

4-20-2011

Minutes, Professional Standards Committee Meeting, Wednesday, April 20, 2011

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, Professional Standards Committee Meeting, Wednesday, April 20, 2011" (2011). *Professional Standards Committee Minutes*. Paper 47.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ps/47

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 Minutes: April 20, 2011

Attendance:

- Members: Claire Strom, Richard James, Emily Russell, Joshua Almond, Dorothy Mays, David Charles, Steven St. John, Marc Fetscherin, Carlee Hoffman.
- Dean of Faculty Representative: Interim Dean Deb Wellman
- Additional PSC Elect Members: Julia Foster, Joan Davison, Robert Vander Poppen
- Guests: Carrie Schulz, Pat Schoknecht

Meeting Convened: 3:00 pm

Announcements:

- Approval of last week's minutes: Minutes approved.
- New and returning PSC Members elected the next Chair of PSC. Committee elects Joan Davison as new Chair.

Old Business:

- Faculty pay
 - Claire – Aside from grant reviews, the big thing we've been working on this spring is the rationalizing of non-course load faculty pay. We have addressed concerns regarding adjunct, overload, and field study compensation. The only thing we have left is Maymester and faculty summer pay. AAC decided that it was okay to have pay linked to enrollment numbers. This PSC felt uncomfortable with that decision and wanted to revisit that issue.
 - David – My issue is that when it is attached to enrollment it doesn't allow for alternative pedagogical approaches. It encourages one particular model, a model that is more accommodating for large class sizes (such as a lecture-based format) than those that may benefit from smaller, more intimate sizes.
 - Claire – It also encourages faculty to move to that particular pedagogical style.
 - David – And it makes it so faculty can't predict what they're going to be paid [until enrollment numbers are confirmed].
 - Emily – I think it ought to be more than overload pay.
 - Steve – It ought to recognize the sacrifice you are making by agreeing to teach in the summer. You can't go anywhere even if you're only teaching one course.
 - Emily – Starting figure \$3,500?
 - Dick - Am I correct that Maymester is four weeks but Holt is 8?
 - Clair – Yes, but it is the same number of contact hours.
 - David – I like \$3500 as a starting point.
 - Emily - I know of instances in intercession when demand was higher than the cap and the professor got twice the compensation for teaching twice the number of students in the same time period. Would this system preclude that?
 - Dorothy - Couldn't we give them a bump up per each addition student enrolled above the cap?
 - Josh – I don't think so, because that moves us back to the pedagogical issues that we're trying to correct or avoid.
 - David - I'm just wondering if classes of 35 students are what we're looking for?
 - Marc – Why don't we have a cap?
 - Steven - I think that's an AAC decision.

- Marc - You can always make an exception but I prefer that it should have a rule.
- Emily - It makes sense that it should follow the regular, normal cap.
- Clair - I like Emily's idea of going with the normal, semester caps for classes. If we're saying its just \$3500 regardless, then we can go with the regular cap.
- David - Tying it to what it is normally, though... I'd hate for Maymester to become just a watered down version of what we normally teach.
- Claire - Is everyone happy with \$3500 and tying it to the regular cap? [PSC committee members affirm their agreement]
- Claire - [to Deb] How does this go forward?
- Deb - I think it may have to go back through AAC again. The compensation models for field study have gone through Giselda and have already been changed. Holt was worried about how they can track that but they think they've figured out how to do it. We'll have to have Toni or Karla keep track of it.
- Claire - The one we didn't talk about is faculty compensation for master's degree programs.
- Deb - I talked to Bruce. That might be a more complicated issue.
- Claire - I recommend that next year's PSC committee address compensation in the masters program. Some issues raised were the amount of compensation, whether or not that was on load or overload, and whether or not they get paid extra for doing it if it is on load.

New Business:

- PSC reviewed the IT grants

Adjourn 3:47 pm

Addendum: President Lewis Duncan and Dean Karen Hater both participated in a faculty feedback survey. Dean Hater responded to the faculty as a whole regarding the nature and content of the survey results. Although initially President Duncan indicated that he planned to respond directly to the faculty regarding this survey, in the end he opted to send his response to Claire Strom, Chair of PSC. She has asked that both his letter and Dean Hater's responses be included in these, the last minutes of the year. Accordingly, they are included below.

President Lewis Duncan's email to Claire Strom, President of the Professional Standards Committee:

From: Lewis Duncan
Sent: Wednesday, April 27, 2011 11:40 AM
To: Claire Strom
Cc: Dr. Richard E. Foglesong; Jill Jones
Subject: feedback response to faculty

Dear Claire,

Please share the attached letter with members of the PSC. It is essentially the draft letter I discussed with you in our meeting last week, updated in response to that conversation and subsequent discussions. For chronological clarity, I have placed in italics the revisions and addenda to the original draft letter.

Also, again for clarity, I am affirming that our conversation and this letter constitutes my formal "response to the faculty," and that I have no intent to respond before the faculty as a whole.

Sincerely yours,
Lewis

President Lewis Duncan's Response to the Faculty:

To: A&S Professional Standards Committee, & *A&S Faculty president(s)*
From: Lewis Duncan
Re: Faculty feedback survey response *April 14, 2011 & April 25, 2011*

I would like to thank the faculty who chose to participate and respond thoughtfully to the presidential feedback survey performed this spring semester, and especially acknowledge Marc Fetscherin for his work in designing the survey and Mark Freeman for his work to reduce the responses into statistical groupings and to a meaningful summary.

Dividing my response into general and specific comments, I would first like to express disappointment to the faculty leadership that a process for administrative feedback that was presented as being of high importance to the faculty would, in implementation, result in such modest overall engagement. With a month-long window for responding to what was a relatively brief questionnaire and open opportunity for additional comment, nearly two-thirds of the faculty opted not to participate. As was noted before the survey was administered, there is always some self-selection of respondents weighted toward those that feel most strongly about the topic in question, either positively or negatively, but the low response rate makes some of the statistical analysis quite problematic. One might speculate that so many faculty chose not to participate in a favorable sense because of their general satisfaction with the state of the

College and its leadership, or unfavorably because of a concern that their voice would still not be heard, or even that their failure to respond was a means of expressing dissatisfaction with the faculty leadership itself, for whom the survey was a significant cause of action. Without participation, there is really only unsubstantiated speculation to interpret their absence.

In my feedback response meeting with Prof. Strom, as chair of PSC, she additionally suggested that the low participation rate could be attributed to junior faculty who, with fewer years of service, might have felt insufficiently experienced at the College to have an informed opinion, and therefore did not respond to the survey request. This hypothesis actually can be examined from the available data. Indeed, junior faculty, both in the cohorts of tenure-track and tenured but ten years or less of service, participated in the survey at a lower rate, but only at a slightly lower rate of 25%. While this does weight the respondents toward the longer serving faculty, it does not account for the absence of nearly two-thirds of the faculty. By any measure, the survey falls well short of representing a quorum opinion of the faculty.

For example, within the grouping of all faculty who are tenure-track, there was only one respondent who expressed dissatisfaction with my overall performance, and within the grouping of tenured faculty with ten years or less of service, one additional dissatisfied respondent. There was a more polarized response, more strongly negative and strongly positive among the longer serving tenured faculty. Perhaps there is some reassurance I can find that there seemed to be no significant statistical variance within the responses according to other groupings, such as male/female and by A&S division.

As a last more general response, I must also note that even though the open commentary was presented as an opportunity for constructive feedback, few of the actual comments were offered in this advisory spirit. The majority of the intended “feedback” was evaluative rather than instructive, and the most negative comments, though clearly from a small minority set of voices, were insulting and poorly informed. The comments submitted were in tone and content generally counterproductive to the stated goal of intending to “improve the effectiveness of the administration and their relationship with the faculty.”

I also commented to Prof. Strom that a number of the comments were based upon misinformation or misimpressions that were addressed in the presidential job description and self-assessment that was attached to the survey. Including this as a component of the survey process was part of my agreement with the faculty, just as a clear statement of evaluative criteria and self-assessment is the starting point for faculty reviews. When I asked Prof. Strom why none of the submitted comments seemed to make reference to this document, she responded that it was her impression that no one had read it. If this is the case, it is quite disappointing, given the considerable effort made to provide faculty with an informed basis for reaching their opinions.

Regarding specific areas of suggested improvement, the most common subject was a request for greater engagement between the president and the faculty. This is not unexpected, in that feedback from all other constituent groups (students, staff, alumni, community members and organizations, and even the Board of Trustees) all ask for more time and engagement with the president, here and at essentially all other institutions around the country. It is an expected and near unanimous refrain everywhere. This is not a consequence of presidents who as a whole are insufficiently active, but rather a reflection of the many constituencies and responsibilities

that we serve. None of the faculty comments made any reference to the extensive self-assessment report I provided to attempt to show the breadth of these responsibilities and ongoing professional activities. One takeaway then is perhaps that I should become more actively self-promoting, so that more faculty are aware of what I am doing, at least regarding external activities in terms of the national speeches given and national leadership service undertaken which help to advance Rollins' academic reputation. I also have noted a related kernel of constructive criticism within these concerns, that I perhaps have over-delegated responsibility to other senior leaders. There seems to be a faculty preference that I take on a more personal role of engaged leadership and provide more direct oversight of other administrators in the performance of their duties, at least in the areas of affecting academic excellence. I intend to do so. However, even on this topic of greatest common comment, I would still note that only a quarter of the respondents expressed dissatisfaction in response to the specific survey question of "delegates appropriately."

Other comments included a desire that we move on to a new capital campaign, which we are already doing in the necessary "quiet phase." Additionally, there were consensus compliments for our focus on international initiatives and a few isolated but highly vitriolic comments directed at the Winter Park Institute. I choose not to respond to this type of specific yet unconstructive feedback. I would note that the programming of the Winter Park Institute is overseen by a faculty-led committee, and concerns over its programming should be directed accordingly.

Dean Karen Hater's Response to the Faculty

Dear Faculty,

I would like to share with you the results of the Faculty Feedback Survey that was completed online this term. I want to thank all of you who took the time to provide constructive feedback on this survey. 49 respondents participated in the survey of the 180 faculty at Rollins. This is approximately a 27.2% response rate. I have attached the executive summary which was given to me as well as the Student Affairs organizational chart so that you would have more information regarding the departments that are included in student affairs as well as the names of the staff members in student affairs.

Since the executive summary provides the basic results of the survey, I won't repeat those results here. However, I'll share with you some of the comments and any themes that seemed to emerge from those comments. I feel that I should be cautious in any interpretation of the results since the number of respondents was so low, but I believe I still gained valuable information that I can hopefully use to improve my performance. Overall, I feel the results of the survey were favorable. For those of us who have participated in a number of evaluative surveys, we know that comments on the open-ended questions tend to be at either extreme – very positive or very negative. This was true for this survey as well. So there were comments that ranged from "She is bad news" to "Karen Hater is doing an excellent job as Dean of Student Affairs". However, as the executive summary points out, there are a few central themes that emerge from the narrative feedback: I need to be more comfortable and engaging when presenting to the faculty; I need more focus on vision; I promote a strong sense of student

responsibility; and there are structural problems with the position in relation to other administrators. After reading the comments, I feel that communication continues to be a concern for some faculty (“Dean of Students needs to keep faculty informed on what is going on in student affairs on a regular basis” and “I would like to know more about the students who are having problems” and “Her talks to the faculty, while informative, are often painfully slow and boring”) There also emerged a sense that I am doing a good job holding students accountable. (“I like Dean Hater’s quick response when issues arise with students. She listens well, consults broadly, and acts in a timely manner” and “Although alcohol continues to be a major problem, locally and nationally, this is the best shape the campus has been in for a long time” and “She has brought a much stronger sense of student responsibility than I have seen before.”) It also seems that the faculty would like to see a stronger leader with more focus on vision in the dean’s position. (“She seems too comfortable with her role as caretaker. A stronger dean might develop a more interesting campus culture” and “ She is maintaining the status quo which is good but not advancing us further which is bad” and “I see a lack of leadership, too low a profile, and a reactive rather than proactive stance on issues of improvement of student life”) There were also a number of comments relating to issues arising from the structure of this position in relation to other administrators and the effects of that. (“I am an ardent supporter of this position being on equal ground with other administrators, and I am not sure that is always the case” and “My concerns about this position – approachability, responsiveness, transparency – are largely structural concerns that go both ways” and “The Dean of Student Affairs is invisible to faculty”) There were certainly other comments, not related to these themes, that will be helpful to me in improving my performance and the quality of student affairs.

I would also like to clarify some points made in the comments that I believe to be factually incorrect. One comment stated, “What would she do if she could not phone the college lawyer several times a day (adding greatly to our budget expenditures) to make decisions for her?” I’d like to point out that in the three years that I have been Dean, I have called the College attorney twice for advice on student matters. Also, a couple of faculty stated concerns about the growth of the Division of Student Affairs (“I am most concerned about the growth of the number of staff in this area.”) I have attached an organizational chart so you can be clear about the departments included in Student Affairs. I’d like to point out that in my three years as Dean, we have lost three positions (one in Residential Life, one in Multicultural Affairs and one in Student Involvement and Leadership), added one (Community Standards) and also, for the last five years, there has not been an Associate Dean of Student Affairs. (which had existed for a very long time)

I want to express my appreciation to all of you who took the time to reflect and respond honestly to this survey. Although I could not include in this e-mail all comments included in the survey, I can assure you that I have taken all of them seriously. Thanks again.

Karen

Karen L. Hater, Ed.D.
Dean of Student Affairs
1000 Holt Avenue - #2345
Winter Park, Florida 32789
407-646-2345 (telephone)
407-646-2035 (fax)

Executive Summary Faculty Survey

Dean Karen Hater

March 14, 2011

The following is a brief summary of the faculty survey conducted on-line for Dean Karen Hater. 49 respondents participated in the survey of the 180 faculty at Rollins. This is approximately a 27.2% response rate. I have collected percentages for the satisfied and dissatisfied categories. A few central themes emerged from the narrative feedback.

- Interact with the Dean: 43% rarely; 57% regularly
- Satisfaction with the Dean: 12% dissatisfied; 27% neutral; 62% satisfied
- Narrative feedback: Dean needs to be more comfortable and engaging when presenting to the faculty; promotes a strong sense of student responsibility; she needs more focus on vision; there are structural problems with the position, in relation to other administrators
- Qualified: 8% unqualified; 75% qualified; 17% neutral
- Honest: 4% dishonest; 88% honest
- Successful: 14% unsuccessful; 59% successful
- Approachable: 4% unapproachable; 68% approachable
- Receptive: 8% unreceptive; 83% receptive
- Strong: 16% weak; 52% strong
- Active: 20% passive; 56% active
- Friendly: 4% unfriendly; 92 % friendly
- Decisive: 8% indecisive; 57% decisive
- Transparent 13% opaque; 70% transparent
- Leadership: 14% dissatisfied; 67% satisfied
- Curricular and Co-curricular Integration 19% dissatisfied; 40% satisfied
- Promoting Students Responsible Behavior: 13% dissatisfied; 69% satisfied
- Foster Student Growth: 10% dissatisfied; 63% satisfied
- Student Advocacy: 6% dissatisfied; 60% satisfied

-
- Provide Healthy and Caring Environment: 6% dissatisfied; 71 % satisfied
 - Communication and Interaction with the Faculty: 20% dissatisfied; 60% satisfied
 - Expressive Arts: 0% dissatisfied; 77% satisfied
 - Humanities: 10% dissatisfied; 60% satisfied
 - Science: 0% dissatisfied; 75% satisfied
 - Social Sciences: 21% dissatisfied; 58% satisfied
 - Females: 18% dissatisfied; 61% satisfied
 - Males: 4% dissatisfied; 64% satisfied
 - Tenure Track Tenured: 11% dissatisfied; 61% satisfied
 - Tenure Track Untenured: 0% dissatisfied; 62% satisfied
 - Visiting Faculty: 0% dissatisfied; 100% satisfied
 - Service 1-5 years: 0% dissatisfied; 72% satisfied
 - Service 6-10 years: 0% dissatisfied; 81% satisfied
 - Service over 10 years: 16% dissatisfied; 50% satisfied