

Proposed Amendment to Faculty Bylaws, Article VIII, Section C, 1, c,
p. 17.

After paragraph two add the following:

Associate Professors who have fulfilled the other criteria for promotion, but who have not distinguished themselves by scholarly publication may be promoted to Professor if the evaluation committee concludes that the promotion is justified by exceptional conditions, such as the following: the individual's contribution to the college, especially in teaching, has been outstanding.

Submitted by Barbara Carson

I propose this amendment because, while affirming the importance of research to our profession, I believe it vital that we allow an escape clause for those whose research does not express itself in publication. In the original version, we would confer our professorship on those who distinguish themselves in publication, but who may not be very effective as teachers, but we deny it to those who distinguish themselves as teachers, but who are not effective in publication. There is an imbalance here that denies, it seems to me, a good deal of what Rollins stands for.

Most of us, I have no doubt, will need both publications and teaching to support our claim to a professorship, since probably few of us mere mortals are truly outstanding teachers. However, I believe that we must leave room for the few who are dedicated and exceptionally effective teachers, who stay current in their fields, who can--because of their own love of learning--ignite that love in their students, but who have not published widely. (I believe, for example, that we must leave room at Rollins for our future Wilbur Dorsetts. If we do not think that teachers like Wilbur--who had, I understand, not a critical article to his name--are worthy of the title professor, then maybe the title isn't worth much.)

I propose this amendment, too, because I believe that the recent drive for stringent, quantified publication requirements for full professor is based on an unsound premise. Last year when we were all pondering whether a full professor was someone who had published six articles or five, written one book or one book and three articles or one hundred pages, it struck me that there was an unexamined assumption behind that push for publication. Apparently it was believed that professors--or at least associate professors bucking for promotion--at other top liberal arts colleges were publishing like crazy. Somehow I just didn't believe this could be true. The faculty I spoke with at Rollins were putting in fifty and sixty--and more--hours a week just preparing for classes, grading papers, counseling students, doing committee work. Could it really be that faculty at other good liberal arts colleges managed to do all of that well and still find time to write all those papers we believed necessary to justify a full professorship? Could it really be that Swarthmore and Williams had cooped all the academic paragons while Rollins had landed us duds who were so inefficient that we could fit only occasional publications into our teaching schedules?

I decided to do a little--admittedly unscientific--research. I chose at random three liberal arts colleges that I felt Rollins would be proud to be associated with: Swarthmore, Williams, Sarah Lawrence. (The choices were dictated in part by what recent catalogs were available in the Registrar's Office the day I went over.) I listed the names of all professors and associate professors in the English departments of Swarthmore and Williams. Since Sarah Lawrence does not indicate faculty ranks in the catalog, I listed all the English faculty for that school. Then I went to the International Bibliography of the Modern Language Association, the meticulously prepared bibliography of current publications in the profession. It's possible for a work to slip through the cracks of the MLA Bibliography, but not likely. For each faculty member I had listed, I checked the publication record for the five years, 1974-1978.

What I discovered was this: using the Rollins English Department's publication criterion (five articles past associate professor), it would take the average English faculty member at Sarah Lawrence and Swarthmore forty-four years to be promoted to full professor; at Williams it would be eighteen years (but that's because one faculty member, R. Bell, churned out five works in those five years; the other nine members averaged only one work each, so it would take them twenty-five years to be promoted to full professor here). (See attachment.)

I think there's a lesson here somewhere--maybe two or three. But one that occurs to me is that we should ask ourselves this: if our first priority at Rollins truly is excellence in teaching, what is the correlation between publication and good teaching? (For one response, see the final attachment, an excerpt from the essay "Mythology of Teaching.") The sketchy statistics I accumulated suggest that it's possible that the reputation of top-notch liberal arts schools does not necessarily come from a high publication rate. And one final idea this inquiry suggested to me is that the professors we are describing in our Bylaws--and the absence of those we are proscribing--just might make Rollins into an institution that we really don't want to be.

PUBLICATION RATES AT SWARTHMORE,
WILLIAMS AND SARAH LAWRENCE

For Swarthmore, and Williams those listed were associate professors or professors in 1979. For Sarah Lawrence (where no rank is given in the catalogue) all faculty were listed.

Swarthmore	1978	1977	1976	1975	1974
Thomas H. Blackburn, prof.	0	0	0	0	0
David Cowden, prof.	0	0	0	0	0
Arnold Pagliana, prof.	0	0	0	1	0
Susan Snyder, prof.	0	0	0	0	1
Derek Traversi, prof.	0	0	1	0	0
Lee Devin, Assoc.	0	0	0	0	0
Charles James, Assoc.	1	0	0	0	0

$\frac{4 \text{ papers}}{35 \text{ people / years}} =$ approximately 1/9 paper a year. Thus the average faculty member at Swarthmore would take 44 years to achieve our criterion.

3 of 7--0 publications
4 of 7--1 publication each in five years
Williams

Michael Bell, prof.	0	0	0	1	1
Peter Berek, prof.	2	0	0	0	0
Arthur Carr, prof.	0	0	0	1	0
Don Gifford, prof.	0	0	0	0	1
Lawrence Graver, prof.	0	0	0	0	0
Eldred Jones, prof.	0	0	1	0	0
John Reichert, prof.	1	0	0	0	0
Fred Stocking, prof.	0	1	0	0	0
Robert Bell, Assoc.	1	2	1	1	0
Lynda Bundotzen, Assoc.	0	0	0	0	0

R. Bell is responsible for almost 1/3 of the publications here.

$\frac{14 \text{ papers}}{50 \text{ people / years}} =$ 1/4 paper a year--or eighteen years to attain our standard

Sarah Lawrence

Arnold Krupat	0	0	0	0	0
Ann Lauinger	0	1	0	0	0
Nicholaus Mills	0	0	0	0	2
Alice Harris	1	0	0	0	0
James Zito	0	0	0	0	0
Louis Barillet	0	0	0	0	0
Daniel Kaiser	0	0	0	0	0
Ukha Wacgs	0	0	0	0	0
Hyman Kleinman	0	0	0	0	0
Robert Wagner	1	0	0	0	0

[continued next page]

Formula: $\frac{\text{number of people} \times \text{years} \times 5 \text{ [our standard]}}{\text{actual papers published}} =$ rate of publication

	1978	1977	1976	1975	1974
Sarah Lawrence					
Harold Wiener	0	0	0	0	0
William Park	0	0	1	1	1
David Rubin	0	0	0	0	0
J. Mason Gentsler	0	0	0	0	0

$\frac{8 \text{ papers}}{70 \text{ people/years}} = 1/9 \text{ paper a year--or 44 years to be a full professor at Rollins}$

The Mythology of Teaching

Assumptions 8, 9 and 10 are closely related: No. 8, that teaching and research are complementary activities; No. 9, that teaching a subject matter requires only that one know it; and No. 10, that teaching is not a profession.

Attempts to correlate effective teaching with effective research have arrived at little correlation. Duplication of the studies that have already been made promises little more than a display of possible variations: Some good researchers are good teachers; some good researchers are poor teachers; some poor researchers are good teachers; some poor researchers are poor teachers; the majority of both researchers and teachers are mediocre but in different combinations and ways. That present empirical evidence agrees with common sense should be no surprise.

Teaching and research may be usefully compared with writing and reading. Teachers draw upon ideas and information that come from research as writers draw upon their reading, but both teachers and writers use other resources as well. Research may stand in the way of teaching as reading may keep a writer from writing. Any writer knows how insidious an enemy reading can be. Professors are less willing to recognize that research can be the foe as well as the friend of teaching. Like teachers who do little formal research, writers may not be voracious readers or may read at their own discretion and pace. Lacking an inquiring mind, however, neither the teacher nor the writer will achieve very much.

Research as practiced within the American college and university is often only indirectly related to the teaching of undergraduates. Specific research activities are likely to be hostile to specific teaching responsibilities in a number of ways. The specialized character of the bulk of research does not match level and generality of the subject matter in most undergraduate courses. Time devoted to research comes out of the same number of free hours one can allot to teaching; college teachers commonly complain that there is never enough time for either. The psychological set, the satisfactions, even the physical postures for research--the researcher must isolate himself; the teacher cannot--are not the same as for teaching.

Despite the obvious diversity of individuals attracted to college and university teaching, two distinct and somewhat opposing types can be distinguished. The one likes to work alone, responds poorly to outside distractions and pressure, is more at ease with the stuff of ideas, facts, and materials of a discipline than with students and learning. The other seeks out company, can handle pressures and distractions, and prefers interacting with students to manipulating materials and ideas. The scholar-teacher who combines both types is a recognizable figure as well as an anomalous one. Considering the great numbers of college and university teachers, it is not surprising that a large number would not be particularly successful teachers, chiefly because they are not strongly attracted to teaching or because they may accept teaching as a condition of enabling them to pursue the research aspects of the scholar's life.

From Kenneth Eble, "Mythology of Teaching, THE CRAFT OF TEACHING (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1976), pp. 9-21.

MEMORANDUM

ROLLINS COLLEGE

To: Members of the Faculty and Staff

September 5, 1978

From: Thaddeus Seymour, President

Subject: Administrative Organization and Responsibilities

There are a number of inconsistencies in our Faculty Handbook and Bylaws, and I am certainly reluctant to compound them further. Moreover, the principle of participation requires that appropriate agencies share in organizational change. However, to clarify responsibilities and to solve some management problems, I have been working with colleagues in recent weeks to realign some of their functions and authority.

The Faculty Handbook refers to the "Administrative Council." I intend to use in its place weekly staff meetings with college officers at 11 o'clock on Monday mornings. The purpose of these meetings is "to improve communications; to anticipate needs; and to identify appropriate avenues for addressing problems as they arise." These meetings are not a substitute for established procedures for decision-making and are not intended to preempt the existing agencies for doing the work of the College. Participants are:

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|
| Ed Cohen, President of the Faculty | Ron Pease, Dean of Student Affairs |
| Dan DeNicola, Dean of Education | Dan Riva, Dean of Continuing Education |
| Don Griffin, Vice Provost | Wanda Russell, Associate Dean of Student Affairs |
| Cindy Grubbs, Director of Admissions | Thaddeus Seymour, President |
| Fred Hicks, Executive Vice President | Don Webb, Assistant Treasurer and Comptroller |
| Don Hill, Acting Dean of Crummer | Tom Wells, Director of Physical Plant |
| Ed Jucker, Chairman of Athletics | Arnold Wettstein, Dean of the Chapel |
| Dwight Ling, Provost | Randy Xenakis, Director, Public Info. & Publications |

The functions of various offices and officers have been modified and, I hope, clarified. Any changes which impinge upon the Bylaws will, of course, be directed to the Council for consideration and action. I believe that it will be desirable for us to review and revise the Faculty Handbook and the Bylaws in due course.

PROVOST - The Provost serves as the Chief Academic Officer. In the coming year, he will take on major responsibility for budget development and supervision in all academic areas.

VICE PROVOST - The Vice Provost will function as the "Dean" of the undergraduate program in the College, and his reporting relationship to the Provost will be parallel and equal to that of the other Deans. For the short term, because of his special expertise, the Vice Provost has assumed responsibility for the administrative computer system.

FINANCIAL VICE PRESIDENT AND TREASURER - This position is vacant and a search is underway. A search committee representing faculty, administration, and trustees will screen applicants and recommend candidates. The major change in this office is in the nature of its authority. Although the office is responsible for the "business" of the College, its service function will be emphasized as budgetary responsibility and accountability are distributed. Until a new Vice President is appointed, the Comptroller will function as our Chief Financial Officer. To comply with our Charter, the Executive Committee of the Board of Trustees has elected one of its members, Mr. Harold Ward, to serve as Acting Treasurer. This is a pro forma and temporary arrangement, and the Executive Committee will be responsible for any policy issues which may arise.

EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT - History and circumstance invite some misunderstanding of this position which the Trustees established in October, 1977. The Executive Vice President will function as "Vice President of Development," and his responsibility and authority are directed to the external affairs of the College as they relate to regular operations. He will coordinate the work of the Director of Community Relations, the Alumni Director, and the Director of Public Information and Publications.

DEAN OF STUDENT AFFAIRS - As budgetary responsibility is distributed, this office will have increased financial responsibility, particularly in the area of financial aid. The Director of Admissions will report here, as before, and the Office of Campus Safety has been transferred from the Financial Vice President to the Dean of Student Affairs.

Thaddeus Seymour

MEMORANDUM

ROLLINS COLLEGE

From DWIGHT L. LING, PROVOST

Date DECEMBER 15, 1978

To ALL FACULTY

Copies To

Subject

As stated in the Handbook for Faculty, under Faculty Organization, pages 6 and 7, department heads will be appointed by the President annually or on a rotation basis in consultation with the Provost, Vice Provost, and members of the department.

Since I am annually charged with the implementation of this policy, I want each of you to answer the following questions. Please read the questions carefully. So that your answer will be kept in strict confidence, please send it to me in an envelope marked "confidential" by January 15.

I thank you.

(Tear off and return this portion)

PLEASE READ THE QUESTIONS CAREFULLY

TO: OFFICE OF THE PROVOST

NAME _____ DEPARTMENT _____

1. If your department headship is not now rotating, do you favor the rotation of the position?

Yes _____ No _____

2. Under either the present system or a rotation, would you support the present head for reappointment to the position next year (1979-1980)?

Yes _____ No _____

3. If your answer is no, please state the reasons. (Use back of sheet if necessary.)

4. If your answer is no to No. 2, who would you nominate for the position?

NAME OF THE PERSON YOU WOULD NOMINATE _____