

4-10-2008

## Minutes, Arts and Sciences Executive Committee Meeting, Thursday, April 10, 2008

Arts & Sciences Executive Committee

Follow this and additional works at: [http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as\\_ec](http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ec)

---

### Recommended Citation

Arts & Sciences Executive Committee, "Minutes, Arts and Sciences Executive Committee Meeting, Thursday, April 10, 2008" (2008). *Executive Committee Minutes*. Paper 84.  
[http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as\\_ec/84](http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ec/84)

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

**Approved Minutes**  
**Executive Committee of the Arts and Sciences Faculty**  
**April 10, 2008**

Members Present: Laurie Joyner, Paul Harris, Don Davison, Barry Levis, Wendy Brandon, Rick Vitray, Barry Levis, Stephanie Schuldt, Roger Casey, Sharon Carnahan, Dick James (visitor).

- I. Call to order – Davison called the meeting to order at 12:35 PM
- II. Approval of Executive Committee Minutes from April 3, 2008 – The Executive Committee postponed approval of the minutes until its next meeting.
- III. Old Business
  1. Professional Standards Committee—Bylaw revision on tenure and promotion – Brandon presented the revision that D’Amato had tentatively accepted at the faculty meeting but members of PSC had raised objections (see attachment1). Harris felt that he still had some concerns with the suggested changes recommended by Homrich. Joyner thought that if law or medicine professionals have to follow current criteria, then professors should as well. Brandon observed that the committee must then present that as the rationale for the proposal. Casey saw strange a loophole in using midterm criteria because a candidate could then delay promotion for many years. Harris suggested that faculty should set a deadline for a set of criteria to be in place. Brandon said that it should be three years. Casey asked if a department rejected a candidate’s application for promotion then if the candidate applied again for promotion then a new set of criteria would apply. Brandon should add the words “for each review.” Vitray thought that this addition would not address some of the concerns expressed by members of PSC. Harris suggested there is a high degree of paranoia among the faculty. Casey felt that someone who had not met criteria is generally talked out of applying by the department. Vitray still liked the idea of having a required midcourse evaluation at least three years before promotion. Casey said that a number of faculty delay promotion for a considerable amount of time. Davison said that there are some male-dominated departments in which women faculty felt uneasy and so there is a concern in that regard. Davison said that he would write up the version to be sent to the faculty in time to reach them seven days before the next meeting.

#### IV. New Business

1. Honors Curriculum – Carnahan presented the changes to the Honors degree program to be presented at the next faculty meeting (see attachment 2). Levis explained some of the changes including the statement that departments may count the honors-in-the-major project toward major requirements. The Executive Committee approved placing the motion on the faculty agenda.
2. Merit Task Force – Dick James reported on the work of the Task Force. They have been talking to departments. In the process they have come up with grounding assumptions. They have also worked on the criteria but then decided that the criteria should be determined department by department. Now they are considering what they needed to provide as a framework for the process. They see the need for a group of faculty to work with the dean to consider evaluations submitted by departments. They don't know if it should be a standing committee or a subcommittee of Finance and Services. They foresee a process in which the departments come up with criteria. Then individual faculty will self evaluate, after which the department could or could not comment on the individual evaluation. All of this material would go to the faculty committee and dean to make decisions. Grounding assumptions based on their previous research. This process would be in addition to and not in place of current adjustments; it would be transparent as possible; and it should be voluntary. If a faculty member does not want to fill out the form, he or she does not have to be part of the merit system. Joyner felt that it should not be possible for a faculty to divorce themselves from the process. Faculty members who are not doing their basic jobs should not be rewarded through salary increases. Levis expressed dismay about that conclusion. He argued that Duncan's letter clearly stated that the merit pool would be separate from the traditional pool. He saw no reason why a person could not opt out of the merit pool portion. Through several deanships, there had been an unwillingness of the deans to take on the responsibility of dealing with some faculty who were not shouldering their responsibilities. Casey strongly disagreed when he exclaimed, "Bull Shit." Faculty needed to take collective responsibility for the actions of their peers. Levis argued that because department chairs do not have real authority then only the dean had the influence to take appropriate action. Joyner felt that the college could not have a system that would allow persons not living up to expectations to opt out. Casey argued that there is a group of faculty who have worked at optimal level and want to demonstrate it to their peers and receive rewards for it. Others would be average and be comfortable at that level. He thought this might be a group that would not see the need to submit materials.

Then there is a third group, those who clearly are not doing their jobs, They should not be included in the average group. Brandon said that what we currently use to evaluate faculty is very adequate. Joyner argued that it is the faculty that should be developing adequate ways of evaluating if current ones are not suitable. Davison said that there had been some evolution in Joyner's understanding of the proposal from what had been presented to the faculty. He felt that devolving this process to the department level is not a particularly good idea. We need to recognize the diversity of contributions but also need to have some uniformity. Joyner agreed that the criteria should be normalized at the college level and at least to normalize across divisions and eventually across the college. Joyner felt that anxiety is coming about because of the newness. Davison said that if criteria are exclusively departmental the result could produce great diversity in standards. James said that the task force could have good agreement on teaching but then it fell apart at the next meeting because departments would not recognize merit in teaching in honors or RCC. Brandon felt that there had to be institutional standards and not just be prisoners of what already exists. There is a great deal of material in AAUP documents that are very helpful. Vitray wondered that if we are asking faculty to do more, what can they do less. He worried about the time commitment. Joyner thought that the AFAR might be the means of self-evaluation. She sees this process as good for the individual. James said that some chairs wanted to have peer rather than individual self evaluations. Casey mentioned that Furman and Centre have good processes for peer evaluations. One has students trained to observe teaching. They provide documented observations without assessment. Davison asked who was going to make a report to the faculty. Brandon argued that we need to focus on the developmental process rather than collecting a few more bucks. We need to encourage a paradigm shift. Joyner also saw the need to take a developmental approach to help the faculty who need help. Casey suggested that the faculty needed to focus on being paid more for high quality rather than high quantity. Brandon thought that would be a relief for senior faculty who are worn out.

3. Bylaws – Davison felt that the changes to Griffin/Boles amendment suggested by Duncan do not meet with directive of the faculty when it adopted the Griffin/Boles motion and requested that it be strengthened through a Bylaw amendment (see attachment 3). He thought that it should be appended to Article IV, Section 1. On meetings of the faculty. He felt that was more consistent with the spirit of what the faculty passed.
4. Honor Code Board – Davison announced that Bernal would serve one more year and Kovarik would serve for a two-year term.

5. Holt School – Carnahan asked if she should continue working with Sharon Carrier to work out arrangements with Holt and AAC in light of the decision made at the last Executive Committee meeting that AAC should supervise the Holt curriculum. The committee recommended that she should.

V. Adjournment – the meeting was adjourned at 1:50 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Barry Levis  
Secretary

## Attachment 1

Proposed Bylaw Change for A&S (brought to Exec Comm today)

PSC April 6, 2008

**Proposed Change: Submitting Departmental Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to FEC FACULTY OF THE COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES SECTION V – BYLAWS ARTICLE VIII: FACULTY EVALUATIONS B. CRITERIA FOR FACULTY EVALUATION Section 2. Departmental Criteria**

[text as it currently stands] “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, including those specific to the discipline. The department shall provide a rationale in support of their standards. The department must resubmit these criteria to the FEC and they must be accepted by the FEC before any tenure track search may be conducted.

[Note: This would take effect for the academic year 2004-2005, and for candidates recently hired the following would apply. Any department with a candidate who has a tenure-track appointment but who has not yet reached a mid-term evaluation, must submit a new set of criteria and have them accepted by FEC before the mid-course evaluation.]”

[proposed amended text] “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, if the candidate has requested a mid-course evaluation, the criteria in effect at the time of the mid-course review will be used; otherwise the most recent criteria will be used.”

[reason for the proposed change] The current bylaws do not specify that criteria for the rank of Professor are to be submitted to FEC, which is an oversight. Furthermore, currently the submission of departmental criteria is contingent upon requests for a tenure-track position; FEC should, however, have the most current departmental criteria for tenure and promotion readily at hand at all times. Also, PSC believes it is necessary for all departments to review their standards for tenure and promotion on a regular basis. Finally, the “untimely” note at the end of Sec. 2

has been replaced by a sentence clarifying exactly which criteria will apply, in case of changes. Note that if new criteria are put into effect, candidates for tenure may choose which set of criteria to use. All other candidates (e.g., candidates for promotion to Professor or for early promotion to Associate Professor), however, must use the most recent criteria, unless they request a mid-course evaluation. The goal here is to prevent a “moving target” for such candidates, while also allowing for criteria for promotion to be reevaluated and revised periodically.

Alicia's proposed change that we discussed today at Exec Comm

Re: the bylaws change:

First of all, Mario, I appreciate all of your hard work on this. I know this has become a thorn in your side! Wendy, I know you have also gone the rounds with this one. From the reaction at the last A&S faculty meeting, it seems there are issues that remain.

First, I don't understand the part of "requesting" a mid-course review (see section below in red). I thought they were automatic? Maybe I am wrong about this, but I thought it was mandatory part of the process.

Either way, the point is that whatever is stated in writing by the FEC during the mid-course review is the criteria that defines tenure. I am not sure that "the criteria in effect at the time of the mid-course review will be used" captures that it is a statement issued by the FEC. Maybe "the criteria identified at the time ..."

Also, I will state again, and concur with Susan Libby (and Jill Jones at the faculty meeting), that I do not support the last part of the final sentence which implies that a change in criteria for associate professors would be applied. I believe this would be a breach of contract and would interfere with an associate professor who, acting with good intentions, meets the criteria stated at the time of their promotion, makes other commitments (service for example) believing to they have met the criteria only to have the standard changed for some part of the criteria for promotion to full professor (scholarship for example). I don't believe the argument that she/he would be part of a departmental vote to the change in criteria is valid. For example, if the associate professor were the only woman or minority faculty member in a dominant culture department, or held diverse views of any kind, a politically motivated ambush could be justified by this bylaw.

See my suggestions in blue below. Alicia

Current Proposed Change of the last two sentences:

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, if the candidate has requested a mid-course evaluation, the criteria in effect at the time of the mid-course review will be used; otherwise the most recent criteria will be used.”

**Alicia's Suggested Change:**

**Any department with a candidate for tenure or promotion will use the set of criteria in effect at the time of the candidate's hiring or previous promotion, unless the candidate chooses to use the most recent criteria at the time they take effect of implementation. Criteria identified at the time of the mid-course evaluation for tenure will be recognized as the defining criteria. In all other cases, if the candidate has requested a mid-course evaluation, the criteria in effect at the time of the mid-course review will be used; otherwise the most recent criteria will be used.**

## Attachment 2

### Proposal for Revision of the Honors Degree Program

Be it resolved that the following changes be made to the Rollins College Catalog dealing with the Honors Degree Program:

#### 1. Special Degree Programs

##### CURRICULUM

Through a series of team-taught interdisciplinary seminars, the Honors Degree Program introduces students to the various methods of inquiry in the liberal arts. The core curriculum (HON 201 Honors Conference Seminar ~~Making Sense~~ through HON 490 The Theodore Darrah Honors Synoptic Seminar ~~450 Seniors Honors Research Seminar~~) builds community by providing a shared experience as students progress through college together. The first two years encourage integrative understanding. ~~The junior and senior years are devoted to independent research, with the seminars providing support, supervision, and direction.~~ In the senior year, students complete an Honors-in-the-Major Field project as well as the interdisciplinary Darrah Honors Synoptic Seminar

##### Course of Study

~~HON 401/402 Thesis Prospectus Preparation: Junior year seminar providing direction, discipline, and support as students seek to identify, sharpen, and develop the focus of their senior research project. In the spring term, students must present a detailed prospectus outlining their plans for the senior year's project and demonstrating preliminary familiarity with the literature in the area. Two term sequence.~~

~~HON 450 Senior Honors Research Seminar: As senior Honors students pursue their individual research projects, they meet on a regular basis to discuss the difficulties that arise in the course of research.~~

~~Students present their work to their colleagues and consider the issues involved in the effort to communicate their results to the wider community. Two-term sequence.~~

~~HON 498/499 Senior Honors Research Project: Intensive, independent research in student's major field. Seniors defend their work before a committee of three faculty members. Two-term sequence.~~

HON 490 The Theodore Darrah Honors Synoptic Seminar. Team-taught interdisciplinary course in which students are presented with a series of contemporary problems and will demonstrate how disciplines represented contribute to an understanding of and solutions to these problems. Students complete this course in the fall of the senior year.

## 2. Courses of Instruction

### The Honors Degree Program

Rollins offers a special program in the liberal arts for students with exceptional abilities. The Honors Degree Program admits students with a superior record of academic achievement and leads to a distinct and separate undergraduate degree - Artium Baccalaureus Honoris - the Honors Bachelor of Arts Degree. Honors students complete a core sequence of interdisciplinary courses designed to provide an integrated understanding of the liberal arts. A series of four team-taught seminars during the first and second years, introduce students to the various methods of inquiry in the liberal arts. These courses substitute for some of the general education requirements of the regular bachelor's degree program and are designed to: (1) teach students to think and write critically across a broad range of disciplines and (2) encourage and prepare students to be independent thinkers. ~~Honors seminars in the third and fourth years support significant independent research projects that represent the culmination of students' careers at Rollins.~~

HONORS STUDENTS

Most Honors students are admitted to the program prior to their first year at Rollins. With regard to academic and social permissions, they enter the College with sophomore status. Attending small, interactive seminars together for four years, Honors students get to know each other and form a community of learners based on shared experiences, collaborative projects, and lively discussions. This sense of community begins during their first days on campus with the Honors Conference Seminar and culminates with the ~~Senior Honors Research Seminar, in which students present and discuss the findings of their independent research projects.~~ Darrah Honors Synoptic Seminar, in which students will be presented with a series of contemporary problems and will demonstrate how each discipline would contribute to an understanding and a solution to these problems. Special Honors Dinners and other Honors activities further enhance this sense of community. Students find that the challenge and excitement of learning is not dependent solely on faculty members, but arises freely and spontaneously within this community of peers.

Adventurous students are encouraged to spend a semester away from the campus (usually in the junior year) pursuing experiential learning, study abroad, or some other exceptional educational opportunity.

#### ADMISSION

Entering first-year students are eligible for the Honors Degree Program if their high school record shows evidence of special scholastic attitude and aptitude. Honors students normally constitute the top 10-percent of the entering class. The Honors Program Supervisory Board, together with the Office of Admissions, reviews the files of the most promising entering students in order to identify and select candidates for the Program.

Transfer students with forty (40) or fewer semester hours may also be selected for admission. In addition, each year a small number of Rollins' sophomore students are also admitted to the Honors Degree Program based on their academic performance, the rigor of their

schedules as first-year students, and recommendations from their professors.

## GRADUATION REQUIREMENTS

### I. COURSES AND CREDITS

(See Courses of Instruction, Honors Degree Program for course descriptions.)

#### A. Seminars

- \* HON 201 and HON 202
- \* HON 301 and HON 302
- \* ~~HON 401/402 (two term sequence)~~
- \* ~~HON 450/450 (two term sequence)~~ HON 490

#### B. Independent Studies

\* ~~HON 498/499 Senior Honor Research Project~~

Honors students must complete a two-semester honors-in-the-major-field project (total of eight [8] semester hours) approved and supervised by the student's department. One member of the student's committee must be a faculty member from the Honors Supervisory Board or a faculty member approved by the board. In addition, the student must make a presentation in the fall semester to his/her committee about the nature of the project and work that has been completed to that point, and make a detailed defense of the project to his/her committee and a more general public presentation of his/her work at the end of the spring semester. The eight (8) credit hours for the honors-in-the-major-field project may count towards credits in the student's major.

#### C. General Education Requirements

- \* Knowledge of Other Cultures (C)
- \* Decision Making and Valuation (V)
- \* Foreign Language (F)
- \* Lab Science (O or P, and N)
- \* Quantitative (Q)

#### D. Major Field

\* Complete courses required for major (48-64 semester hours)

#### E. Electives

\* Includes an optional minor of six to eight courses (32-48 semester hours)

For the sake of providing flexibility in their academic scheduling, Honors students are required to complete only two physical education courses:

- \* one Basic Physical Education (BPE) and
- \* one Physical Education Activity (PEA).

Nonetheless, the Program does support the principle of a sound mind in a sound body and therefore recommends the usual three (3) physical education courses.

Students must fulfill the above academic requirements in no less than 140 semester hours.

#### II. GRADES AND EXAMINATIONS

Candidates for the Honors B.A. Degree must maintain a minimum cumulative average of 3.33 to continue in the program and earn the degree. They must also earn a grade of 'B' or better for ~~both HON-498/499~~ their Honors-in-the-major-field project. Latin honors at graduation (Cum Laude, Magna Cum Laude, and Summa Cum Laude) are awarded in the Honors Program on the basis of cumulative GPA, with the same numerical criteria as in the rest of the College (see the Curriculum and Academic Policies section of this Catalogue).

## I. Rationale

The Honors Degree Program has gone through a major revision of the first two years of the program. The Honors Degree Supervisory Board now believes that we should also look at the final two years so that the entire program can achieve a degree of coherence that has been previously lacking. In particular the program begins as an interdisciplinary experience that focuses on broadening a student's intellectual growth but currently concentrates narrowly on the completion of a research project in the major. All of the HON courses in the junior and senior year are centered on that effort. The supervisory board believes that disciplinary intensity diminishes the enriching experience of the first two years of the program because it focuses so sharply on the major. We believe that a new capstone will reinvigorate the interdisciplinary approach learned in the freshmen and sophomore years. It is also apparent to us that students in the program become so fixated on the research project (some even becoming overwhelmed by the prospect of having to complete one) that it detracts from the purpose of the honors degree program as a whole. We therefore recommend that the following changes be made to the program to give it more coherence and a sharply interdisciplinary thrust.

## II. Program Revision

A. Course Addition. HON 490(?): The Theodore Darrah<sup>1</sup> Honors Synoptic Seminar. (four credit hours). Students will complete this course in the fall of their senior year. The course will be a team-taught interdisciplinary course in which students will be presented with a series of contemporary problems and will demonstrate how each discipline represented would contribute to understanding and solving of these problems. The two faculty members must come from two different divisions.

B. Change in the Final Project. Honors students will no longer be required to complete a two-semester (eight credit hours) research project as currently required. Instead they must complete a two-semester honors-in-the-major project (eight credit hours) which is approved and supervised by the student's department. One member of the student's committee must be a faculty member from the Honors Supervisory Board or a faculty member approved by the board. The student must receive at least a "B" for the project. In addition, the student must make a presentation in the fall semester to his/her committee about the nature of the project and work that has been completed to that point, and make a detailed defense of the project to his/her committee and a more general public presentation of his/her work at the end of the spring semester.

In order to maintain control over the process by the Honors Supervisory Board, the Director of the program will contact all departments who have junior honors students (sophomores in the case of AMP students) likely to begin Honors-in-the-Major projects

---

<sup>1</sup> Named in honor of Ted Darrah, who taught a similar course while he was Dean of the Knowles Memorial Chapel.

the following year so that the proposals can be appropriately prepared. Junior Honors students will be required to submit a thesis topic with a one-paragraph description along with the name of the proposed sponsor to the director of the Honors Degree Program by the end of November. By the end of April of the junior year, Honors students will submit to the director of the Honors Degree Program a five-page description of the project along with the names of all members of the committee including the name of the outside representative approved by the Honors Degree Supervisory Board,

C. Courses to be removed from the program: HON 401, 402 (Thesis Prospectus) and HON 450 (Senior Honors Research Seminar) for a total eight credit hours. Because the final project will come under the department for Honors in the Major, the eight credit hours for HON 498/499 would become credits in the major for the honors-in-the-major project.

### III. Benefits

We believe these changes will greatly enhance the program by giving it an hourglass structure that will emphasize breadth in the liberal arts and provide an integrated understanding of the liberal arts. The new capstone experience will reinforce synthesis across the disciplines with students now conversant in their respective disciplines. We believe that these revisions will encourage new vitality in the program, a process we began last year with the revision in the freshman and sophomore years. As a corollary benefit it will allow honors students to have the entire junior year free to study abroad programs. Also it will aid AMP students who have had difficulty completely the requirements for the Honors Degree Program in three years. Finally the change would have no net effort on faculty loads since the same number of faculty teaching HON 401/402 and HON 450 will teach the new Theodore Darrah Honors Synoptic Seminar. We think it's a damn good idea.

**PROPOSED BYLAW REVISION REGARDING  
REPORT BY DEAN OF STUDENT AFFAIRS  
Arts and Sciences Faculty Meeting  
April 17, 2008**

**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.

(proposed addition)

*AT LEAST AT ONE MEETING EACH SEMESTER OF THE FACULTY OF THE COLLEGE OF 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 THE COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES.*

