

10-30-2012

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee Meeting, Tuesday, October 30, 2012

Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee

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

Recommended Citation

Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee, "Minutes, Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee Meeting, Tuesday, October 30, 2012" (2012). *Professional Standards Committee Minutes*. Paper 24.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ps/24

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

PSC Minutes, October 30, 2012

Present: Joan Davison, Carlee Hoffmann; Julian Chambliss; Robert Vander Poppen; Gay Biery-Hamilton; Julia Foster; Ted Gournelos; Alexander Boguslawski; Dominique Parris

Visitor: David Richards

Passed minutes from the previous PSC meeting, October 16, 2012.

1. We agreed that we should send all of the early Critchfield proposals for sabbatical back to the faculty who requested them to ask for more details, especially about their budgets. We set tentative budget limits for each proposal so that when they are returned with more detail we can quickly allocate the awards.

2. Several issues about these grants were discussed including whether or not faculty should be limited in the amounts that they are awarded, especially those faculty who seem to receive money for these and other grants over the years, and whether endowed chairs should be limited. Several ideas were put forth, including 1) whether a faculty member who received money for three years in a row, would then have to take a year off from being awarded; 2) placing limits by project over a longer period, such as five years (perhaps \$10,000 or \$15,000 for two projects between sabbaticals); 3) asking people to look for outside funding, and indicate that on their proposals for Rollins money; 4) asking people to think carefully about whether or not they need all of the money they request; 5) asking for a clear articulation about how their research or project will benefit Rollins as well as the faculty member asking for it.

We appreciate that everyone has to go through the PSC for all monies now, and that that the process is more transparent than it used to be. However, perhaps there isn't enough accountability, yet? We decided to bring the idea of setting monetary limits for individuals who apply for numerous grants to the EC. Further, we would like to open a discussion about how endowed chairs should be considered, as well as the idea that we desire greater transparency with Cornell and McKean awards.

3. Dave Richards, Dean of Holt, visited us to discuss how Rollins Holt can improve the quality of their faculty and students. One weakness in the Holt program is that there are a number of adjunct faculty who do not have much of a teaching or scholarly background, or teach at other institutions and may not be as engaged with our students, as desired. He argued that we should have one Rollins degree, and thus, the same expectations for teaching excellence and student performance in both the Day and Holt programs. However, it is difficult to obtain good faculty for Holt because we do not pay them well. Further, with so many Holt faculty being adjuncts, it is difficult for him to plan the academic calendar and maintain consistence over time.

He presented a few options for discussion:

1) Hiring tenure-track faculty would be the best option, however, this would be too expensive, given that every Holt student only generates \$9700 (Day students generate three times that amount).

2) Hiring lecturers who are appointed within the Day departments, who would teach 4:4:2 (summer) was another option. These lecturers would teach ten courses a year and hired with a year-long contract with benefits, and be able to be rehired if they were successful. He pointed out that the University of Richmond is using this model. We would keep the best adjuncts we are currently using, and would hire eight to ten permanent lecturers in the near future. Richards argued that we could expect a significant improvement in the quality of Holt faculty, if we adopted this plan. Further, we could maintain 20-30 courses or one-third of the class schedule, which would be much more consistent than currently. These lecturers would be accountable to the Dean of Holt and also to the departments at Rollins.

Several problems were discussed:

1) This model would cost Holt two to three times as much as they are now spending, using adjuncts.

2) Would these lecturers advise students and participate in independent studies? Currently, the lecturers used in the Day program do not. Richards said that the Holt advising system is different and these lecturers would not have to be responsible for that, but that he would expects these lecturers to advise students about graduate school, for example.

3) Day lecturers are not in the protocol for merit pay, and thus, would not get raises because the Board of Trustees aren't giving cost-of-living increases, currently. As it stands now for faculty, merit pay includes three criteria, teaching, scholarship and service. Since we cannot expect as much from lecturers, the question arises as to how they would be evaluated for merit pay, and if they could even expect salary increases at various points in their careers.

Further, if these lecturers are a part of the departments, they would have to be evaluated by the A&S Dean per our bylaws, although the Holt Dean could provide input. Even Rollins faculty who have taught at Holt are not evaluated by the A&S Dean for their teaching there. If Holt instructors were integrated into departments this would have to be addressed. Further, would the departments be involved, also?

4) Current lecturers get travel money, and the best ones are trying to present papers at conferences to acquire full-time positions, and thus, are

professionally active. Naturally they might be interested in applying for tenure-track positions in their Rollins departments when these arise, and this has presented problems for certain departments in the past. It's uncomfortable when an existing lecturer in a department does not get hired for a tenure-track position.

5) Although Holt may hire only eight to ten lecturers now, what will the future hold? How many lecturers will they need in the future, and what percentage of the Holt program will be taught by lecturers? It was pointed out that we get the best people when we offer tenure-track positions. More Day faculty used to teach in the Holt school but that trend has declined over the past decade because they weren't paid enough. Unless Day faculty wanted to teach overtime, hiring them to teach one-third of their time at Holt is too expensive. Given the budget constraints and if we wish to hire more quality lecturers in the future if the program grows, then we should conduct national searches and hire excellent people to fill these positions. However, one big problem is that hiring lecturers creates a hierarchy of teaching staff Rollins, which creates problems. For one thing, students may realize that some faculty are lecturers, and perceive them more negatively than other faculty. Second, how would an increase in the number of lecturers affect departments, and fit into the professionalization of Rollins? Third, national searches and evaluations require a time commitment, and would departments want to participate in these things? Another issue is providing office space for these lecturers.

We decided that we need an inclusive town-hall meeting to begin to discuss these issues about improving the quality of teaching at Holt, since Holt is a part of Rollins. We would expect that the discussions and decision-making process would be democratic.