

2-16-2010

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Faculty Meeting, Tuesday, Feb. 16, 2010

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, Tuesday, Feb. 16, 2010" (2010). *College of Arts and Sciences Faculty Minutes*. Paper 28.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_fac/28

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.

Approved Minutes
Arts and Sciences Faculty Meeting
Tuesday, February 16, 2010
12:30 – 1:45pm

Members present: Barry Allen, Joshua Almond, Ilan Alon, Mark Anderson, Pedro Bernal, Erich Blossy, Bill Boles, Rick Bommelje, Wendy Brandon, Jennifer Cavanaugh, Julian Chambliss, Ed Cohen, Denise Cummings, Alice Davidson, Don Davison, Joan Davison, Nancy Decker, Hoyt Edge, Mike Gunter, Larry Eng-Wilmot, Marc Fetscherin, Rick Foglesong, Julia Foster, Christopher Fuse, Eileen Gregory, Fiona Harper, Paul Harris, Scott Hewit, Alicia Homrich, Richard James, Jill Jones, Laurie Joyner, Ashley Kistler, Tom Lairson, Carol Lauer, Richard Lewin, Lee Lines, Cecilia McInnis-Bowers, Jonathan Miller, Thom Moore, Ryan Musgrave-Bonomo, Marvin Newman, Socky O’Sullivan, Thomas Ouellette, Rhonda Ovist, Twila Papay, Kenneth Pestka, Roger Ray, Sigmund Rothschild, Marc Sardy, Judy Schmalstig, Jim Small, Eric Smaw, Bob Smither, Paul Stephenson, Kathryn Sutherland, Lisa Tillmann, Rick Vitray, Jay Yellen

Guest: Sharon Agee

- I. Call to Order - The meeting was called to order at 12:39 PM. Foglesong comments on civility and apologizes for his remarks to Newman at the previous meeting.
- II. Old Business – none.
- III. New Business
 - A. Proposed changes to the existing *Strategic Faculty Compensation Implementation Protocol*. – Joyner begins the discussion and clarifies \$180,000 is available for '09-'10 to be distributed this academic year. She notes she already requested \$200,000 for '10-'11 but does not have a response from Trustees on that request. Foglesong reminds the faculty that last October the faculty agreed on the protocol for merit pay, and in the spring FSC made an allocation. Foglesong continues that and in fall '09 the Merit Pay Appeals Subcommittee heard appeals and subsequently offered recommendations for changes to the protocol based on the appeals. As a result EC created and convened CAMP chaired by Smither. Foglesong notes the EC then refined CAMP's proposals into a specific motion. Foglesong then asks all to stand who had a role in the merit process; he emphasizes the faculty's collective pursuit of policy and the fact no one necessarily agrees with every detail of the policy. He then identifies four separate proposals to the protocol. Tillman moves proposal 1 and Harris seconds: "1) Shall each faculty member be notified in writing by the Dean with an explanation of his or her ranking? (Note: "Explanation" means a faculty member will be told how many points he/she received in each category.)" Jones asks whether the faculty voted to have merit pay. Foglesong explains a vote occurred, and individuals do not

always achieve the outcome preferred. Tillmann comments the faculty voted to accept money rather than to have merit pay. Foglesong returns to proposal 1 and emphasizes the intent of the letter from the Dean is to identify points. O'Sullivan asks about whether the proposal should conclude with a question mark. Foglesong agrees, but explains the intent is to incorporate the proposals into the context of the protocol. Lairson asks if the letter is in addition to or instead of the provost's letter. Foglesong asks Joyner to respond, and she answers faculty members will know what category they fall into and the points awarded in each sub-category. Joyner mentions the information on rating from FSC would go from her office to the provost's office with Eck and Holbrooke working on letters. Ouellette suggests the Dean's letter is just a statement of award not an actual explanation. Davison responds the letter explains to the extent it includes subcategory numbers. Gregory comments that the protocol should specify this is a numerical explanation. She also notes she did not receive the information last year, does not care who provides the information this year, but does want an explanation. Gregory moves to insert the word numerical so that the protocol reads "Each faculty member will be notified in writing by the Dean of the numerical ranking." The amendment is seconded, and the question called. The faculty votes to amend the proposal with the clarification of "numerical." Hoyt moves to change the wording of the proposal from ranking to rating so that the protocol reads: "Each faculty member will be notified in writing by the Dean of the numerical rating." The question is called and passes. Homrich then calls the question on the proposal and proposal one passes. Small moves proposal 2 and Tillmann seconds: "2) Shall each faculty member be able to request a re-evaluation from FSC and the Dean? If still dissatisfied, a faculty member can still appeal to the Merit Pay Appeals Subcommittee." Foglesong shows CAMP's flowchart and identifies the new step as an opportunity to ask for reconsideration from FSC and the Dean and perhaps a quicker and more immediate reconsideration. Foglesong also identifies the location of the proposal in the text of the existing protocol. Harris states that if a faculty member only meets expectation then the faculty member was never evaluated by FSC, so how can the faculty member be re-evaluated. Joyner comments any faculty member who asked questions about an evaluation had the issue reconsidered by FSC because elsewhere in the protocol the Dean is given the right to go to FSC for any clarification or advice. Boles clarifies that under the new proposals all faculty members will receive initial reviews by FSC. Lairson notes value in this two-step process. Lauer asks whether a faculty member can request a reevaluation in which the Dean and FSC not only looks back over what already exists but also in which the faculty member presents a case. Lauer offers an amendment to the phrase "each faculty member can request a re-evaluation from FSC and the Dean." She suggests the addition: "with an opportunity to present additional information and additional explanation." The amendment is seconded. Joyner comments the amendment raises an equity issue because people will want to have cases reheard and this opens up to everyone another process and the process might never finish. Gregory expresses concern that

she never received any feedback on FSAR and this is why people desire cases reheard. Ovist notes she is very concerned that in the examination of best practices for merit pay the committee learned it is important not to rush the process or decisions. She perceives, however, that timeliness and efficiency are dominating the process and “we have done nothing but rush.” Ovist quotes Marx, “We make our own history, but we do not make history in circumstances of our own choosing.” Ovist elaborates that rather than pursuing merit pay based on best practices, the faculty seems to be using worst practices. Ovist says this has led to a lack of morale and animosity. Homrich calls the question on the amendment. The amendment to the proposal to present a case fails by 20-19. Davison explains proposal 4 does specify that FSC looks at every faculty member. Small calls the question on proposal 2 and the calling of the question passes. The faculty vote on the proposal and it carries. Tillmann moves proposal 3 and Small seconds: “(3) Preceding the process, shall department chairs submit generic letters to the FSC and Dean to provide contextual information about the department not available in the FSAR?” Cavanaugh explains this proposal came from the department chairs meeting and notes the chairs felt comfortable with a generic letter rather than submitting evaluations about specific individual faculty members. Cavanaugh offers the example that the chair of theater might note theater faculty do not offer 8am courses because they often are in the theater until 10pm at night; the comment is general and not about individual faculty members. Foglesong reiterates generic means department wide not specific to an individual. Vitray suggests a department chair might not have anything to say in a letter, and therefore perhaps the text of the proposal should read “may submit generic letters...” rather than “will submit generic letters...” The amendment is seconded. Tillmann states other members from the department might want a letter. O’Sullivan calls the question and Lewin seconds. The faculty votes and may is substituted for will. Foglesong notes the faculty still is considering the motion for proposal 3 to let chairs submit a letter. Small calls the question, it is seconded and passes. The faculty vote and proposal 3 passes. Small moves proposal 4, and Tillmann seconds: “(4) Shall the available points for assessment be: 1-3 for teaching, 1-3 for service, and 1-3 for scholarship? The Dean of the Faculty will review each faculty FSAR and rate the faculty member within the categories of *Meets Expectations*, *Exceeds Expectations*, or *Below Expectations* based upon the points for assessment. *Exceeds Expectations* will be awarded for 8-9 total points, *Meets Expectations* for 6-7 total points and *Below Expectations* for 3-5 points. The FSC will review each faculty member; evaluation will be based on the FSAR and professional judgment considerations identified by the department chair. The FSC will reach agreement with the Dean on all faculty evaluated.” Foglesong explains this proposal counts each of the three areas equally, but the CAMP proposal called for a 5-3-3 weighting in which teaching was evaluated on a 1-5 scale. Foglesong elaborates the EC did not agree to propose CAMP’s suggestion because the current method of course evaluation is too imperfect to assign more weight to teaching. He notes EC does not oppose CAMP’s

suggestion on policy grounds but rather the operational grounds of how to assess teaching. He states concern also exists about gender and age bias in the teaching evaluations. Schmalstig asks what the numbers mean in the proposal and what one must do to get a three. O'Sullivan notes a grammatical problem in the existing protocol and then extends thanks to the people who worked on merit pay. O'Sullivan concludes that perhaps not that many people are unhappy with the protocol, or more people would be in attendance. Jones says she really hoped we could discuss this issue and would prefer if we did not need to rush through the question. She explains that she realizes a 1 means do not meet expectations, 2 means meet expectations, and 3 means rocked it and did something outside extraordinary. Yet, she notes she finds it hard to understand why if achieve a "meet expectations" in two subcategories and "exceed expectations" in a third subcategory then why the overall rating is not "exceed expectations." Jones states Rollins talks a lot about the significance of teaching, but then it needs to recognize that significance. She expresses concern Rollins is repeatedly changing that message. Blossey says many problems exist with the system and it is a serious issue if we cannot weight teaching more heavily because we do not know how to evaluate teaching; the outcome then is that we do not value teaching at a higher level. Ovist recalls *Teaching in Paradise*, nothing did not discuss teaching evaluations or RCC courses but these now are the measures; she elaborates she decided to teach at Rollins because it valued teaching. She concludes the merit system has brought bickering and a focus which is not to the benefit of the best teaching. Edge suggests if teaching evaluations are good enough to effect the whole life of faculty members in tenure decisions then teaching evaluations should be useful for merit pay considerations. Edge proposes an amendment to proposal 4 which ranks teaching on a scale of 1-6, with exceeds merit 10-12 and meets merit 7-9. Hoyt moves and Jones seconds the amendment to proposal 4. Tillmann explains EC discussed the issue for 40 minutes and the outcome is no one opposes valuing teaching at a higher weight, but the greatest ambiguity is about how to evaluate teaching for merit pay. Tillmann further notes that the merit pay evaluation is different than the tenure evaluation; in the tenure evaluation the teaching evaluation is not the only instrument and syllabi, peer reviews, and other considerations are discussed. Tillmann concludes she could not oppose this weighting more until we have a clear sense of how to measure teaching excellence. Homrich questions if we can define 1-2-3, then why is it a problem to go from 1-6. Lines notes a conundrum exists concerning if we create a system with a very distorted message for junior faculty who perhaps have different standards for tenure. Lines continues he also believes it currently is difficult to rank on a 1-6 scale. Harris agrees with Lines and suggests a better measure could occur at the departmental level. Harris also explains the use of course evaluation forms is limited unless faculty members fall into the bottom 10%. Lauer comments FEC does not use the quantitative numbers of the evaluations because of the problems with the evaluations. Cavanaugh asks for clarification what is going to be used to evaluate teaching for merit pay: is it just the course evaluation or is it other materials including

the FSAR. Joyner states the assumption is all faculty members met expectations. Consideration of below expectations occurs based on teaching evaluations only in egregious cases when a faculty member's teaching evaluations frequently are in the bottom 10%. Joyner also notes the FSC and Dean no longer will use the top 10% to determine exceeds expectations but further notes the top 10% never was used in isolation but rather in conjunction with favorable qualitative comments and teaching awards. Cohen confirms 2 was the default. Small calls the question on the amendment and this passes. The faculty vote on the amendment to proposal 4 and it fails. Gregory inquires whether the FSAR is based on last three years to allow faculty members time to publish, or time to focus on a new course, or perhaps allow for the fact faculty members cannot always be elected to governance committees. She notes this needs to be specified on the FSAR. Joyner responds each question on the FSAR details whether to answer based on one year or three year. Joyner explains the review looks at one year of FSAR (although it contains information for multiple years) but three years of teaching evaluations. Ovist says the system is a problem if it reproduces historical inequalities. Ovist asks for the specific criteria used in merit pay review. Ovist suggests there is a problem if we cannot trust a future dean. Joyner answers the issue for faculty members is that confidence in the system comes from trusting colleagues of FSC, not from trusting me; she elaborates the merit pay process is one of shared responsibility. Foglesong asks about the practical consequence of voting down the motion given that FSC decided the approach, and the point system is what is currently in place. Cohen confirms points were awarded by last year's FSC based on this proposal and that the proposal merely codifies the practice agreed to last year by FSC but not approved by the faculty. Schmalstig asks what is used to determine ratings in the subcategories. Joyner answers the FSAR is used. Schmalstig asks if the interpretation of the FSAR is subjective. Joyner responds the interpretation is a professional judgment. Tillmann notes the system can continue to be reviewed and further changes made. Foglesong asks for someone to call the question. Tillmann calls the question. The faculty vote a tie on the proposal, 18-18. Foglesong votes in favor of the proposal – the proposal passes.

Adjournment - The meeting was adjourned at 1:53 pm.

Attachment 1

STRATEGIC FACULTY COMPENSATION IMPLEMENTATION PROTOCOL

Preamble: To implement the Strategic Faculty Compensation System, the Arts and Sciences Faculty will create two entities as oversight mechanisms: the **Faculty Salary Council (FSC)** and the **Merit Pay Appeals Subcommittee**. The charge of the FSC is to work in a spirit of collegiality with the Dean of Faculty to ensure the mission and goals of the College are clearly reflected in the criteria used to assess merit across areas of professional responsibility as outlined in the Faculty Handbook. The FSC and the Dean of Faculty share responsibility through the process of oversight and review holding each other to the highest standards of fairness, transparency, and accountability. The FSC is a subcommittee of the College of Arts and Sciences whose authority shall be limited to those specified herein. The Merit Pay Appeals Subcommittee further guarantees standards of fairness, transparency, and accountability by providing faculty members a process to appeal their merit evaluations on grounds of substance or procedure. The Strategic Faculty Compensations System will begin as a pilot with on-going evaluation by the FSC and reports to Professional Standards Committee.

Strategic Faculty Compensation Process:

Each fall the Dean of Faculty will convene a meeting of the FSC to share information regarding the likely size of the total salary raise pool and to seek advice regarding criteria, data sources, and rules of evidence. The FSC will recommend to the Dean that the merit process not be initiated if the merit salary pool does not meet or exceed the minimal amount determined by the A & S Faculty Executive Committee. In addition, the Executive Committee and FSC will guarantee the merit pay system exists in addition to (*not as a substitute for*) the current system of promotion salary adjustments, annual across the board percentage increases to base pay, and equity adjustments. Merit pay will be an increase in the base pay for a faculty member and not treated as a one-time bonus. The FSC will reach agreement with the Dean on the division of the merit salary pool into “Exceeds”, “Meets”, and “Falls Below” amounts. The Dean will not begin the process of evaluating faculty until after the FSC meeting.

Preceding the process, department chairs will submit generic letters to the FSC and Dean to provide contextual information about the department not available in the FSAR. The individual assessment of faculty professional performance for merit purposes then begins with the faculty member assessing his or her own performance. The Faculty Self-Assessment Report (FSAR) provides the opportunity for a faculty member to demonstrate how his/her practices and activities meet or exceed professional expectations. The Faculty Handbook, Section V, Article VIII B states the “Criteria for Faculty Evaluation.” While this criterion was established for Tenure and Promotion decisions, the definitions of expectations of Rollins’ faculty in the categories of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service apply to any merit pay evaluations. Therefore the available points for assessment will be: 1-3 for teaching, 1-3 for service, and 1-3 for scholarship.

The Dean of the Faculty will review each faculty FSAR and rate the faculty member within the categories of Meets Expectations, Exceeds Expectations, or Below Expectations based upon the points for assessment. Exceeds Expectations will be awarded for 8-9 total points, Meets Expectations for 6-7 total points and Below Expectations for 3-5 points. The FSC will review each faculty member; evaluation will be

based on the FSAR and professional judgment considerations identified by the department chair. The FSC will reach agreement with the Dean on all faculty evaluated. The FSC will assist the Dean, as necessary, to clarify or validate a specific faculty member's contributions. Each faculty member will be notified in writing by the Dean with an explanation of the ranking. Each faculty member can request a re-evaluation from FSC and the Dean. If still dissatisfied, a faculty member can appeal to the Merit Pay Appeals Subcommittee. In addition, the FSC will assist the Dean in making any necessary modifications to the FSAR to improve its utility and to the overall system to better link evaluation to a system of recognition and rewards that most appropriately expresses the value that the College places on its faculty.

FSC Membership: Membership of the FSC shall consist of the four elected Division Heads from the College of Arts and Sciences and one tenured faculty member elected by the Executive Committee. If a Division Head is not tenured then the affected Division will elect a tenured faculty member to serve on the FSC. The Chair of the FSC will be elected by the committee from the elected members of the Council. The Dean of the Faculty serves as an *ex-officio* member.

FSC Implementation Responsibilities: The FSC will confer with the Dean of the Faculty to clarify the use of evaluation criteria, data sources, and rules of evidence to implement the Strategic Faculty Compensation System. In addition, the FSC will:

- a) review and reach agreement with the Dean on all faculty selected for *Exceeds Expectations* or *Below Expectations* categories;
- b) assist the Dean in the preparation of the annual report on the characteristics of the *Exceeds Expectations* faculty member contributions;
- c) undertake an annual review and recommend changes in all areas related to the salary decision-making process including possible revisions to the FSAR, the procedures for evaluation/review, and the appeals process and make procedural recommendations to the Dean for inclusion in subsequent years; and
- d) work in collaboration with the Dean of the Faculty to continue ongoing discussions and consensus building regarding the values underlying what we consider a productive and contributing faculty member at Rollins College.
- e) review the aggregate outcomes of the merit evaluation process before the final salary decisions are made;
- f) serve as a source of counsel in compensation awards;
- g) advise the Dean of the Faculty in cases where a faculty member believes that the assessment of their contributions is not fair and/or equitable

Strategic Faculty Compensation Appeals Process

Membership of Merit Pay Appeals Subcommittee: The faculty salary appeals will be evaluated by a sub-committee of the Professional Standards Committee (PSC). Membership shall consist of four full professors from the A&S Faculty. If the PSC does not have sufficient number of full professors, the faculty will elect subcommittee members from candidates nominated by the Executive Committee. This sub-committee cannot include any members of the FSC. The Merit Pay Appeals Sub-committee should

have a gender balance and should represent all four divisions of A&S. The sub-committee members will serve a two-year term.

Appeal Procedures: Faculty members will have 14 days after the start of the semester following receipt of his/her salary letter to submit a written request for a re-evaluation. The faculty member submitting an appeal can select three of the Merit Pay Appeals Sub-committee members to hear his/her case. One of the three will represent the division of the appealing faculty member. The faculty member deserves an expeditious handling of his/her case. The appeals sub-committee must respond to the faculty member within 14 days after receipt of the re-evaluation request. Any adjustments to the faculty member's salary as a result of the appeal process will be made at the same time as other merit adjustments. If warranted, retroactive salary will be provided.