

10-4-2011

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Finance and Service Committee Meeting, Tuesday, October 4, 2011

Arts & Sciences Finance and Service Committee

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

Recommended Citation

Arts & Sciences Finance and Service Committee, "Minutes, Arts & Sciences Finance and Service Committee Meeting, Tuesday, October 4, 2011" (2011). *Finance and Service Committee Minutes*. Paper 10.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_fs/10

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

A Governance committee of Rollins College

Minutes of the meeting of 10/4/2011, 12:34-1:52 PM, Carnegie conference room

Attending: Joseph Siry (F), Laurel Goj (F), Cynthia Snyder (F), Robert (Bob) Moore (F), Twila Papay (F), Paul Reich (F), Diane Willingham (S), Meredith Hein (S), and student representatives Lila Martin and Sanjay Rana

OLD BUSINESS

Minutes from the meeting on 9/6/11 were approved.

NEW BUSINESS

1. Cynthia Snyder has a conflict with the meeting times for the college sustainability committee. Therefore F&S will take nominations/volunteers at our next meeting for her replacement.
2. Joe Siry has been attending the budget and planning meetings and provided the following information in an update.
 - a. There is debate over a 2-4% tuition increase for next year with the goal of keeping it closer to the 2% mark favored by the board of trustees.
 - b. President Duncan indicated retention of 20 students is critical.
 - c. 1 in 5 students do not return for a third semester
 - d. Laurie Joyner will join F&S in our November meeting for a discussion on student retention.
3. The majority of the meeting focused on a discussion of merit pay initiated by a proposal sent by Professor Eileen Gregory. The text can be found at the end of these minutes. The following points were discussed.
 - a. Members of the committee agreed that the money should be distributed this year rather than be held in escrow.
 - b. The Gregory proposal does not include those who were not evaluated previously because they were new faculty members at the time.
 - c. More people will apply to be reevaluated than just "a few faculty."
 - d. There will be difficulties with reassessment given the lack of a specific rubric utilized the last time.
 - e. The proposal is punitive for those who exceeded expectations the last time.
 - f. It was noted that help in the form of monetary aid for research travel and anecdotally course releases were granted for those who did not meet merit expectations to help improve their scholarship and teaching respectively.
 - g. Clarification of what is measured should be more clearly stated in the FSAR.
 - h. Questions arose regarding the campus committee examining how teaching is evaluated in addition to the CIE's. It was noted that staff does not have a mandatory 360 review for merit pay but it is becoming encouraged.

4. The members of F&S agreed to invite Dean Bob Smither to discuss the merit pay issue with our committee on a meeting tentatively scheduled for Tuesday, November 29th.

SUBMITTED PROPOSAL

Joe [Siry],

I have two suggestions for your committee to consider in regards to the salary money held in escrow for CAS.

1. I suggest that the money be distributed as soon as possible. I do not believe it is fair to hold this money in escrow until the amount becomes sufficiently large to be worth distributing as unequal merit pay. Doing so would be unfair to faculty who are leaving the College at the end of this AY due to retirement or other reasons. They are working hard and it is unfair to withhold money from their salaries until after they have left the college.

2. I realize that the awarding of merit pay as it was done the two years we did it was very time consuming, but by not giving faculty the opportunity to apply for merit pay we essentially are giving merit pay without meaning to. Faculty who in the two merit determinations in recent past years were classified as exceeds expectations are now making \$2000 more than colleagues who were classified as not meeting expectations during those two years. This continuing discrepancy is unfair unless those who did not make the highest rating have the opportunity to demonstrate that they have improved and should receive a higher classification. Without this opportunity our merit pay system is discriminatory and is punitive rather than being a program that encourages faculty development.

I propose that any faculty member who in the last merit pay review did not receive a ranking of "exceeds expectations" and thus did not receive the salary increase that went with that classification should have the right to request a review and their salary be adjusted appropriately using the amount associated with the rankings as of the last review. So if someone who was classified as "not meeting expectations" could now demonstrate that they "meet expectations" they would receive an additional \$500 to their base salary. If a faculty member classified as "meets expectations" could demonstrate that they now "exceed expectations" then they would get \$500 added to their base salary. Faculty who were classified as "exceeds expectations" in the last review would not be eligible for any additional merit salary.

This procedure would not be time consuming since it would not require review of the entire faculty; only those who believe that they can demonstrate that they have progressed from one category to the next would be reviewed. Since it is likely that only a few faculty would apply for the review and receive the new classification, this should not use up very much of the salary pool that is being held in escrow; however it would help boost morale and emphasize the developmental aspect of merit pay. If this opportunity is not provided then we instead have an unfair merit system where those faculty ranked

highly two years ago continue to receive more money than those ranked lower with no opportunity for the latter to improve their financial position.

I suggest that the merit review I described above take place and salaries be adjusted accordingly. Then the remaining money be distributed equally among all of the CAS faculty.

Respectfully,
Eileen [Gregory]