

4-3-2012

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee Meeting, Tuesday, April 3, 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, April 3, 2012" (2012). *Professional Standards Committee Minutes*. Paper 30.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ps/30

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.

April 3, 2012

Present: Joan Davison, Julie Carrington, Julia Foster, David Charles, Dorothy Mays, Emily Russell, Barry Levis, Robert Vander Poppen, Bob Smither, Mike Buck.

- 1) **Student-Faculty Collaboration Grants.** There were 24 applications, which we ranked in order of preference. All but the final two applications were funded. We hope in the future we will have a ballpark figure for how much funding is available, as we spent many hours both individually and collectively trying to make fine distinctions among the top and middle candidates. This work would not have been necessary had we known the award pool was so generous. Given the coming changes in administration, we don't know who will be responsible for overseeing the grant's budget next year, but we will make another attempt to ascertain the available funding prior to ranking the grants.
- 2) **By-Law changes.**
 - a. We decided to change the title of the document to "Faculty of Arts & Sciences" instead of "College of the Arts & Sciences"
 - b. In Article VIII we clarified that faculty members will be appointed to and reviewed by a single academic department, but that teaching and service may spread across different schools.
 - i. We discussed merit pay for faculty who have responsibilities in more than one college. Bob Smither asked for clarification on which college *pays* the merit pay? Joan notes that when people are divided between departments, the salary line is usually split between the departments. Wouldn't the merit pay be split along the same lines for colleges? We think this sounds logical, but we are not certain. Bob notes that there is no budget for merit pay in Holt like there is in A&S. CPS *does* have a merit allocation. After the Board sets aside money for salary increases, who will decide what goes to each school? Bob: That is decided by the number of faculty in each college. Although there is potential for differing merit percentages awarded based on the number of people judged as meritorious, all the alternatives have similar problems. Bob: How will merit be determined for people teaching in both colleges? Joan: Teaching in both schools will be determined by where their home department is. The problem comes with faculty who claim to BELONG to both schools. There are very few such cases, and Joan suggests that we can have these cases handled with 50% for their merit be determined in each school.
 - c. We will ask to present the by-law revisions under a "consent agenda" for voting by the faculty. This will allow us to peel out specific pieces of the document for debate...then let us vote for the remaining document in its entirety. Emily will send out a pdf of the revised by-laws in advance of the next faculty meeting.
- 3) **Faculty Academic Dishonesty policy.** Multiple issues have come to the surface about the policy we passed. It is possible our policy is no longer in compliance with the federal policy that is mandatory for federal grants. Our document used the Dept. of Health & Human Services policy as our starting point. We cut and pasted the portions we believed to be relevant. The problem is that there is another federal document which has

mandatory requirements we do not have clearly stated in our policy. We need to carefully examine our document for discrepancies.

- i. In our document, we call the subject of the review “The Accused.” In the federal document they are The Respondent. The terms are required to be neutral.
- ii. In the federal regulations, it says we are supposed to have an Officer for Research Integrity who screens the cases before it ever gets to the Provost. We don’t have this. Who would it be? How would they be trained? What happens when there is a conflict of interest?
- iii. Joan also notes that if the Respondent is found innocent of the charges, we are to keep the paperwork for seven years. She wonders why we would do this?
- iv. We discussed turning this issue over to an attorney. Comparing the various federal policies is a complex task, and if we alter anything to make it relevant to Rollins, a layperson may continue to introduce problems. Another alternative might be to look at the policies of peer institutions.
- v. We questioned why we used the HHS standards as our starting policy. Devon Massot from the Office of Grants & Contracts was the one who alerted us to the need for a policy and used the HHS policy as a model. We have since learned there are differing policies for the NSF, the NEH, and probably plenty more. How did we land on HHS as the model? David thinks that this question involves a lot of legal questions that may not be under the purview of this committee. Devon’s office has not been brought into the loop on this. David suggests we request a new document from Devon.
- vi. Conclusion: Joan will bring this before the EC: We believe this is too complex an issue for us to handle without legal counsel, and we recommend this be referred to the college attorney. Joan will also ask the Provost for her advice.