

4-18-2013

# Minutes, Arts & Sciences Faculty Meeting, Thursday, April 18, 2013

Arts & Sciences Faculty  
*Rollins College*

Follow this and additional works at: [http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as\\_fac](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 18, 2013" (2013). *College of Arts and Sciences Faculty Minutes*. Paper 35.  
[http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as\\_fac/35](http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_fac/35)

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](mailto:wzhang@rollins.edu).

**MINUTES**  
**Arts & Sciences Faculty Meeting**  
**April 18, 2013**  
**12:30 – 1:50 pm**

In attendance: Vidhu Aggarwal, Barry Allen, Joshua Almond, Mark Anderson, Pedro Bernal, Gay Biery-Hamilton, William Boles, Dexter Boniface, Wendy Brandon, Carol Bresnahan, Jennifer Cavanaugh, Julian Chambliss, David Charles, Martha Cheng, Daniel Chong, Gloria Cook, Daniel Crozier, Mario D’Amato, Joan Davison, Nancy Decker, Kimberly Dennis, Hoyt Edge, Christopher Fuse, Yudit Greenberg, Kevin Griffin, Michael Gunter, Dana Hargrove, Paul Harris, Jonathan Harwell, John Houston, Jill Jones, S. Ashley Kistler, Stephen Klemann, Harry Kypraios, Susan Lackman, Lee Lines, Luis Martinez, Jonathan Miller, Jennifer Scott Mobley, Susan Montgomery, Robert Moore, Thomas Moore, Anne Murdaugh, Lisa Musgrave, Rachel Newcomb, Jim Norris, Maurice O’Sullivan, Thomas Ouellette, Derrick Paladino, Kenneth Pestka, Jennifer Queen, Paul Reich, Kasandra Riley, Charles Rock, Dawn Roe, Marie Ruiz, Robert Smither, Cynthia Snyder, Michelle Stecker, R. Bruce Stephenson, Steven St. John, Claire Strom, Kathryn Sutherland, Zeynep Teymuroglu, Patricia Tome, Robert Vander Poppen, Martina Vidovic, Richard Vitray, Susan Walsh, Jonathan Walz, Jay Yellen, Wenxian Zhang, James Zimmerman, Eric Zivot. Guests: Marc Fetscherin, Donald Rogers.

- I. Call to Order. The meeting is called to order.
  
- II. Shall we approve the Minutes from the April 4 A&S Faculty meeting? The minutes are approved.
  
- III. Dual Degree Q&A. Jill Jones introduces Marc Fetscherin and Nancy Decker. Jill notes that the A&S Executive Committee had concerns about the process that led to the creation of the Dual Degree program with Reutlingen in Germany. Marc addresses the faculty. He states that he is pleased to be back at the “mothership.” He reviews the two-year process, beginning in November 2011, which led to the creation of Rollins’ Dual Degree program with Reutlingen. Marc notes that other well-known

Universities as well as close competitors, such as Elon University, have already undergraduate dual degree programs. The Dual Degree program at Rollins is designed specifically for INB students. In terms of process, the program was approved by the INB Department, the CPS curriculum committee, the CPS faculty, the CPS Dean and Provost. Rollins' program is unique in the state of Florida. Marc states that the program promotes Rollins' mission of global citizenship. INB, Marc notes, has not changed its curriculum in CPS and remains committed to the liberal arts ethos, specifically the study of foreign language and area studies. Marc states that the program is bringing new students to Rollins that would not have come here otherwise. It also helps internationalize the campus and student body. Marc and Nancy welcome questions from the floor. Harry Kypraios asks why A&S is involved in this issue if it pertains to the International Business major. Nancy Decker states that students will major in INB and receive a Rollins degree. Jill Jones states that one concern expressed by the Executive Committee to the Executive Council was the precedent. Charlie Rock asks if this is already a done deal. Marc affirms that the proposal went through the CPS governance structure and was therefore approved by the appropriate mechanism. Marc states that this is a narrowly focused program, akin to the issue of transfer students with considerable prior classwork. Marc notes that a review process will be put in place to evaluate the program over time. Jennifer Queen asks if the A&S faculty will be a part of the review process, or will it come to us again as a done deal. Jill Jones states that, in terms of process, she and Provost Bresnahan did not see eye to eye; Jill was under the impression that A&S would have the opportunity to review this program before it was approved. Claire Strom states that the comparison to transfer students is inappropriate; transfers students only receive one degree, not two. Hoyt Edge seeks clarification; is it the case that these students will come to Rollins after two years at Reutlingen. Marc confirms. Hoyt states that he worries about these upper class students taking the first-year Neighborhood courses since they are meant to be academically developmental. Julian Chambliss asks how long Elon has been doing their program. Marc states that Elon is two years ahead of Rollins in that respect. Nancy adds that Elon did this in part to save their German program. Dan Chong asks about the General Education requirements. Has this been discussed with the General Education implementation committee? Nancy states that, yes, they are in contact with the committee. Lee Lines states that this program underscores the need for communication between A&S and CPS. Sharon Carnahan commends the due diligence that led to the development of this program; she hopes that any future programs will undergo the same rigorous planning.

Charlie Rock asks if they explored any other major besides international business. Marc replies, no, that was not their intention; however, he encourages other departments to think about such opportunities; he is happy to help.

#### IV. Committee Reports

1. President's report. Jill Jones gives a short update about the *ad hoc* meeting of the Board of Trustees on April 26-27. She states that the Board members will meet with the A&S EC and Executive Council, but she does not know who else, specifically, they will meet. Jill announces that tomorrow there will be a meeting of A&S faculty at SunTrust Auditorium to discuss the upcoming meeting of the *ad hoc* Board of Trustees committee. This is an informal discussion and there will not be minutes.
2. PSC. Joan Davison wishes to publicly thank all of the committee members for their hard work. Committee members are asked to stand; the faculty applauds those standing. PSC first wishes to remind all faculty members that Rollins does have a final exam policy which is in the handbook, and prohibits final exams being administered outside the designated period unless permission is obtained from the dean. Department chairs might wish to remind members, particularly adjuncts and instructors, of this policy. Second, PSC wishes to remind faculty members that tomorrow is the deadline for the submission of Mellon grant proposals. *Teaching Evaluations*. Finally, as mentioned at previous meetings, PSC undertook a consideration of the Faculty/Course Evaluations. Initially, PSC was concerned that it might be inappropriate to use average scores which combine A&S with CPS, given that CPS has a different mission and offers courses which are career oriented. This concern led to a consideration of the benefit of having percentiles and averages. Percentiles can seem to be misleading; the data tends to be skewed such that very good scores often register low percentile scores. Additionally, PSC wondered whether what we wish to know is the absolute value of a faculty member or course, or the relative value (that is compared to other faculty members and courses). After deliberating about all of these issues, PSC ultimately concluded that college wide averages and percentiles simply should be eliminated. Another question which PSC addressed was the current administration of evaluations, which tends to be outside the classroom (though can be conducted in the classroom if individual professors make the effort). Faculty members

occasionally find among their evaluations comments intended for other courses. Student representatives on PSC stated that the context in which evaluations are completed outside the classroom really is not conducive to obtaining credible feedback. Further there is the problem of the quasi-compulsory nature of the process. Joan notes that the Stanford "Tomorrows Professor" listserv recently sent out an analysis of the use of online CIE tools. This analysis showed support for that delivery protocol with one major caveat that we neglect here at Rollins - "Participation in online ratings is voluntary and requires student motivation to invest time and effort in completing the forms". The fact that we coerce our students into completing the online CIE in order to receive their grades (as opposed conducting the surveys in class as a normal class activity) is problematic. And this is revealed in answers – such as the comment that, “I answered this question already!”, or simply typing a letter into the open ended box. Thus, PSC favors returning the evaluation to the classroom. Student representatives on PSC also suggested that the number of questions ought to be shortened and seemingly less redundant if we want students to be attentive to the questions and provide meaningful answers. PSC also believes certain questions could be better addressed by faculty peers, rather than students. An example is whether or not the instructor is knowledgeable or if their course is current. Given this suggestion, PSC developed a list of questions (see Attachment #1 below). This is the current status of PSC’s consideration of the assessment tool. *Discussion.* Socky O’Sullivan states that from his point of view on FEC an important consideration is what to do about faculty who are nearing promotion. He notes that regardless of the form, it is only “one piece” of information that FEC uses. Socky states that what he does not like about the form is that there does not appear to be a connection between the students’ quantitative and qualitative evaluations. He expresses his own viewpoint that students are often harder on faculty in the quantitative scores and kinder in their qualitative responses. Joan Davison recalls that when we switched to the old form, faculty had the option of using one form or the other, at least in the immediate period following adoption; this addresses the issue of faculty who are nearing promotion. Sharon Carnahan states that there are some great suggestions for changing the form in the PSC report. She states that there are really two issues here; the administration of course evaluations and the form itself. Regarding the latter, Sharon states that she hopes that people with appropriate expertise will be involved in re-designing any form. Charlie Rock asks if the committee gave a lot of thought to the purpose of the form and whether or not it will be used to consider issues of merit. Joan Davison states that the tenured members of the committee view the form as

developmental rather than strictly evaluative, though a broader discussion on this point has not yet happened. Gay Biery-Hamilton states that students often have different understanding of the questions than the faculty. She states that PSC worked with students to develop the question list. She believes that whoever creates the questions needs to keep student concerns in mind. Jenny Queen states there was an extensive process that led to the adoption of the old form and that she is concerned that the same is not happening now. She believes that it is important that faculty be able to analyze the statistical properties of any evaluation form. Joan Davison states that, currently, there is no campus-wide attempt to ensure validity and reliability. Paul Harris states that the current system, which he helped to design over the course of several years, is really a customer satisfaction survey at its core. Given his role in developing the system we have in place now, he asks why he was not consulted about the possibility of overhauling the form. Joan Davison states that she wishes to clarify that, at present, this is merely a report and that nothing has been changed or voted on. This is the first time in three months that PSC has had the opportunity to report on this. Rick Vitray states that he agrees with Sharon that this is going to take some time to develop a new form; he also agrees that the form is redundant and can probably be improved. He states, furthermore, that he believes additional mechanisms—besides teaching evaluations—should be used to evaluate teaching. He states that students may change their opinion of a particular class two years after graduating and that there is no way to easily assess this.

3. F&S. *Merit Pay Committee*. Bob Moore reports that the Merit Pay Committee has now been established with five members all serving two year terms. About half of the committee will rotate out each year. The current members are Paul Harris (2012-2014), Pedro Bernal (2012-2014), Carol Lauer (2012-2014, at large), Bill Boles (2013-2015), and Wenxian Zhang (2013-2015). *Faculty salary augmentations linked to promotion to associate and full professor*. The Finance and Services Committee voted to increase the “bumps” to \$3500 for Associate Professors and \$6000 for Full Professors. The previous amounts (\$3,000 and \$4,000) had been established in the 1990s. We suggested that the bylaws be revised to require reviews of these increments every few years so that we do not see another 20 years go by before appropriate adjustments are made. The provost suggested five year intervals would be appropriate and workable. The Compression Issue. We asked Human Resources if there is a system that we could apply that would automatically counteract the effects of any resulting compression from these new amounts (assuming they are approved by the administration). Reply

from Matt Hawks: "Going forward each year as we promote faculty using the new promotional increase amounts...we will need to review how the increases impact other similarly situated faculty members from a compression/inversion standpoint,...it may be appropriate in some cases to make corrective equity adjustments to the salaries of others. So as a matter of regular practice we would begin reviewing this each year at promotion time. That said, for sake of transparency I think it is also important to clarify that these compression reviews and any related adjustments would in many cases be limited in scope to those faculty in the respective academic department and discipline of the promoted employee." *SunRail and Rollins*. Rick Foglesong made a presentation to the Finance and Services Committee in which he suggested that we support a number of endeavors supportive of SunRail and SAG (SunRail Action Group), a community stakeholder group formed to help make SunRail successful in Winter Park. These actions include the following: 1. Have Rollins develop a protocol for selling fare cards to employees using pre-tax dollars. 2. Have the College provide employee addresses to reThink, a SunRail contractor that is part of the SAG initiative, so they can map these addresses to determine potential transit ridership. 3. Draw up a list of names of employees who would be willing to participate in focus groups in support of a social-marketing campaign. 4. Ask the College to give employees approximately two hours off to participate in one or two focus groups by ReThink and allow ReThink to communicate with potential transit riders among Rollins employees using campus email or other media. We are currently in discussions with Human Resources on how best (and to what extent) we can see these recommendations carried out.

4. SLC. On April 9, the Student Life Committee had a meeting with, and report/update from, Res Life staff members Whitney McDonald and Leon Hayner, and Dr. Gabriel Barreneche regarding Living Learning Communities (LLC's). We discussed the purpose of LLC's, which is primarily to integrate college learning experiences with the everyday lives of its residents. The goals of LLC's are: "to foster greater interactions between faculty, staff, and students inside the residence halls; to enhance academic achievement, retention, and quality of learning; to link in-hall programming academic experiences; and to provide opportunities for interdisciplinary teaching and collaboration among faculty." The fall to spring retention numbers for 2012-13 LLC communities are all above 92%. Topics under discussion for next year: RCC's will continue to be placed in the same hall; roommate preferences will be honored. Possible changes to the faculty-

programming requirement: an attempt to move from formal to less formal interaction such as: In-hall office hours, In-hall advising sessions, Attending social programming planned through Res Life. The students seem to respond very well to informal interaction with faculty. On April 16, SLC had a discussion with Giselda Beaudin from the Office of International Programs, and the HIP Advisory Committee regarding how SHIP grant process has worked this year. The committee's discussion centered on efficiently dealing with the post-grant reports, but most importantly, trying to define what types of experiences we have been funding this year, which have been a bit more variable than we imagined that they would be at the outset. Giselda shared that the HIP committee did not necessarily envision this program to be for the funding of travel only, but rather, High Impact Experiences in general. However, we agreed that it seems to be the travel-type of experiences that are most unattainable by students without some extra financial support. We discussed the possibility of having some kind of a rubric to define how many criteria a given experience satisfies to determine eligibility to make our deliberations easier. However, this year, we have been taking each application as an individual case, and have been evaluating a wide array of student circumstances in determining these grants. We are concerned that the inflexibility inherent in a rubric might cause us to turn down some very worthy projects. Should we be allocating a certain amount of money per semester, or maybe even per meeting, so that we don't run out of money prematurely, before say, student summer projects, have even been arranged? We deliberated on 9 more proposals, nearly exhausting the extra \$3400 that we got from the Office of Community Engagement along with one returned grant, which was our largest of the year. The funds will almost certainly be gone after our meeting on April 23.

5. AAC (report sent by email). Claire Strom reports that AAC has begun to consider some guidelines for blended learning in A&S. Robert Vander Poppen is chairing a committee that is working on this. The first draft was very thoughtful and helpful. AAC saw it on Tuesday and has sent it back for some revisions. A larger problem is how Holt classes are going to fit in to any A&S guidelines, since Holt has already embarked on blended learning way outside of the parameters that A&S are considering.

## V. New Business

1. PSC election. A seat is open on the PSC committee. Nominations are being accepted from the floor. Tom Moore nominates Anne Murdaugh. Jonathan

Miller nominates Elizabeth Hunt. The faculty vote. Anne Murdaugh is elected to PSC.

2. Jill Jones presents the FEC slate to the faculty for endorsement. The slate is as follows:

- Continuing members: Sharon Carnahan (Social Sciences, 2 years) and Bob Sherry (Expressive Arts, 1 year).
- Renewed members: Steve Klemann (Science & Mathematics, 1 year).
- New members: Ed Cohen (Humanities, 3 years); Rick Foglesong (Social Sciences, 3 years) and Mark Anderson (Science & Mathematics, 2 years).

Hoyt Edge moves that we accept the FEC slate. The motion is seconded. The faculty vote and approve the slate by a majority vote—a few loud “no” votes notwithstanding.

## VI. Announcements

1. Socky states that candidates for promotion (and their Chairs) should attend the meeting next week.
2. Jonathan Miller announces that Olin library won the 2013 ACRL Excellence in Academic Libraries Award and that the award ceremony will be held on the Olin Lawn at 11a.m. on Thursday 4/25. If you wish to recognize the hard work of the library staff please attend. Everyone is welcome.

## VII. Adjourn.

## **ATTACHMENT #1: Assessment Survey**

**Faculty Member** (questions #1-5 answered on a Likert scale, that is rating as strongly disagree, disagree, somewhat disagree, somewhat agree, agree, strongly agree)

1. This professor provides effective feedback.
2. This professor prepared the material and individual classes well.
3. This professor effectively engages students.
4. This professor promoted an environment in which students were respected.
5. This professor is willing to help me outside of class.
6. My overall rating of this professor is (rating from very weak, weak, somewhat weak, somewhat strong, strong, very strong ):
7. (Open ended question) Use this space to describe the professor's strengths and weaknesses, and/or explain your ratings.

**Course** (#1-5 as Yes/no)

1. Did this course challenge you in a positive way?
2. Was this course interesting?
3. Did this course teach you something new?
4. Did this course change the way you think?
5. Would you recommend this course to a friend?
6. My overall rating of this course is (rating from very weak, weak, somewhat weak, somewhat strong, strong, very strong ):
7. (Open ended question) Use this space to describe what made this course a positive and/or negative learning experience. You may also use this space to explain your answers.

**Major/General Education Learning Outcomes**

(Up to 5 questions still to be determined by relevant department or faculty)