article	IX.	<u>Amendment Procedure</u>

ARTICLE I
GENERAL GOVERNANCE

Section 1.

These bylaws define the governance system for the Faculty of Arts and Sciences of Rollins College. The Trustees of the College (Trustee Bylaws, Article IV) grant the faculty the right to "adopt for its own government such principles and bylaws as

shall seem desirable to promote efficiency and facilitate work." All such principles and bylaws are subject to the rules, regulations and requirements of the Board of Trustees, the provisions of the Charter of Rollins College, and the laws of the state of Florida.

Section 2.

The standards set forth by the American Association of University Professors as published in AAUP Policy Documents and Reports, 1990 (or most recent) edition, when not in conflict with the College Charter, Trustee Bylaws, and these Bylaws, shall be binding on matters of academic freedom, appointments, tenure, faculty responsibility, and accountability.

ARTICLE II MEMBERSHIP, RESPONSIBILITIES, AND SUFFRAGE

Section 1. Faculty Membership

The Rollins Trustees (Trustee Bylaws, Article IV) define the faculty of Rollins College as consisting of "the President, the professors, and such other employees as may from time to time be designated by the Board of Trustees."

Section 2. Responsibilities of the Faculty

Among other responsibilities, Rollins College (Trustee Bylaws, Article IV) entrusts the faculty of Rollins College "with all matters pertaining to the order, instruction, discipline, and curriculum of the College," and with "immediate government and discipline of the students," subject to the rules, regulations and requirements of the Board of Trustees.

Section 3. Voting Membership of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences

The following have the privilege of both voice and vote in meetings of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences of Rollins College: the President of Rollins College, the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, all those holding full-time positions as artists-in-residence, lecturers, instructors, assistant professors, associate professors, and professors, who are appointed either to academic departments of Arts and Sciences, to the Hamilton Holt School, or to the library and whose primary responsibility is to teach in Arts and Sciences; Arts and Sciences and Holt deans with faculty rank or holding tenure in Arts and Sciences; Directors, librarians, and department chairs with faculty rank.

Section 4. Student-Delegates

There shall be nine (9) student-delegates, selected by the Student Government Association, who enjoy the privilege of voice only.

Section 5. Attendance and Participation by Other Non-Members

All meetings of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences and its governance committees shall be open to observation by any employee or student of the College, provided, however, such open observation shall not apply in grievance considerations, including hearing on that subject. The right of a non-member to speak at meetings of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences shall ordinarily be granted by the President of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences or the chair of the committee. A non-member shall ordinarily be limited to a combined total of five minutes in which to speak. Exceptions to the practice of open meetings or to the limit of a combined total of five minutes of speaking time for a non-member shall require a vote of the members of the committee or faculty.

ARTICLE III OFFICERS OF THE FACULTY OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

Section 1. The President of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences

The Faculty of Arts and Sciences shall elect a President who shall serve as its Executive Officer. The President of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences shall call and preside at meetings of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences and the Executive Committee of the Faculty and shall call for the initial meetings of the Standing Committees. The President of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences represents the Arts and Sciences faculty to the Administration and to the Board of Trustees, serves on the Executive Council of the Rollins College Faculty, and shall be a tenured member of the Arts and Sciences faculty. The standing Committee chairs shall submit an annual report to the President of the Faculty on or before May 30 of each academic year. The President of the Faculty shall, on or before June 15 of each academic year, forward to the Faculty, the Provost, and the Dean of Arts and Sciences a copy of all amendments to these bylaws which have been approved by the Faculty of Arts and Sciences in accordance with these bylaws. The President of the Faculty receives two courses of release time each year of service.

Section 2. The Vice President/Secretary of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences

The Faculty shall elect from its membership the Vice President/Secretary of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. The Vice President/Secretary of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences shall be a tenured member of the Arts and Sciences faculty and shall compile and distribute the agendas and minutes of meetings of the Arts and Sciences faculty and the Executive Committee of the Faculty. In the absence of the President of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, the Vice President/Secretary shall

preside over Arts and Sciences faculty meetings and meetings of the Executive Committee.

Section 3. Terms of Office

The term of office of the President of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences shall be for two years, normally beginning on June 1. The President of the faculty may not serve more than two consecutive terms. The term of office of the Vice President/Secretary of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences shall be for two years.

Section 4. Election of the President and Vice President/Secretary of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences

The Executive Committee of the Faculty shall nominate at least two candidates for the offices of President of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences and Vice President/Secretary of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. The slate shall be published at least ten days prior to the election meeting. The election of the President of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences and the Vice President/Secretary of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences shall be from this list of nominees and from any additional nominations made from the floor of the faculty meeting. All nominations require the prior consent of the nominee.

Section 5. Recall

The President of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences may be recalled at a regular or special meeting of the faculty by a two-thirds vote of the faculty present and voting in quorum as defined in Article IV, Section 4 of these bylaws.

Section 6. Unexpired Terms of Office

Should a vacancy occur, the position of President of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences or Vice President/Secretary of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences shall be filled for the unexpired term by faculty election, as defined in Section 4 of Article III of these bylaws. The Executive Committee of the Faculty shall prepare nominations for a special meeting of the College faculty to achieve this end.

ARTICLE IV MEETINGS OF THE FACULTY OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

Section 1. Regular Meetings

The Faculty of Arts and Sciences shall normally meet monthly during the academic year. Elections for the President, Vice President/Secretary, and the at-large faculty representatives for the four Arts and Sciences standing committees shall be held on or before the April meeting of the Faculty. At least one meeting each semester of the faculty of the College or Arts and Sciences, or upon the request of the President of the Faculty, the Dean of Student Affairs, or his or her designee, shall make a report to the faculty about the state of the College in regard to student life. Furthermore, any serious incident shall be reported by the Dean of Student Affairs or his or her designee at either a regular or special meeting of the faculty of Arts and Sciences.

Section 2. Special Meetings

Special meetings of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences may be called by the President of the Faculty as deemed necessary or as the result of a petition as allowed in Article IV, Section 5. The Faculty of Arts and Sciences shall meet as needed to approve by majority vote administrative appointments to the positions of President of Rollins College, Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, the Dean of the College and Vice President for Planning, the Dean of Arts and Sciences, the Dean of Student Affairs, the Dean of Admissions and Student Financial Planning, the Dean of the Hamilton Holt School, and the Dean of Knowles Memorial Chapel.

Section 3. Calling of Meetings

The primary authority to convene faculty meetings resides in the President of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. Upon presentation to the President of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences or to the Executive Committee of the Faculty of a petition requesting a special meeting of the Arts and Sciences faculty, and that it is signed by one third of the faculty members required for a quorum, or one-third of the student body of Arts and Sciences, or the Hamilton Holt School, the President of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences or the Executive Committee shall call the requested meeting. The meeting normally shall take place within seven workdays of receipt of the petition.

Section 4. Quorum

The quorum for regular meetings shall consist of one-third of the voting members of the Faculty. The Dean of Arts and Sciences shall supply this number to the President of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences at the beginning of each regular or special meeting.

Section 5. Petitions of Review

Upon presentation to the President of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences of a petition of review signed by one third of the faculty members required for a quorum or one fifth of the student body, any decision of the College administration which changes the letter or spirit of College policy must be submitted for review to a meeting of the

Faculty of Arts and Sciences. Any student or faculty member may initiate such a petition. Notice of the petition and its contents shall be distributed to the Arts and Sciences faculty seven days prior to the meeting. If the faculty votes to oppose such a decision, the President of Rollins College shall resolve the issue.

Section 6. Rules to Order

Robert's Rules of Order, when not in conflict with these bylaws, shall be used as authority for the conduct of meetings of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. The faculty shall be served by a parliamentarian, who shall be appointed for a two-year term by the Executive Committee of the Faculty from among the voting membership of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. The records of the faculty's deliberations and minutes shall be open for inspection.

ARTICLE V GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE

Section 1. Governance Structure

The Faculty of Arts and Sciences has delegated certain of its responsibilities to the Executive Committee of the Faculty and to four standing committees. These bodies shall act on behalf of and report to the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. The normal legislative process is from committee to Executive Committee to the Faculty. Service on standing committees is a professional duty of any faculty member selected.

Section 2. Elections

At-large faculty representatives shall be elected to the standing committees at the regular faculty meeting in March. The Executive Committee of the Faculty prepares at-large nominations and publishes the slate at least ten days prior to election, but additional nominations may be tendered from the floor. Divisional representatives to all committees with divisional representation shall be nominated and elected from within the divisions during the month of March, under procedures agreed upon by the members of the respective divisions. All nominations require prior consent.

Section 3. Vacancies

Should unforeseen at-large vacancies occur, the Executive Committee of the Faculty nominates a replacement at least ten days prior to approval by the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. Such elections may be accomplished by mailed ballot or during a special meeting of the faculty. Should unforeseen divisional vacancies occur, replacements shall be nominated and elected from within the divisions under procedures agreed upon by the members of the respective divisions. A majority of

the electoral unit represented by any faculty committee member may recall the representative at any time.

Section 4. Procedures

The Arts and Sciences division and their constituent units are:

Expressive Arts: Art and Art History, Music, Library Science, Physical Education, and Theatre and Dance;

Humanities: English, Modern Language and Literature, Philosophy and Religion, and Critical Media and Cultural Studies;

Science and Mathematics: Biology, Chemistry, Computer Science, Environmental Studies, Mathematics and Computer Science, and Physics;

Social Sciences: Anthropology, Economics, History, Political Science, Psychology, Sociology, and Graduate Counseling.

Unless otherwise specified in these bylaws, each faculty and staff representative normally shall be elected for a two-year term of office that shall begin in September. Terms of office shall be staggered.

The standing committees shall elect a chair and recording secretary from the faculty membership of their respective committees at their first meeting. The secretaries shall keep the minutes of each meeting.

The President of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, the Vice President/Secretary of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, and the chair of each standing committee shall be tenured Arts and Sciences faculty members. No faculty member shall serve more than two consecutive terms of any standing committee. No Arts and Sciences faculty member shall serve concurrently on two standing Arts and Sciences committees.

The chairs of the standing committees and the President of the Arts and Sciences faculty shall serve as Arts and Sciences representatives on the Executive Council of the Faculty of Rollins College. When unable to attend meetings of these bodies, committee chairs shall delegate a member of their committee to represent them.

All standing committees shall normally meet each month during the academic year. The chairs of standing committees will report the activities of their committees to each meeting of the faculty and are responsible for communicating the agendas, concerns, and work of their committees to the appropriate administrators in a timely and systematic fashion.

Section 5.

Notwithstanding anything contained in these bylaws to the contrary, faculty members who serve on any Standing Committee of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, must be tenured or on official tenure track in the College.

ARTICLE VI THE ARTS AND SCIENCES EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Section 1. Membership

The voting membership of the Executive Committee of the Faculty shall consist of the President of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, the Vice President/Secretary of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, the President of the Student Government Association, and the four chairs of the standing committees. The non-voting membership shall consist of the President and the Provost of the College and the Dean of Arts and Sciences.

Section 2. Responsibilities and Duties

The Executive Committee convenes and sets the agenda for the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, refers business to the appropriate committees, reviews proposed committee legislation, brings such legislation to the Faculty, acts on it (subject to their review) or returns it to committee, interprets the authority of standing committees as set forth in the Bylaws, prepares at-large faculty nominations to fill committee vacancies, interprets these Bylaws, reviews them annually, proposes any changes in them to the Arts and Sciences faculty, and acts for the faculty when a quorum cannot be assembled. Minutes of the Executive Committee shall be published and distributed to the entire College community in a timely fashion.

ARTICLE VII STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE FACULTY

Section 1. The Academic Affairs Committee

Responsibilities. The Academic Affairs Committee shall have primary authority in all policy matters concerning curriculum, including general education requirements, student academic standards and honors, academic advising, continuing and graduate education programs of Arts and Sciences and the Hamilton Holt School, the library and media services, and in all matters pertaining to academic schedules and calendars. Each year, the committee shall issue an advisory statement to the appropriate Deans on the appointment and replacement of members of the faculty.

Membership. Membership of the Academic Affairs Committee shall consist of thirteen voting members: eight from the faculty of Arts and Sciences (four at large and four divisional, the latter of whom shall be selected from within the division they represent), one at large from the College of Professional Studies, and four students chosen by the Student Government Association. The students shall be appointed at the beginning of the academic year and remain on the Committee for a period of one year. The College of Professional Studies representative shall recuse him or herself from voting on matters strictly pertaining to Arts and Sciences. The Dean of Arts and Sciences serves as an ex-officio, non-voting member.

Section 2. The Professional Standards Committee

Responsibilities. The Professional Standards Committee shall have primary authority and responsibility in all policy matters dealing with the criteria and procedures for professional evaluation, professional leave, and research and professional development for the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. The Committee reviews all internal grant allocations for faculty of Arts and Sciences and the College of Professional Studies and makes recommendations to the appropriate dean of grant awards. The Committee advises the President and Vice Presidents on the administrative structure of Arts and Sciences, including the creation and elimination of administrative positions and the appointment, evaluation, and professional development of administrators.

Membership. Membership of the Professional Standards Committee shall consist of eleven voting members: eight elected from the faculty of Arts and Sciences (four at large and four divisional, the latter of whom shall be elected from within the division they represent), one at large from the College of Professional Studies, and two students chosen by the Student Government Association. The students shall be appointed at the beginning of the academic year and remain on the Committee for a period of one year. The College of Professional Studies representative shall recuse him or herself from voting on matters strictly pertaining to Arts and Sciences. The Dean of Arts and Sciences serves as an ex-officio, non-voting member.

Section 3. The Student Life Committee

Responsibilities. The Student Life Committee recommends policies and priorities with regard to student life to the Faculty and advises the administration concerning the implementation of such policies.

Student life concerns include, but are not restricted to, issues related to student housing, student services, student activities and organizations, student conduct and standards, recreation, and intercollegiate athletics.

Membership. The membership of the Student Life Committee shall consist of fourteen voting members: six elected from the faculty of Arts and Science, one at large from the College of Professional Studies, two members of the professional staff

elected by the members of the staff (at least one of whom is drawn from Student Affairs), and five students selected by the Student Government Association. The students shall be appointed at the beginning of the academic year and remain on the Committee for a period of one year. The College of Professional Studies representative shall recuse him or herself from voting on matters strictly pertaining to Arts and Sciences. The Dean of Student Affairs serves as an ex-officio, non-voting member.

Section 4. The Finance and Service Committee

Responsibilities. The Finance and Service Committee consults with the administration and serves as an advocate on issues related to finance and general services of Arts and Sciences. Such concerns include, but are not restricted to, issues related to budget, salary and benefits, student financial planning, tuition and fees, physical plant, campus safety, bookstore, food service, and personnel.

Membership. Membership to the Finance and Service Committee consists of twelve voting members: six elected from the faculty of Arts and Sciences, one at large member from the College of Professional Studies, two staff members elected by members of the staff, and three student representatives selected by the Student Government Association. The students shall be appointed at the beginning of the academic year and remain on the Committee for a period of one year. The College of Professional Studies representative shall recuse him or herself from voting on matters strictly pertaining to Arts and Sciences.

Section 5. Authority

All committee recommendations become policy when approved by the Faculty.

All policies shall be implemented by the appropriate administrators of Rollins College.

When policies and their implications are unclear, administrators will be guided by the advice of the appropriate committee.

Standing committees seeking clarification of policy implementation shall confer directly with the appropriate administrator.

ARTICLE VIII FACULTY EVALUATIONS

A. FACULTY APPOINTMENTS

Faculty members shall be appointed to and reviewed by a single academic department, but teaching and service responsibilities may be distributed among

different schools. In such cases, more than one Dean will be involved in the evaluation of a candidate, and so all statements in Article VIII pertaining to a Dean should be interpreted as applying to "Deans" when this is the case. Likewise, in programs headed by a Director rather than a Dean, all statements in Article VIII pertaining to a Dean should be interpreted as applying to a "Director." All reports and recommendations and any responses by candidates will be in writing. Recommendations regarding candidacy for tenure or promotion must clearly support or not support the candidate. Notices of reappointments and non-reappointments are the responsibility of the President and will be in writing. These letters are sent out by the Provost on behalf of the President.

Section 1. New Appointments

Faculty appointments may be made to tenure-track or visiting positions. No tenure-track appointment may last beyond seven years without the faculty member being granted tenure, with the exception of faculty members on parental leave for childbirth or adoption who accept an extension in accordance with Rollins College Policy. Science Division and Psychology faculty who begin the tenure track in fall, 2012 (assuming the Bush renovation takes place on schedule) and who require specialized laboratory facilities in the Bush Science Center to conduct their research, may, at the time they submit their materials for their mid-course evaluation, declare that they wish a one-year extension of the tenure clock. That extension will convert their fifth year on the tenure track to a non-counting year, allowing them to take the fourth year course release currently offered to tenure-track faculty. This provision expires automatically once these faculty have been accommodated as described. No visiting faculty appointment may last beyond six consecutive years. Initial appointments of tenure-track faculty shall normally be for a two-year period. All faculty appointments shall be made by the President with the advice of the Provost, who may act as the President's agent, and the appropriate Dean. All tenure-track appointments will be made as the result of national searches.

The department to which the candidate will be appointed will usually conduct the search. Search committees shall have one faculty member from outside the department who will be appointed by the appropriate Dean in consultation with the department. The appointee will be a voting member of the search committee. The recruitment and selection of candidates for faculty appointments will conform with the equal employment opportunity and affirmative action policies of the College.

The Dean shall not recommend the appointment of anyone of whom a majority of the tenured and tenure-track members of the appointee's department or program disapproves. If a new appointment must be made when a majority of the members of the department or program cannot be consulted, the Dean may recommend no more than a one-year visiting appointment.

While faculty members are not normally hired with tenure, this option is permitted in the special circumstance of appointment to endowed chairs. In such a case, the

candidate must possess the rank of Associate or Full Professor at the previous institution and already have been granted tenure at that institution.

If the chair is in a specific discipline, a search committee will be formed within the appropriate department with representation from at least one other department appointed by the Dean of Arts and Sciences. The committee will set out the criteria necessary for a successful candidate to the position. If the chair is not department based, the Dean will appoint a search committee consisting of representatives from relevant departments and programs.

When the search committee has reached a final decision, it will send a letter of recommendation to the FEC. The search committee and the FEC, in assessing the merit of the candidate, along with the usual evaluation of research and service, will give special consideration to teaching quality in their evaluation. The FEC will examine the credentials of the candidate and will give the Dean its approval or disapproval of the recommendation of the search committee, based on a stringent evaluation of the candidate against the tenure guidelines of the department or program. The Dean will then pass along to the Provost his/her recommendation as well as the recommendation from the FEC. The Provost in turn will make a recommendation to the President, who then makes the final decision on the appointment.

Section 2. Reappointments

Reappointments normally occur annually after the initial appointment. However, a department or program may recommend reappointment contracts of two or three years, subject to the concurrence of the appropriate Dean. All appointments and reappointments made during a faculty member's probationary period are terminal appointments for not more than three years. Visiting appointments are for not more than three years.

Reappointment evaluations are conducted by the Candidate Evaluation Committee (CEC). Reappointments shall be made by the President only with the approval of the CEC and a majority of the tenured and tenure-track members of the department, after review by the appropriate Dean and the Provost.

In the case of a renewable one-year academic year appointment, notice of non-reappointment must be transmitted in writing to the candidate not later than March 1. In case of a two-year academic appointment, a written notice of non-reappointment must be sent to the candidate not later than December 15. If a one-year appointment terminated during an academic year, the candidate must be notified in writing at least three months in advance of its termination. If a two-year appointment terminates during an academic year, the candidate must be notified in writing at least six months in advance of its termination. After two or more years of service, notice of non-reappointment must be given not later than twelve months before the expiration of the appointment.

B. CRITERIA FOR FACULTY EVALUATION

Section 1. General Criteria

The education of students is the primary mission of Rollins College. To that end the role of the faculty involves teaching, research and scholarship, and service as interrelated components that serve this mission. Rollins values teaching excellence above all. We see scholarship and service as concomitant to good teaching. We expect candidates for tenure and promotion to demonstrate scholarly interests and give evidence of an active scholarly life. We expect candidates for tenure and promotion to engage in service within the College and to demonstrate how service outside the College is connected to the mission of the College.

We expect candidates to make a case for tenure and promotion. Tenure and promotion represent a recognition by the College community that a faculty member has met Rollins' standards for membership and achievement. We expect every faculty member to adhere to professional standards, as well as to demonstrate the commitment to rational dialogue that is required for cooperative relations among colleagues and the promotion of knowledge and understanding among students. To receive tenure and promotion, the candidate must demonstrate that he or she has contributed, and will continue to contribute, to the College's educational mission and goals in spirit as well as substance. In making the case for tenure and promotion, the candidate should address the following categories:

Teaching. Rollins College expects the candidate to demonstrate both high competence in his/her field(s) and the ability to convey knowledge of his/her field to students. While we recognize the legitimacy of a wide variety of teaching methods, the candidate must be able to organize coherent and useful courses, stimulate student thought, challenge student assumptions, and establish a realistic but demanding set of expectations. Means of evaluation in this area include course evaluations, classroom visits, review of course syllabi, writing or conversations with colleagues that demonstrate the candidate's intellectual ability, and evidence of effective communication skills. Evaluation of the quality of teaching need not be limited to on-load courses but can include student advising and over-load teaching. The candidate must demonstrate excellence as a teacher to merit tenure or promotion.

Research and Scholarship. We expect the candidate to demonstrate scholarly accomplishment, as well as ongoing intellectual activity directed toward making a contribution to his or her fields(s) and/or toward the extension or deepening of intellectual competence. We recognize the value not only of scholarship in a particular academic discipline, but also in inter-disciplinary scholarship and pedagogical research. Accomplishments in this area may be demonstrated, as appropriate, by the following: scholarly writings submitted for review by one's peers and accepted for publication, presentation of papers at professional meetings, creation of art or performance, serving as a session organizer or discussant at

professional conferences, participation in scholarly activities such as seminars in which written scholarly work is required, service as a referee or reviewer for professional journals and/or publishers or professional conferences, invited lectures and performances, the receipt of grants or fellowships from which scholarly writing is expected, public performance, and the publication of journal articles or books. These activities must represent a pattern of professional development, suggesting intellectual and scholarly life that will continue after the awarding of tenure or promotion.

These requirements are the same for tenure and promotion, except that the College has higher expectations for candidates for promotion to Professor. Given the time that normally elapses before a candidate can apply for promotion to Professor, he or she must be able to demonstrate a stronger record of scholarly accomplishment to merit promotion.

College Service. We expect every faculty member to make a contribution to the College community beyond the classroom and beyond his or her research efforts. Contribution to the College community beyond the classroom should include, for example, such services as participation in College committees, involvement in student activities, effectiveness and cooperation in departmental and inter-departmental programs, active and effective participation in the cultural and intellectual life of the College, and service in the outside community. Development of academic, curricular, and other programs that enrich the life of the College can weigh heavily in considering a candidate's College service.

The commitment to advising (students, organizations, programs) can also be seriously considered in evaluating a candidate's College service. Student advising includes not only accepting a reasonable number of advisees, consistent with the candidate's other responsibilities, and making oneself available to students outside of the class on a regular basis, but also interacting with students outside of class regarding issues and interests in the courses a candidate teaches and discussing with advisees their overall academic program, course selection, and career concerns.

Service to the College can take many forms, and Rollins recognizes the variety of contributions made by individual faculty members that contribute to the mission of the College.

Section 2. Departmental Criteria

Each department, with the concurrence of the Faculty Evaluation Committee, shall determine how the above criteria shall be defined and applied for faculty evaluations in particular academic disciplines, providing to the FEC explicit standards for teaching, scholarship, and service for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor and Professor, including standards specific to the discipline. The department shall provide a rationale in support of their standards. The

department must reevaluate and resubmit these criteria to the FEC every five years, or earlier if the criteria have been revised. Any department with a candidate for tenure will use the set of criteria in effect at the time of the candidate's hiring, unless the candidate chooses to use the most recent criteria at the time they take effect. In all other cases, the set of criteria in effect three years prior to the candidate's evaluation will be used, unless the candidate chooses to use the most recent criteria at the time they take effect.

Section 3. Specific Criteria for Reappointment and Promotion

No reappointment or promotion, except as provided below for instructors who receive the terminal degree, is to be regarded as automatic, but must be earned by merit as demonstrated by all applicable activities. Promotions in rank shall be made in accord with the general criteria of the College and the specific criteria described below. They will go into effect September 1 following the evaluation proceedings.

Reappointment. Criteria for reappointment shall be the same as those for tenure and promotion, with the understanding that the candidate is evaluated for the promise of excellence in teaching, research and scholarship, and College service.

Promotion to Assistant Professor. For persons employed at the initial rank of instructor pending attainment of the terminal degree, promotion to the rank of Assistant Professor will be automatic and take effect upon official confirmation of their receiving the terminal degree.

Instructors who have not received the doctorate or the terminal degree in the appropriate field may be promoted to Assistant Professor only if the majority of the Candidate Evaluation Committee and the appropriate Dean conclude that all criteria for reappointment have been met and that the individual's continued employment is justified by exceptional conditions, such as: the individual's contribution to the College has been outstanding, and if applicable, progress on the terminal degree is significant enough so that this degree will be awarded within a year.

No candidate without the terminal degree will be promoted without the approval of a majority of those on the Candidate Evaluation Committee.

Promotion to Associate Professor. Persons holding the rank of Assistant Professor may be promoted to the rank of Associate Professor upon and not before the award of tenure. (See eligibility for tenure, Section D.) If the Candidate Evaluation Committee and the appropriate Dean believe that the individual's contribution to the College, professional growth, and potential warrant promotion, then upon their recommendations and the concurrence of the Provost, the promotion may be granted by the President. No candidate will be promoted without the approval of a majority of the Candidate Evaluation Committee. Only in exceptional cases will promotion to the rank of Associate Professor be considered for individuals not holding the terminal degree in the appropriate field and not having completed the

minimum number of years. These exceptional cases will be determined by joint approval of a majority of the relevant Candidate Evaluation Committee, the Faculty Evaluation Committee, and the appropriate Dean.

Promotion to Professor. Faculty members with the terminal degree in the appropriate field holding the rank of Associate Professor may be awarded promotion to Professor, after a minimum of five years full time experience in a senior institution at the rank of Associate Professor, of which at least three years have been at this institution. The Board of Trustees, upon recommendation by the President, may waive this minimum duration, but only in exceptional circumstances. The delineation of these circumstances will be determined by each Candidate Evaluation Committee of the College in consultation with the Faculty Evaluation Committee and the appropriate Dean.

For promotion to the rank of Professor, the individual must receive the positive recommendation of a majority of the Candidate Evaluation Committee. The Provost will make a separate report and recommendation to the President. Promotions to the rank of Professor shall be made by the Board of Trustees and upon the recommendation of the President.

C. PROCEDURES FOR ANNUAL REVIEW OF UNTENURED FACULTY

Section 1. Annual Evaluations

The CEC (formed by December 1) will conduct annual evaluations of all tenure-track faculty. The candidate will submit materials for review, including a professional assessment statement, to the CEC by January 1. The evaluation will be documented in a report addressed to the appropriate Dean and placed in the candidate's permanent file by February 15. The report should include an analysis and evaluation of the candidate's progress toward tenure, based on the criteria set forth in the bylaws and in individual departmental criteria.

These annual evaluations are to be conducted for every year in which neither a tenure evaluation nor a comprehensive mid-course evaluation takes place.

Departmental evaluations are to be conducted every year for Visiting Professors of any rank. The evaluation will be documented in a report and placed in the faculty member's departmental file by February 15. The report should include an analysis and evaluation of the faculty member's accomplishments in meeting department and College expectations.

D. POST-TENURE EVALUATIONS

The CEC (formed December 1), with the support of the appropriate Dean, is charged with the responsibility of encouraging improved teaching and professional development for all members of the faculty. Tenured faculty will normally be

evaluated every seven years, two years before their eligibility for a sabbatical. Exceptions may be recommended by the appropriate Dean, with the approval of the Professional Standards Committee.

While the primary purpose of continued assessment is to promote improved teaching and professional development, it also assists tenured faculty in the identification of strengths and correction of any deficiencies. Should the CEC or the appropriate Dean detect deficiencies which are particularly significant, the evaluation proceedings may be initiated at any time.

The faculty member's professional assessment statements play a primary role in these seven-year evaluations. The faculty member creates a professional assessment statement called the Faculty Development Plan. This plan, with supporting documents, goes to the members of the CEC to review by January 1. The CEC then meets with the faculty member to discuss the professional assessment statement and writes a brief letter of evaluation in response to it, noting their developmental assessment of the faculty member and how the plans fit into the department's goals. This letter is sent to the appropriate Dean by April 15 of the penultimate year before the faculty member is eligible for a sabbatical.

Deans play a central role in providing ongoing encouragement and support for faculty efforts at professional development. The Dean meets with the faculty member separately to discuss the professional assessment statement, and supporting documents, and the letter of the CEC. The Dean then writes a brief letter of evaluation, stating points of concurrence or disagreement. The faculty member receives a copy of this letter by August 15 of the evaluation year.

Both letters, along with the Faculty Development Plan, and other supporting materials, are placed in a file for the faculty member that is kept in the office of the Dean. While a faculty member has a reasonable latitude for changes of professional direction, this file is then used in decisions about release time, requests for funding, and merit awards.

Timeline for Annual and Post-Tenure Review:

	Annual	Post-Tenure
Notification by Dean's office of eligibility	N/A	April 15
CEC formed by:	December 1	December 1
Candidate materials submitted to CEC and (post-tenure only) the Dean	January 1	January 1
CEC's letter to Dean and candidate by:	February 15	April 15
Dean's letter to candidate and CEC by:	N/A	August 15

E. PROCEDURES FOR MID-COURSE, TENURE, AND PROMOTION FACULTY REVIEW

Section 1. Candidate Evaluation Committee Structure and Evaluation

a. Composition

The chair of the department to which the candidate has been appointed, in consultation with members of that department, shall select a Candidate Evaluation Committee by May 15 prior to the academic year in which the evaluation takes place. The CEC normally consists of the Chair of the department (unless the Chair is being evaluated) and a minimum of two additional tenured members of the department who are selected by a majority of all full-time members of the department, without excluding tenured members who wish to serve. In addition, a member of the FEC serves as an ex officio (non-voting) member when the candidate is being evaluated for tenure or promotion. If two additional tenured members of the department are unavailable, non-tenured members may be appointed. If non-tenured members are unavailable, the department Chair, with the advice of the candidate and the approval of the CEC, will select tenured members from outside the department to serve on the CEC. If the department Chair is the candidate being evaluated, another member of the department shall be selected as CEC chair. The chair of the CEC will notify the FEC, the Dean, and the candidate of the members of the CEC by June 1.

For candidates with an appointment in more than one department or program, the CEC, with the advice of the candidate, will add to the CEC one more tenured faculty member, or non-tenured faculty member, if a tenured faculty member is unavailable. This faculty member should have greater familiarity with the work of the candidate outside the department to which the candidate was appointed. If such a faculty member is unavailable, the Chair of the Professional Standards Committee will select a tenured faculty member to serve on the CEC.

b. Collection of Materials Required for Review

The Chair of the CEC has the responsibility for collecting additional materials required for the evaluation including letters from tenured members of the department and/or department letters signed by the tenured members of the department, and student evaluations, and making them available electronically for members of the CEC, FEC, and the appropriate Dean to review by the time the candidate submits her/his materials.

At the candidate's request, for the assessment of the candidate's scholarship, two peer evaluators for institutions other than Rollins will be selected by the Chair of the CEC and the appropriate Dean from a list submitted by the candidate. The Chair

then contacts the peer evaluators and requests their evaluation of the candidate's scholarship. This request must be made in writing to both the Dean and the Chair of the CEC by June 15.

c. Review by Candidate Evaluation Committee

After each member of the CEC has reviewed the candidate's file, the CEC meets with the candidate to discuss the activities addressed in the file. Issues that the CEC considered relevant to the evaluation that might not have been addressed by the candidate are also raised here. The CEC then approves a report and recommendation written by the Chair. The report and recommendation records the vote of the CEC. The report and recommendation are sent electronically to the candidate, the Dean, and the FEC.

If the CEC makes a positive recommendation, it gives reasons for its recommendation in the report. In the cases of a recommendation against awarding tenure or promotion, the CEC gives reasons for its conclusion. No candidate is tenured or promoted without the approval of a majority of the CEC. The candidate is given a copy of the report and recommendation, and has the opportunity to respond in writing, within one week, sending his/her response to all of the appropriate entities in the process.

Section 2. Faculty Evaluation Committee Structure and Evaluation

The FEC consists of six tenured faculty members each with the rank of Professor serving staggered terms of three years. These faculty members are appointed by the Executive Committee, with some consideration given to academic diversity, and ratified by the faculty. Members of the FEC receive one course-released time every year they serve on the committee.

a. Composition

The FEC consists of six tenured faculty members, each with the rank of Professor, serving staggered terms of three years. These faculty members are appointed by the Executive Committee, with some consideration given to academic diversity, and ratified by the faculty. Members of the FEC receive one course-released time every year they serve on the committee.

b. Access to Information

The FEC has access to the candidate's file and all other materials considered at other stages of the evaluation process, and can request additional information from the Dean. It is always appropriate for the FEC to introduce additional information that might not have been included by the CEC or the appropriate Dean. The FEC also has

the authority to call in anyone it needs for consultation, especially where there is disagreement between parties at different stages of the evaluation process.

c. Review by the Faculty Evaluation Committee

The FEC conducts its own evaluation of each candidate for tenure and promotion. The evaluation will be based on the following sources: the written report and recommendation by the CEC, the department's approved criteria for tenure or promotion, the assessment of external evaluators (when requested by the candidate), the report and recommendation of the appropriate Dean, the candidate's professional assessment statement, an interview with the candidate, and any other material or information that the FEC has obtained in the exercise of its duties. The FEC may also consult with the CEC, the appropriate Dean, or any other member of the community.

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. Candidates for tenure, promotion, and mid-course reviews will attend their scheduled FEC interviews as well as additional meetings at the request of the candidate or FEC. At the invitation of the FEC, other persons, who the bylaws state may be consulted, may attend meetings of the FEC to which they are invited. This bylaw supersedes all other bylaws or faculty handbook rules, which may be contrary.

The FEC cannot challenge substantive requirements of a department for tenure or promotion that has approved criteria. The FEC will require the evaluation from the CEC to adhere to its approved criteria, both procedural and substantive.

Upon completion of its review of its candidates, the FEC writes a report and recommendation. The recommendation of the FEC may agree or disagree with that of the CEC or of the Dean. In the event of a negative evaluation by the FEC, the FEC will consult with the CEC on points of disagreement. If the FEC is still not satisfied with the arguments of the CEC, it submits its negative recommendation to the Provost for his/her report and recommendation.

Section 3. Comprehensive Mid-Course Evaluation

Prior to the tenure review, each candidate for tenure and promotion will receive one comprehensive mid-course evaluation. The CEC, the appropriate Dean, and the FEC will each prepare a written report detailing the perceived strengths and weaknesses of the candidate, including specific comments regarding directions the candidate might pursue to strengthen his or her case for tenure or promotion.

A candidate for promotion to Professor has the right to make a written request to the relevant department head and Dean for a comprehensive mid-course evaluation.

The subsequent evaluation for promotion can take place no earlier than two years after the mid-course evaluation.

a. Notification

Normally, the comprehensive mid-course evaluation will take place in the spring of the candidate's third year, but no later than two years before the evaluation for tenure is to take place.

The review for tenure or promotion is conducted in the academic year preceding the award. Tenured appointments or promotions commence September 1 the year following the award.

By April 15 of each year, the appropriate Dean notifies, in writing, those faculty members eligible for tenure review and /or promotion evaluation the following fall. Having received the Dean's notification of eligibility, candidates seeking evaluation must inform the appropriate Dean in writing by May 15, The Dean then provides him/her with a timetable for the evaluation process and a description of the materials s/he must assemble for the evaluation file (the professional assessment statement, course syllabi, information the candidate deems relevant to the evaluation).

b. The Candidate

At the time of the tenure and/or promotion evaluation, each candidate is expected to make a written statement of his/her activities since her/his last evaluation. All relevant professional activities are addressed: teaching, research and scholarship, and College service. The statement includes the candidate's assessment of his or her successes and failures, as well as a plan for future development. In the area of scholarly research, the College is particularly interested in knowing:

- how the candidate has developed professionally since the last formal evaluation
- how the candidate's research interests and professional activities constitute a coherent path of development, and
- how the candidate's research interests are connected to his or her academic life

Since each candidate's application is judged by colleagues from the general College community, as well as those from his or her particular academic discipline, the professional assessment statement plays a critical role in making determinations about the candidate's professional competence and quality of mind. While a faculty member has reasonable latitude for changes of professional direction, the professional assessment statement is used to make determinations about the candidate's professional development in subsequent evaluations and may be

consulted when determinations are made about requests for funding and release time support.

The candidate must submit their materials electronically to the CEC, appropriate Dean, and FEC by December 15.

c. Evaluation by Candidate Evaluation Committee

Having reviewed the candidate's file, interviewed the candidate, and deliberated, the CEC writes a report and recommendation, which makes a case for or against the candidate and sends it electronically, along with the letters from the outside evaluators if applicable, to the FEC, with copies to the Dean and candidate, by February 15. The candidate may choose to write a response to the report and recommendation, and should send this response electronically to the FEC, the Dean, and the CEC within one week.

d. Evaluation by Appropriate Dean

Based on the candidate's file as well as her/his knowledge of the candidate, the appropriate Dean conducts a separate evaluation. The Dean may also consult with the CEC, the candidate, or any other members of the community.

For mid-course evaluations, the Dean submits a report and recommendation to the candidate, the CEC, and FEC no less than one week before its meeting with the candidate. The candidate may choose to write a response to the report and recommendation, and should send this response electronically to the FEC, the Dean, and the CEC within one week.

e. Evaluation by the Faculty Evaluation Committee

Having received the recommendations of the CEC and the appropriate Dean, and after reviewing the candidate's file, interviewing the candidate, and deliberating, the FEC will write a report and recommendation and send it to the candidate, the CEC, and the Dean by May 15.

Section IV. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor Evaluation

a. Eligibility

Normally, a candidate is eligible for the awarding of tenure in her/his seventh year of a tenure-track appointment at Rollins, with the possibility for earlier consideration if the candidate has had prior experience. Individuals with three years full-time experience at the Assistant professor level or higher at other institutions may be awarded tenure in their sixth year at Rollins. Individuals with four or more years full-time experience at the Assistant Professor level or higher at other institutions may be awarded tenure in their fifth year at Rollins. Individuals

who have had full-time experience at the Assistant Professor level or higher at Rollins in a visiting position may use their Rollins' visiting experience as tenure-track, or may utilize up to the full seven-year tenure-track probationary period.

b. Notification

The review for tenure or promotion is conducted in the academic year preceding the award. Tenured appointments or promotions commence September 1 the year following the award.

By April 15 of each year, the appropriate Dean notifies, in writing, those faculty members eligible for tenure review and/or promotion evaluation the following fall. Having received the Dean's notification of eligibility, candidates seeking evaluation must inform his/her department chair and the appropriate Dean in writing by May 15. The Dean then provides her/him with a timetable for the evaluation process and a description of the materials each candidate must assemble for the evaluation file (the professional assessment statement, course syllabi, samples of exams and other assignments, samples of written work, and any other information the candidate deems relevant to the evaluation).

c. The Candidate

At the time of the tenure and/or promotion evaluation, each candidate is expected to make a written statement of his/her activities since his/her last evaluation. All relevant professional activities are addressed: teaching, research and scholarship, and College service. The statement includes the candidate's assessment of her/his successes and failures, as well as a plan for future development. In the area of scholarly research, the College is particularly interested in knowing:

- How the candidate has developed professionally since the last formal evaluation
- How the candidate's research interests and professional activities constitute a coherent path of development
- How the candidate's research interests are connected to his/her academic life

Since each candidate's application is judged by colleagues from the general College community, as well as those from her/his particular academic discipline, the professional assessment statement plays a critical role in making determinations about the candidate's professional competence and quality of mind. While a faculty member has reasonable latitude for changes of professional direction, the professional assessment statement is used to make determinations about the candidate's professional development in subsequent evaluations and may be

consulted when determinations are made about requests for funding and release time support.

The candidate must submit their materials electronically to the CEC, Dean, and the FEC by July 1.

d. Evaluation by the Candidate Evaluation Committee

Having reviewed the candidate's file and deliberated, the CEC writes a report and recommendation, which makes a case for or against the candidate and sends it, along with the letters from the outside evaluators if applicable, to the FEC, with copies to the Dean and candidate, by October 1. The candidate may choose to write a response to the report and recommendation, and should send this response electronically to the CEC, the Dean, and the FEC within one week. Should the CEC make a negative recommendation, the candidacy cannot go forward except on appeal.

e. Evaluation by Dean

Having received a positive recommendation of the candidacy by the CEC, the appropriate Dean will conduct a separate evaluation. This will be based on the Dean's review of the candidate's file as well as her/his knowledge of the candidate. The Dean may also consult with the CEC, the candidate, or any other members of the community.

For tenure decisions, the Dean submits a report and recommendation addressed to the Provost but sent electronically to the FEC, the candidate, and the CEC at least one week before the candidate's meeting with FEC. The candidate may choose to write a response to the report and recommendation, and should send this response electronically to the CEC, the Dean, and the FEC within one week.

f. Evaluation by the Faculty Evaluation Committee

Having received the recommendations of the CEC and the appropriate Dean, and after reviewing the candidate's file, interviewing the candidate, and deliberating, the FEC will write a report and recommendation and sent it to the candidate, the CEC, and the Dean by December 15. Should the candidate wish to challenge the recommendation of the FEC, s/he may send an electronic response addressed to the Provost, but also sent to the FEC, the Dean, and the CEC within one week.

It is the responsibility of the FEC to make the following materials available to the Provost by December 15: the candidate's file; the report and recommendation, together with the letters from outside evaluators, of the CEC; the report and recommendation of the Dean; the report and recommendation of the FEC and additional materials it used in its evaluation; and any optional responses to any of these by the candidate.

g. Evaluation by Provost

Assessing the recommendations from the CEC, FEC, and the Dean, the Provost reviews the candidate's file and makes a recommendation to the President. For tenure decisions, this letter is submitted to the President by January 15. If the Provost accepts a positive recommendation of the CEC and recommends overturning a negative recommendation of the FEC, s/he submits reasons for his/her decisions in writing to the FEC and the candidate.

When a conflict occurs between the FEC and the CEC, or when the FEC receives permission from the Provost to extend the date for submission of its report, the President may extend the date for the Provost's recommendation for a period not exceeding thirty calendar days from receipt of the FEC report and recommendation. The candidate will be notified by the President of such extension(s) and given a revised date for the Provost's recommendation to the President.

h. Recommendation by President

Upon receiving the Provost's letter, the President makes a recommendation to the Board of Trustees. For tenure decision, this recommendation is made at the February Board meeting. The decision of the Board is communicated to the candidate in writing five business days after the meeting. In the case of a negative decision, the candidate has until August 1 to file an appeal. Appointment to tenure and promotion to Professor will go into effect September 1 following the vote of the Board.

Section 5. Promotion to Professor

a. Eligibility

Faculty members with the terminal degree in the appropriate field holding the rank of Associate Professor may be awarded promotion to Professor, after a minimum of five years full time experience in a senior institution at the rank of Associate Professor, of which at least three years have been at this institution. The Board of Trustees, upon recommendation by the President, may waive this minimum duration, but only in exceptional circumstances. The delineation of these circumstances will be determined by each CEC of the College in consultation with the FEC and the Dean.

b. Notification of the Candidate

The review for promotion to Professor is conducted in the academic year preceding the award. Promotions commence September 1 of the year following the award.

By April 15 of each year, the appropriate Dean notifies, in writing, those faculty members eligible for promotion evaluation the following fall. Having received the

Dean's notification of eligibility, candidates seeking evaluation must inform his/her chair and the Dean in writing by May 15. The Dean then provides her/him with a timetable for the evaluation process and a description of the materials that s/he must assemble for the evaluation file (the professional assessment statement, course syllabi, samples of exams and other assignments, samples of written work, and any other information the candidate deems relevant to the evaluation).

c. The Candidate

At the time of the promotion to Professor evaluation, each candidate is expected to make a written statement of his or her activities since his/her last evaluation. All relevant professional activities are addressed: teaching, research and scholarship, and College service. The statement includes the candidate's assessment of her/his successes and failures, as well as a plan for future development. In the area of scholarly research, the College is particularly interested in knowing:

- how the candidate has developed professionally since the last formal evaluation
- how the candidate's research interests and professional activities constitute a coherent path of development, and
- how the candidate's research interests are connected to her/his academic life

Since each candidate's application is judged by colleagues from the general College community, as well as those from his/her particular academic discipline, the professional assessment statement plays a critical role in making determinations about the candidate's professional competence and quality of mind. While a faculty member has reasonable latitude for changes of professional direction, the professional assessment statement is used to make determinations about the candidate's professional development in subsequent evaluations and may be consulted when determinations are made about requests for funding and release time support.

The candidate must submit their materials electronically to the CEC, Dean, and FEC by July 1st.

d. Evaluation by the Candidate Evaluation Committee

Having reviewed the candidate's file and deliberated, the CEC writes a report and recommendation, which makes a case for or against the candidate and sends it, along with the letters from the outside evaluators if applicable, to the FEC, with copies to the Dean and candidate, by November 1. The candidate may choose to write a response to the report and recommendation, and this response will be sent to the CEC, the Dean, and the FEC within one week. Should the CEC make a negative recommendation, the candidacy cannot go forward except on appeal.

e. Evaluation by Dean

Having received a positive recommendation of the candidacy by the CEC, the appropriate Dean will conduct a separate evaluation. This will be based on the Dean's review of the candidate's file as well as her/his knowledge of the candidate. The Dean may also consult with the CEC, the candidate, or any other members of the community.

For promotion to Professor decisions, the Dean submits a report and recommendation addressed to the Provost but sent electronically to the FEC, the candidate, and the CEC no less than one week before FEC's meeting with the candidate. The candidate may choose to write a response to the report and recommendation, and should send this response electronically to the CEC, the Dean, and the FEC within one week.

f. Evaluation by the Faculty Evaluation Committee

Having received the recommendations of the CEC and the Dean, and after reviewing the candidate's file, interviewing the candidate, and deliberating, the FEC will write a report and recommendation and send it to the candidate, the CEC, and the Dean by April 1. Should the candidate wish to challenge the recommendation of the FEC, s/he may send a response addressed to the Provost, but sent also to the FEC, the Dean and the CEC within one week.

It is the responsibility of the FEC to make the following materials available to the Provost by April 1: the candidate's file; the report and recommendation, together with the letters from outside evaluators, of the CEC; the report and recommendation of the Dean; the report and recommendation of the FEC and additional materials it used in its evaluation; and any optional responses to any of these by the candidate.

g. Evaluation by Provost

Assessing the recommendations from the CEC, FEC, and the Dean, the Provost reviews the candidate's file and makes a recommendation to the President. For promotion to Professor decisions, this letter is submitted to the President by April 15. If the Provost accepts a positive recommendation of the CEC and recommends overturning a negative recommendation of the FEC, s/he submits reasons for his/her decisions in writing to the FEC and the candidate.

When a conflict occurs between the FEC and the CEC, or when the FEC receives permission from the Provost to extend the date for submission of its report, the President may extend the date for the Provost's recommendation for a period not exceeding thirty calendar days from receipt of the FEC report and recommendation. The candidate will be notified by the President of such extension(s) and given a revised date for the Provost's recommendation to the President.

h. Recommendation by President

Upon receiving the Provost's letter, the President makes a recommendation to the Board of Trustees. For promotion to Professor decision, this recommendation is made at the May Board meeting. The decision of the Board is communicated to the candidate in writing five business days after the meeting. In the case of a negative decision, the candidate has until August 1 to file an appeal. Appointment to Professor will go into effect September 1 following the vote of the Board.

	Mid-Course Evaluation	Tenure & Promotion	Promotion to Professor
Dean notifies Candidate re: eligibility	April 15	April 15	April 15
Candidate notifies Dean re: intention, CEC formed	May 15	May 15	May 15
CEC Chair notifies Dean, candidate, and FEC of CEC make up	June 1	June 1	June 1
Candidate electronically submits materials to CEC members, Dean, and FEC members	December 15	July 1	July 1
CEC submits letter to candidate, Dean, and FEC Chair	February 15	October 1	November 1
Dean submits letter to candidate, CEC Chair, and FEC Chair	At least 1 week before Candidate's FEC meeting	At least 1 week before Candidate's FEC meeting	At least 1 week before Candidate's FEC meeting
FEC submits letter to candidate, CEC Chair, and Dean	May 15	December 15	April 1
FEC submits letter to Provost	N/A	December 15	April 1

ARTICLE IX AMENDMENT PROCEDURE

These bylaws, or any provisions thereof, may be abrogated or amended at any meeting of the faculty by vote of two-thirds of those present, assuming a quorum, provided that a notice one week prior to the meeting shall contain a copy of the proposed amendment or amendments. The amendment ultimately made need not be in the exact form in which it was sent to each faculty member, but must deal with the same subject matter.

Rev. 7-17-09
Reviewed 7-27-09
Rev. 11-01-11

ATTACHMENT #2: MERIT PAY

TO: Dr. Robert Smither, Dean of Arts and Sciences & Executive Committee

FROM: Finances and Service Committee

DATE: 6/4/13 12:34 PM

RE: Recommendations for Revising the Merit Pay Distribution Process

NOTE: When the faculty originally created a process to implement the distribution of merit pay, it was based on the premise that merit would be in addition to cost of living adjustments. Given that the Rollins Board of Trustees has declared that any forthcoming pay raises for Rollins faculty will be distributed on the basis of merit, the faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences recommend to the Dean of Arts and Sciences the following procedural changes as part of our ongoing efforts to create an equitable, accountable, and understandable merit-pay system.

- 1) Submission of both the FSAR and a merit pay application sheet (Appendix 1) will be required to be eligible for merit pay.
- 2) A five-member elected committee of tenured faculty chaired by a faculty member will report to the Dean of Arts and Sciences their recommendations regarding who will receive merit raises. The Dean and the Committee will meet to reconcile any disagreements regarding who shall receive merit pay.
- 3) Assessments may include achievements accomplished over a period of three years. The goal of assessment should be to identify a broad pattern of achievement rather than checking off a series of boxes.
- 4) Merit pay will be determined in two categories only. Awards such as the Arthur Vining Davis, the Cornell and Bornstein Scholars, and the endowed chairs will continue to acknowledge exceptional levels of performance.
- 5) Faculty who meet expectations in two of the three categories (teaching, professional work, and service) will be awarded merit pay.
- 6) Faculty having been awarded tenure and/or promotion within the past year will not be reevaluated but will automatically receive a designation of merit for that academic year.
- 7) Faculty who are deemed not to meet expectations for merit pay can submit an appeal to the elected appeals committee and/or meet with the Dean to discuss appropriate professional development opportunities.
- 8) The Dean's office will provide information in the fall semester regarding:

the number of faculty who were eligible for merit in the previous academic year
the number who applied for merit pay
the number who received merit pay
examples of activities considered meritorious in teaching, scholarship, and service

- 9) The Dean of Arts and Sciences will publicly announce in the spring semester the precise amount of merit pool funds for that year as decided by the Board of Trustees.
- 10) The Dean of Arts and Sciences will work with the deans of Holt and CPS to ensure that merit pay does not advantage or disadvantage faculty based on college affiliation.
- 11) The procedural and substantive aspects of merit pay will be reconsidered periodically to fairly, openly, and honorably maintain standards in the future distributions of raises.
- 12) After a two-year period affected faculty will review this process and revised as needed.

APPENDIX 1.

Name _____ Dept. _____

FACULTY MERIT PAY APPLICATION

Accomplishments June 1, 2010 - May 31, 2011

Please list only three items per category

Teaching (last 3 years)

1.

2.

3.

Scholarship or creative equivalent (last 3 years)

1.

2.

3.

Service (last 3 years)

1.

2.

3.

Please forward completed form to thall@rollins.edu