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Minutes
Executive Committee
April 5, 2012

In attendance: Alexandria Mozzicato, Joan Davison, Gloria Cook, Joe Siry, Jenny Queen, Jill Jones, Bob Smither, and Dexter Boniface.

1. Approval of Minutes. There are no minutes available for approval. The committee will approve two sets of minutes at the next meeting.

2. Committee Reports

- PSC Report: Joan Davison reports that PSC completed its work on revision of the A&S bylaws. The committee suggests the amendments be treated as a consent agenda and faculty members be prepared to separate sections which they wish to debate. Jenny Queen asks what a consent agenda is. Joan replies that the idea is that individual changes can be voted on separately; changes that do not require further debate will be voted as a block. Joan states that she anticipates that there will be some opposition to certain bylaw changes. For example, some A&S faculty may oppose any CPS representation on A&S committees. PSC also discussed the Academic Dishonesty Policy which passed in the fall. PSC wonders if the policy 1) complies with federal guidelines, and 2) adequately serves the needs of the respondent. The committee concurred that it lacked the expertise to measure Rollins’ policy against federal regulations and asked EC to inquire whether an attorney can examine the policy. Furthermore, PSC hopes to return to the issue of Student-Faculty Summer Collaborative Research Grants at its last 2011-2012 meeting. The Committee still believes changes should be made in the grant program and wonders who in the administration will supervise the grants next year. PSC would like to know the budget for the program. PSC advises that the program make changes in the application process and possibly the grant criteria. Joan asks about revisions to the FSAR. She wonders what weight is given to student enrollment numbers. She notes that some class times are not conducive to higher enrollments. Jenny Queen states that the information is included to acknowledge high class loads not penalize small ones. Dexter
Boniface states that he did not realize that the FSAR was being revised. Bob Smither notes that this was a request made at the last chair meeting; namely, that the FSAR form be simplified. Joan Davison asks what the purpose of the FSAR is. She states that she believes it was initially developed to satisfy SACS accreditation requirements. Bob states that he was unaware of any connection to SACS but he will look into it before making any changes. Bob states that the FSAR is used in connection with certain awards, albeit infrequently.

- F&S. Joe Siry presents F&S recommendations for revising the merit pay distribution process (see attachment below). Jenny Queen seeks clarification of the meaning of point four in the document; what are the two categories. Dexter Boniface draws attention to Carol Bresnahan’s remark about point five: should meeting expectations in teaching be a necessary (not sufficient) condition of merit? He states that this idea deserves consideration. Joan asks what happens if an untenured faculty member consistently receives merit and does not receive tenure. Joe Siry asks Allie if students are aware of the value the faculty place on students teaching evaluations. Allie replies no, this is not generally well understood. Dexter Boniface raises a concern about point two of the document: election of a faculty committee to make merit recommendations. Joe states that F&S contemplated many different possibilities for this committee, such as division chairs or department chairs, but ultimately decided on an elected committee. Jill asks about divisional representation on this faculty committee. Bob Smither states that that he supports the idea of having some type of committee involved in the decision-making; it is not desirable to have this decision wholly in the Dean’s office. He suggests that this system has proved divisive at Rollins. Bob suggests one possible alternative: that the division chairs could nominate people to serve on this committee. Joan raises a question about whether or not associate professors should serve on such a committee. Will they be able to make a negative vote regarding another faculty member’s merit without fear of future reprisal? Joan raises the question of how much time this will take the committee. Jenny notes
that the goal is that the committee to use the short form, so it should not take so much time. Bob Smither states that the goal of this process should be to get faculty invested in a system that is as simple as possible. Joan asks about point four. She notes that the AVD, Cornell and Bornstein awards are all all-college awards. She states that there could be a situation in which CPS faculty members receive more merit for the same type of activity such as the publication of a book. Joe points out that point ten of the document address this. Jenny asks about the appeals committee. Is this a separate committee? Jenny states that she is on a faculty appeals committee now; however, she is not aware if the committee has ever met.

- SLC. Jenny Queen reports that student life business is wrapping up. She debriefs the committee on Fox Day noting that this was a very successful year in terms of good student conduct. Next, Jenny notes that the committee continues to work on the student travel policy. She asks if it would make sense to implement a pilot program. Joan Davison states that she thinks this is a good idea. Jenny states her concern that there is not enough time to bring the issue before the faculty. Joan Davison states that EC can make decisions if the faculty as a whole cannot meet. Dexter Boniface requests that we discuss this at the next EC meeting.

- SGA. Allie reports that Fox Day went well. She states that students on campus appeared to have a good time. SGA intends to survey the student body about what they liked and did not like. Jill states that she would love to have a student-faculty discussion about Fox Day. Furthermore, Allie reports that Nicole (alumni office) talked to SGA about the senior gift. The alumni office hopes to make this award bigger in the future. Finally, the climbing club has requested funds to participate in a regional competition.

- AAC Report: Gloria Cook reports that CPS approved the proposed changes to the general education requirements. AAC has approved or discussed the following items. First, AAC approved a proposal of one
self-designed major. Second, after consulting with departments such as Environmental Studies, Latin American and Caribbean studies, Biology, Chemistry, AAC has approved the proposal of allowing a CAPE (Caribbean Advanced Proficiency Examination) score of 1 & 2 taken by students in the Caribbean countries to be accepted as the equivalent of AP exams given in this country. CAPE score of 1 & 2 are equivalent to AP score of 4 & 5. Third, Gloria affirms that students can only sign up for one Maymester course. AAC, she notes, has to recognize the appeal process and allow students their right to appeal for two courses. Right now, Rollins has three students who would like to appeal. Two are appealing because they need the two courses to graduate. Finally, Gloria reports that AAC has also approved the proposals to change the core curriculum of the Humanities major/minor at Holt (requiring students to complete at least two of the Humanities core courses at Rollins) and to set up new course submission deadlines for the New Course Subcommittee. AAC has also approved the proposals to combine tutoring and writing consulting training courses offered by Rollins Resource Center, and a change in requirement for the Master of Liberal Studies program (specifically requiring entering students of 2012 to include 4-credits on “Contemporary Culture” as part of their electives).

3. Adjourn to meeting with Bob Smither. The meeting is adjourned.

The following items were not discussed:

Old business

a. The Emeritus Faculty is planning to revise their charter and would just like recognition from the faculty in some way. (All-Faculty business?)

b. Sent the motion from Barry Allen to Lewis and Carol about the VP of Planning.

c. Institutional Planning

d. FEC Slate

New Business

a. Gen Ed revision. Committee
NOTE: When the faculty originally created a process to implement the distribution of merit pay, it was based on the premise that merit would be in addition to cost of living adjustments. Given that the Rollins Board of Trustees has declared that any forthcoming pay raises for Rollins faculty will be distributed on the basis of merit, the faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences recommend to the Dean of Arts and Sciences the following procedural changes as part of our ongoing efforts to create an equitable, accountable, and understandable merit-pay system.

1) Submission of both the FSAR and a merit pay application sheet (Appendix 1) will be required to be eligible for merit pay.

2) A five-member elected committee of tenured faculty chaired by a faculty member will report to the Dean of Arts and Sciences their recommendations regarding who will receive merit raises. The Dean and the Committee will meet to reconcile any disagreements regarding who shall receive merit pay.

3) Assessments may include achievements accomplished over a period of three years. The goal of assessment should be to identify a broad pattern of achievement rather than checking off a series of boxes.

4) Merit pay will be determined in two categories only. Awards such as the Arthur Vining Davis, the Cornell and Bornstein Scholars, and the endowed chairs will continue to acknowledge exceptional levels of performance.

5) Faculty who meet expectations in two of the three categories (teaching, professional work, and service) will be awarded merit pay.

6) Faculty having been awarded tenure and/or promotion within the past year will not be reevaluated but will automatically receive a designation of merit for that academic year.

7) Faculty who are deemed not to meet expectations for merit pay can submit an appeal to the elected appeals committee and/or meet with the Dean to discuss appropriate professional development opportunities.

8) The Dean’s office will provide information in the fall semester regarding:
the number of faculty who were eligible for merit in the previous academic year
the number who applied for merit pay
the number who received merit pay
examples of activities considered meritorious in teaching, scholarship, and service

9) The Dean of Arts and Sciences will publicly announce in the spring semester the precise amount of merit pool funds for that year as decided by the Board of Trustees.

10) The Dean of Arts and Sciences will work with the deans of Holt and CPS to ensure that merit pay does not advantage or disadvantage faculty based on college affiliation.

11) The procedural and substantive aspects of merit pay will be reconsidered periodically to fairly, openly, and honorably maintain standards in the future distributions of raises.

12) After a two-year period affected faculty will review this process and revised as needed.
APPENDIX 1.

Name ___________________________  Dept ____________ __________

FACULTY MERIT PAY APPLICATION

Accomplishments June 1, 2010 - May 31, 2011

Please list only three items per category

Teaching (last 3 years)

1. 
2. 
3. 

Scholarship or creative equivalent (last 3 years)

1. 
2. 
3. 

Service (last 3 years)

1. 
2. 
3. 

Please forward completed form to thall@rollins.edu