

3-13-2012

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee Meeting, Tuesday, March 13, 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, March 13, 2012" (2012). *Professional Standards Committee Minutes*. Paper 29.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ps/29

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 Meeting March 13

Attendance: Robert Vander Poppen, Julie Carrington, Emily Russell, Joan Davison, David Charles, Bob Smither, Dorothy Mays

- 1) We clarified the agenda for upcoming meetings:
 - a. March 20th Meeting is for Student-Faculty Collaboration grants and considering the I.T. grants. The IT grants have already been screened and discussed by a 5-person committee (Jonathan Miller, Pat Schocknecht, Carrie Schultz, Ed Huffman, and Dorothy Mays as the PSC rep.) Most of the applicants received full funding. The applications are available for review at the PSC Blackboard site. We will take the first 5-10 minutes of the March 20th meeting to discuss any questions, but otherwise we are likely to accept the recommendations made by the IT committee. As for the Student-Faculty Collaborations, Joan asks that we submit our rankings to her by Monday March 19.
 - b. The March 27th might be canceled if no new business emerges.

- 2) Bylaw Amendments
 - a. A continuing point of controversy is article II sec. 3 regarding voting membership of the faculty of the A&S. There are two points of controversy here.
 1. The first controversy relates to the suggestion that Artists in Residence, Lecturers, and Instructors be added to the voting membership. If they are made voting faculty, is there a problem under AAUP that grants them the right to demand a tenure hearing after 6 years? Joan says that in the past there has been at least one person at Rollins who has exercised this right and got tenure. Emily wonders if we make it clear they are “continuing appointments” and not permanent appointments if this will solve that problem. She also noted that voting responsibility implies a service requirement that makes them look more like full-time faculty. Having service requirements will have a ripple effect in the merit pay system....these people currently have no service obligation and are not assessed for it. Joan is sensitive to the respect deserving by long-serving artists in residence, but perhaps this is not the time to bring up this issue as it is a more complicated issue than it appears at first blush. We also wonder if we continue to elevate the position of Instructors, Lecturers and Artists in Residence, will we have fewer tenure-track faculty lines in the future? There are also quorum issues. This bylaw change would extend the vote to 23 A&S people, bumping up by 8 the number necessary for a quorum. Will there be an expectation for these people to attend meetings? Attending meetings may become an uncompensated burden for people who already have heavy teaching loads. We are not sure what the difference is between lecturers or instructors. Joan speculates that instructors were ABD...then you convert to Assistant Professor. Lecturers had no such expectation. Although the Executive Committee recommends that we not tackle this issue now, as we were charged with the minimalist approach, we decided to recommend the change in voting status to these people, and see how the chips fall.

- b. The second controversial topic is that voting is extended to and “administrators whose primary responsibility is to teach.” This language excludes the Provost. The current Provost would like us to reconsider this language so that she would have the right to vote in A&S. Joan points out that although we may trust the current people sitting in those offices, we can’t write bylaws in consideration of specific people, but for all future administrators as well. Emily suggests extending the vote to the Provost as a mark of respect to the Provost....but not the other sitting Deans and administrators whose responsibility is not so clearly academic. We want to clearly state “the President of Rollins College and Provost of Rollins College” shall have voting status.
- 3) Article 7. Regarding the A&S rep who will sit on CPS committees. Should the selection of the person be left up to the faculty as a whole...or shall PSC and AAC select one of their own members to sit on the peer committee’s meeting? This creates a potential problem for dueling meeting times. Or should we simply leave this open and not specify. Because their committees are not entirely analogous to ours, we will not make this recommendation at this time.
- 4) Joint Appointments across schools. Article VIII sec A. Which school will be responsible for their FEC review? In the past with joint A&S and Holt appointments, there was still only one FEC and one set of rules. Joan states that a person must be appointed to a department. Even if half their contract is to teach in another school, Joan suggests that we assign that person to their home department for tenure and promotion purposes. Emily suggested the following language to assign tenure and promotion to only one school, but with participation from both Deans:

Faculty members shall be appointed to and reviewed by a single academic department, but teaching responsibilities may be distributed among different schools. In such cases, more than one Dean will be involved in the evaluation of a candidate, and so all statements in Article VIII pertaining to a Dean should be interpreted as applying to “Deans.” Likewise, in programs headed by a Director rather than a Dean, all statements in Article VIII pertaining to a Dean should be interpreted as applying to a “Director.” All reports and recommendations and any responses by candidates will be in writing. Recommendations regarding candidacy for tenure or promotion must clearly support or not support the candidate. Notices of reappointments and non-reappointments are the responsibility of the President and will be in writing. These letters are sent out by the Provost on behalf of the President.