

10-17-2013

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Executive Committee Meeting, Thursday, October 17, 2013

Arts & Sciences Executive Committee

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



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

Recommended Citation

Arts & Sciences Executive Committee, "Minutes, Arts & Sciences Executive Committee Meeting, Thursday, October 17, 2013" (2013). *Executive Committee Minutes*. Paper 9.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ec/9

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 Executive Committee Minutes by an authorized administrator of Rollins Scholarship Online. For more information, please contact wzhang@rollins.edu.



EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

OCTOBER 17, 2013

Minutes

APPROVED

PRESENT

Carol Lauer; Thomas Ouellette; Claire Strom; Fiona Harper (for Julian Chambliss); Hoyt Edge; Yusheng Yao; Carol Bresnahan; Robert Salmeron; Jennifer Cavanaugh (for Bob Smither); Rich Morris; Bob Sherry; Keith Buckley

The meeting was called to order by Carol Lauer at 12: 36PM.

The minutes from the Executive Committee (EC) meeting on September 12 were approved, with 2 minor changes. Minutes were sent to Rollins Scholarship Online via Archives.

REPORTS

Executive Council

Carol Lauer asked committee chairs if they received and understood the email from Wenxian Zhang (Olin Library Head of Archives and Special Collections) dated October 11 regarding the forwarding of the meeting minutes for the A&S faculty, EC, and A&S standing committees (except FEC). Carol asked committee chairs to instruct their secretaries to forward to Archives all minutes for meetings that have already taken place in the F'13 semester, and to routinely send minutes (with appropriate attachments) for all subsequent meetings directly to Archives after they have been approved by the respective committees. Carol asked the chairs if they felt the need for Zhang to attend an EC meeting to walk them through the new online process and the chairs said that wasn't necessary.

Because she anticipates that the agenda items for the next A&S faculty meeting (on October 31) may prompt spirited if not lengthy discussion, Carol asked the committee chairs to submit (only) written reports for that meeting.

Lauer reported that she and Thomas Ouellette met privately with President Duncan on October 01, 2013 and that a range of issues were raised and discussed. The President asked Lauer and Ouellette to meet with him monthly to review pressing issues. The discussion at this first meeting centered on two main issues: the need for a combined (A&S and CPS) Faculty Evaluation Committee and for a combined Academic Affairs Committee. Lauer reported that the President seemed supportive of the former and skeptical about the latter. Lauer reported further on her give-and-take with the President later in the EC meeting (see below).

Bob Sherry, FEC Chair

Bob Sherry brought a revamped proposal to amend the A&S by-laws regarding the structure and composition of Candidate (departmental) Evaluation Committees (CECs) for tenure and promotion. The proposed by-law change addresses and clarifies policies regarding the formation of CECs and the responsibilities of, and voting responsibilities for, individual CEC members. Sherry said that the proposed

change grew out of discussions within his committee and are meant to address three areas of concern regarding the make-up of CECs: conflicts of interest, clarity, and confidentiality. Further, he pointed out that the impulse to craft this by-law change emerged from discussions within the FEC as the current FEC liaisons reported discomfort about perceived conflicts of interest in some departments.

Lauer welcomed the revisions to the proposal and said that she supported it. Claire Strom and Fiona Harper raised concerns about how the new policy would affect their (and other) departments, particularly smaller ones. Strom asked if it was the appropriate time to codify and standardize the practice of requiring letters of support from outside (of Rollins) evaluators as an adjunct to departmental review. Harper said that she would be hard-pressed to find an outside colleague in her discipline to evaluate her scholarship who would appreciate the level of scholarship possible at a small liberal arts institution like Rollins. Strom expressed concern that the proposed change would be at odds with the ethos of transparency and inclusion valued in some departments.

Lauer pointed out that individual departments can and do require outside letters of support under the current guidelines, and that individual candidates may solicit them, at any rate, if they feel their inclusion would clarify or bolster their dossiers. Lauer said that the proposed change allows all appropriate faculty to weigh in on and otherwise participate in the process of evaluating a candidate's scholarship and other materials—and only requires some faculty to recuse themselves from the end of the process: the vote.

Carol Bresnahan pointed out that the current system for tenure and promotion theoretically allows one recalcitrant faculty member to derail the process; that if a candidate is not supported at the departmental level that no further evaluation takes place (by the Dean of Faculty or Provost), thereby giving an inordinate amount of sway to the subjective evaluation of a single colleague.

Sherry asked if the proposal should be discussed in another committee, perhaps PSC, before being brought to the full A&S faculty.

Calling the proposed by-law change “the lesser of two evils,” Lauer said that she would prefer that the full faculty had the opportunity to openly discuss the merits and asked the members of the EC if they wanted to bring forward to the full faculty the proposed change and, further, if they endorsed it. Hoyt Edge questioned whether it was the place of the EC to endorse a proposal; he said that his understanding was that as long as a proposal had been appropriately vetted it should go forward. Strom said that the practice of the EC over the last four years or so was to inform the A&S faculty whether or not a specific proposal was endorsed by the EC or not. The EC voted unanimously to bring Sherry's revised proposal before the A&S faculty but did not endorse it. Two minor cuts to the proposal were recommended—one a typo; the other the words, “or Chairs of joint departments.” Sherry agreed to make the changes and return the “clean” document to Lauer so that she can forward it to the A&S faculty prior to the requisite seven days before their next meeting on October 31.

Rich Morris, Rollins Athletics

Rich Morris brought to the EC a proposal for revamping students' physical education requirements. The proposed calls for the adoption of a Predictive Health Competency composed of:

- 1 for-credit course (the renamed Predictive Health Behavior **or** Physiology of Human Health and Performance) plus
- 2 non-credit “activity courses” **or** two or more years of team participation at the varsity level

Strom endorsed the competency model, said it was in line with the changes being crafted for the

general education curriculum, and that the proposal had grown out of discussions between Athletics and Strom and the PSC. Morris concurred, saying that he believes the proposed changes broaden opportunities for students and that the model, as currently proposed, took shape when Athletics was charged to answer this question: "When you envision a better structure, what does it look like?"

Lauer and Edge said that efforts to propose similar changes to the Athletics program at Rollins had been unsuccessful because they required significant staffing changes and increased funding. Morris countered that under the current model and at current staffing levels, Athletics serves close to 200 students per semester in eight sections of their Health and Wellness course. Strom and Morris pointed out that these numbers are in line with the numbers of students projected for the writing and math competencies; Morris said that they can and do regularly serve 200+ students at their current staffing levels.

The issue of staffing levels and especially of staff members offering for-credit courses opened up a more broad discussion. Morris and others pointed out that there are currently *no* faculty members in the Athletics Department (which also no longer exists, as a Department). Jennifer Cavanaugh pointed out that the policy regarding staff members offering for-credit courses was implemented for and is mostly enforced regarding RCC faculty, and that staff now offer for-credit Athletic courses and have for many years.

Bresnahan offered that since it appears as though the original decision regarding the faculty status of Athletics personnel was an administrative one that it could be revisited at that level (via the respective Deans and Provost).

Lauer closed the discussion about the Athletics competency by proposing that the larger issues regarding staffing, faculty status, etc. should be raised at the Executive Council because they affects all students. Lauer asked the EC if the Predictive Health Competency proposal should be brought to the full A&S faculty and the EC endorsed the proposal.

At the close of the meeting, Lauer returned to the idea of combined committees, similar to the current FECs and AACs, that was raised in her discussion with Ouellette and Duncan on 10/01/2013. Lauer said that she expressed to Duncan her concerns about potential lawsuits and that the likelihood of such challenges was exponentially increased if candidates can point to vastly different standards for tenure and promotion amongst academic departments at Rollins. Citing a biological tenet called Resource Partitioning, Harper pointed out that "the creation of the college [CPS] opened up what appears to be niches (areas of occupation), when in reality there is considerable overlap."

of that the current double-AAC model encourages overlap and discourages the creation of discreet and sustainable niches. Ouellette pointed out that the need for an "umbrella ACC" was brought into sharp focus at a recent meeting with A&S business faculty who expressed concern about the amount of direct overlap between the existing business program in A&S and the nascent one in CPS. Ouellette remarked that the impetus to differentiate the two programs did not appear to be primarily a pedagogical one. Lauer agreed and pointed out that the issue is larger than the tensions emerging between the two business programs; she suggested that to ignore this duplication, particularly when the institution is looking for ways to save two million dollars, is "just absurd." Lauer repeated that President Duncan seems considerably more supportive of a combined committee to oversee tenure and promotion criteria of a similar committee to oversee curricular concerns. Lauer feels that these issues of "turf" and duplication have been intensified by the creation of CPS; that similar concerns will arise as the two colleges co-exist alongside one another. She said that she expected to continue this discussion at a future Executive Council meeting.

Lauer said that the next scheduled EC meeting on October 24 may be cancelled and that EC members would be notified regarding that by October 21; she adjourned the meeting at 1:38PM.

FEC Proposed By Laws Change - New Version

Section 1.

Candidate Evaluation Committee (CEC) Structure and Evaluation

a. Composition

While the composition and structure of a Candidate Evaluation Committee (CEC) varies among departments, normally the *minimum* membership is three individuals and the Department Chair or a senior departmental faculty member serves as the CEC Chair.

The Department Chair wherein the candidate holds appointment (or Chairs for joint appointments), in consultation with departmental members, shall select a Candidate Evaluation Committee (CEC) in conformity the requirements set forth below (§§1-5), on or before May 15 prior to the academic year in which the candidate's evaluation takes place. In selecting a candidate's CEC, the Department Chair may wish to consult with the Dean of Arts and Sciences, since the Dean retains authority to *disapprove* the CEC's composition.

1. Voting Membership For Tenure and Promotion Evaluations:

A candidate's *voting* CEC shall normally consist of the Department Chair (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 qualified tenured members who wish to serve. Only tenured associate professors and full professors may vote on the promotion of assistant professors. Only full professors are eligible to vote on the promotions of associate professors. If the chair is untenured or does not hold the rank for which the candidate is making application, the *voting* CEC, in consultation with the Dean, shall select an appropriate CEC and CEC Chair.

2. Special Circumstances:

Where three qualified (per § 1 above) tenured members of the department are unavailable, the Dean of Arts and Sciences, in consultation with the Department Chair, candidate and the department, shall select tenured faculty members from outside the department (or in very rare instances from outside the College), to serve as *voting* or *non-voting* CEC members.

3. Non-Voting CEC Membership:

Departments are encouraged to include other tenured and tenure-track faculty as *non-voting* CEC members in the evaluative process, so that those faculty members may confidentially review material submitted, provide input and information, and gain knowledge about Rollins evaluative standards, policies, and practices. To ensure confidentiality, *non-voting* CEC members shall not be present for the actual vote-casting or for discussions about vote-casting.

4. FEC Liaison:

A member of the Faculty Evaluation Committee (the FEC Liaison) serves on each tenure or promotion committee as *non-voting* member. The FEC liaison's primary functions are to provide procedural information and support to the CEC/candidate, promote compliance with departmental criteria, and ensure institutional uniformity.

5. Confidentiality:

A breach of confidence by a participant in an appointment and promotion matter is considered to be a serious violation of professional ethics. In this regard, the entirety of a candidate's tenure and promotion proceeding (exclusive of non-confidential documents from the candidate's file) shall be held in strict confidence by all participants. CEC participants shall not discuss the opinions expressed by the Rollins administration, faculty, or by internal or external referees with the

candidate or with other external parties until the candidate's formal evaluation letter is dispersed by the CEC. Post the candidate's CEC meeting, the Department Chair or his/her designee (including but not limited to the CEC Chair) shall convey any and all appropriate information to the candidate in a timely fashion.

The CEC Chair shall send notice of the CEC's composition to the FEC, Dean, and candidate by June 1.

Predictive Health Competency: Proposed Learning Outcomes-

Intellectual and Practical Skills (LEAP ELO #2)

Evidence based data regarding all facets of predictive health, including but not limited to

1. Diet and nutrition
2. Stress management and lifestyle choices
3. Personal fitness level and projected life expectancy
4. Addictive behavior avoidance
5. Use of medicine and over the counter remedies

Experiential learning regarding healthful physical activity

1. Learn skills necessary to participate in healthful physical activities
2. Know the implications and benefits of involvement in healthful physical activities
3. Value physical activity and its contribution to a healthy lifestyle.

VALUE rubric; informational literacy; second level milestones.

Determine the extent of information needed: Understanding health risks based on evidence, not theory. Identify sources that are grounded in science, understand use of anecdotal evidence.

Access needed information: Access information that is clear and evidence based.

Evaluate information and its sources critically: Health is written about constantly. It is critical that one learns to find the root source and weigh the legitimacy of health claims. The role of social media must be addressed.

Use information effectively to accomplish a specific purpose: The purpose is personal health, the problem is always getting the right information, critically assessing it and using it effectively.

Access and use information ethically and legally: Proper format is learned and applied.

Competency can be met by:

Predictive health data:

1. BPE 101 (4 credit), *Predictive Health Behavior* OR
2. PED 201, (4 credit) *Physiology of Human Health and Performance*

Experiential learning:

1. 2 non-credit PEA activity courses OR
2. Varsity participation for two or more years.