

1-21-2010

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Executive Committee Meeting, Thursday, January 21, 2010

Arts & Sciences Executive Committee

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ec

Recommended Citation

Arts & Sciences Executive Committee, "Minutes, Arts & Sciences Executive Committee Meeting, Thursday, January 21, 2010" (2010). *Executive Committee Minutes*. Paper 50.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ec/50

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 Executive Committee Minutes by an authorized administrator of Rollins Scholarship Online. For more information, please contact wzhang@rollins.edu.

**Approved Minutes
Executive Committee
January 21, 2010**

Members Present: Rick Foglesong, William Boles, Thom Moore, Jim Small, Lisa Tillmann, Allison Wallrapp, Joan Davison, Roger Casey

Guests: Ed Cohen, Don Davison (for Laurie Joyner), Harry Kypraios, Bob Smither

- I. Call to order—the meeting was called to order at 12:41 PM.
- II. Approval of Minutes—The Executive Committee approved the minutes of January 12, 2010.
- III. Old Business
 - A. Provost Search Committee – Foglesong reports that Stephenson declined the nomination to the provost search committee because of multiple existing commitments. He asks whether we should nominate another individual to the slate instead of Stephenson, and if so whom. Small moves Bernal, Foglesong seconds, and EC passes. Davison states she does not wish to be on the slate. The slate now consists of Jones, Easton, Bernal, and Simmons. Foglesong also raises the question whether a colloquium should be held to discuss the provost search. The purpose would be to educate and inform the committee on faculty preferences. Small supports the suggestion. Moore reminds EC that the faculty members of the search committee for the president held a colloquium. Boles concurs and states a colloquium was held for the Dean’s search. Tillmann moves and Small seconds the motion for a colloquium. The motion passes unanimously.
- IV. New Business
 - A. F&S Proposal for Representation on the Board of Trustees – Tillmann introduces the proposal for faculty representation on the Board of Trustees from Finance and Services Committee. (See Appendix 3.) Tillmann explains the process and rationale for the recommendation. She notes the various documents provided for the faculty. (See Appendix 4). Small asks whether the proposal suggests faculty members as voting members, and Tillmann responds the language came out of F&S. She explains this is a contentious issue, and while faculty members tend to concur on the desire to seek a presence on the Board, they are split on the issue of whether to seek a vote. Small responds that interaction with the Board is the Board’s decision, and perhaps the faculty should take a step at a time, initially only

requesting membership. Tillmann states the question of voting status probably will occur at the faculty meeting. Tillmann notes she also does not know how invested the faculty membership is in the issue. Small summarizes his reaction that he is uncertain whether a vote is something for which the faculty should ask. Boles asks whether the at-large person mentioned for various Board committees is one person or multiple people. Tillmann responds she envisioned multiple people but recognizes the language might be unclear. Boles asks Casey whether a Student Life Committee exists on the Board. Casey states the issue is under the Education Committee. Small says he is struck by the substantial and significant nature of the request in the proposal. He suggests perhaps the faculty should ask for less with its first request. He notes, however, that perhaps the presence of faculty members on the Board is positive because on the Bornstein Presidential Search committee he interacted frequently with Board members and found the Board unaware of certain issues on campus. Moore states he found the opposite situation when he served on the committee which searched for Duncan; the Board was knowledgeable. Small responds the situation has changed with administrations. Small asks about the time commitment to serve on the Board. Casey states the time commitment of faculty members on the Board will vary with the tasks designated. Casey doubts faculty members on the Board would be tasked with extensive external work. Foglesong states he sent the proposal to Bornstein and asked her opinion. He explains she believes membership on the Board could vitiate faculty input and cause individual members to become co-opted. Foglesong asks Casey if in fact it is a blanket rule that cannot discuss what occurs on the Board. Casey responds during Bornstein tenure the Board's discussions were confidential; he notes Duncan's style is less presentational and more conversational than Bornstein's manner, and most sensitive material is dealt with in the Executive Committee. Casey explains the Board is moving toward dealing with issues at meetings as consent agenda and then focusing upon a single critical issue. He elaborates the Board does seek more knowledge on more issues. Davison suggests the critical factor for faculty is a presence and voice, not a vote given that the Board easily could outvote a few faculty members; Davison also comments she wonders about the appropriateness of faculty presence on the Committee on Trustees and considers efforts to influence Duncan on appointments potentially more successful. Casey concurs and emphasizes the work and discussions of the Committee on Trustees is very confidential. Foglesong asks whether EC shall send this proposal back to Finance & Services for refinement or submit it for faculty approval. Casey raises the point the proposal seeks faculty representation, but yet Crummer opposes the proposal. Casey asks EC how this difference might be resolved. Foglesong states Tillmann presented the Arts and Sciences proposal to the Crummer faculty to ascertain their interest in pursuing a joint or parallel proposal. After deliberation, the Crummer faculty declined to move forward with a proposal. Davison moves and

Boles seconds F&S will present the proposal to the faculty. The proposal unanimously passes. Tillmann then explains an opening exists on F&S because Van Sickle is on sabbatical. She says F&S nominates Barry Allen. EC endorses the nomination of Allen and agrees the faculty floor can provide other nominations.

- B. Committee on Assessment of Merit Pay – Foglesong introduces the Report of the CAMP. (Option B, from Kypraios, is Appendix 1. Option A, from the remainder of the committee, is Appendix 2.) Foglesong asks whether we shall send these proposals back to CAMP for refinement or submit one of them for faculty approval. Davison raises concern about the lack of a colloquium given the original faculty resolution to establish a committee to review the merit pay system states the committee should hold at least one colloquium. Foglesong responds he and Smither realize the resolution requires a colloquium but at least wish to consider taking options to the faculty because of time pressures. Davison notes the \$180,000 has been on the table for many months and that faculty who sought a review previously overlooked the argument concerning time pressures. She also says she has many questions about both options and believes other faculty members will have questions which should be answered and discussed prior to a proposal going to the faculty. Tillmann concurs and expresses concern about the additional work the new options create for department chairs. Small also concurs. Smither explains the option designates no particular role for department chairs but assigns the work to a departmental committee. Small agrees he is hesitant to send to the proposal to the faculty without more discussion. Boles asks when FSC first met last year, and Cohen responds perhaps March or February. Cohen notes to correctly complete the merit pay assessments FSC needs to start its work in March. He explains that unlike last year the new option now includes an additional layer as all merit decisions are to be reviewed. Foglesong then suggests EC consider a first reading of the proposal at the faculty meeting and then a subsequent second reading and vote. He explains a colloquium might not be able to cover all issues. Foglesong suggests EC take advantage of faculty members at the faculty meeting to begin discussion, and then table the issue after some discussion. D. Davison shares concerns about the process from the Dean's Office. He notes the Dean of the Faculty Office holds specific concerns about both options but also has a general concern about the process. D. Davison suggests two questions which are unclear: one, what are you bringing – are you changing or amending the existing protocol because the options do not address specific changes to the existing policy in the handbook; and two, what are the faculty voting upon because A looks like an outline while B looks like a substitute for the current protocol. D. Davison also notes a concern exists about a new process being introduced after the fact. He explains faculty submitted FSARs in August for the existing \$180,000 in merit pay, but now new rules for the procedure and substantive decision are under

consideration. D. Davison explains the Dean's Office finds the suggested options places it in a very difficult situation because the implementation of this proposed new policy because any faculty member who is dissatisfied with their merit application can claim the ground rules (both substance and procedure) were changed after the FSAR were submitted. Whether faculty like or dislike the current protocol it is the only reference they had at the time of the FSAR. D. Davison states an additional issue is the little progress CAMP made given the Merit Appeals Committee's concerns on how faculty members are evaluated particularly in teaching; he elaborates CAMP provides only a checklist with no statement about quality, and suggests CAMP needs to flesh out and give more character and nuance to the actual categories. D. Davison concludes that was a problem with the process last year, and it still exists. He states he is extremely concerned the document does not address its charge which really sought to wrestle with the 17 or 18 items on the Merit Appeals Committee's report. Smither responds the new report handles all these items. D. Davison then asks given the checklist whether teaching an 8am class is meritorious or part of the job; also is teaching an 8am class meritorious irrespective of the quality of the course. Smither responds that it depends, and that nobody can develop criteria for every department and therefore it is preferable not to specify. Smither feels the quality of teaching is beyond CAMP's jurisdiction and departments already make these judgments and can continue to make these determinations. Kypraios concurs that the departments are best positioned to make decisions. D. Davison states the Dean's Office and FEC see substantial variation across departments and the variation is a problem. D. Davison explains he shares with Kypraios and Smither the view that departments possess expertise but suggests the expertise must be based upon an even standard. D. Davison concludes CAMP presents no standard in its option and that for this reason unevenness in the awarding of merit becomes possible. Foglesong states the current discussion is a political debate, the notion the process began in August with FSAR is a political argument, and the disagreement about the degree to which CAMP responds to the concerns of the Merit Appeals Committee also is political. Foglesong favors submission of the CAMP option to the faculty at the meeting. D. Davison disagrees this is a political decision and states it is a matter of proper procedure; he asks the record to show that he disagrees and the submission is procedurally incorrect because the option is not drafted as an amendment to the existing protocol or policy. Small asks Foglesong to clarify what the proposal is. Foglesong asks Cohen if he has an opinion on the issue. Cohen states he cannot speak for this year's FSC because the committee never met and still does not have a chair. Cohen suggests perhaps at the next faculty meeting EC can distribute the options and announce a colloquium to discuss the options followed by a special faculty meeting to conclude consideration of the issue. Small responds that after the colloquium the issue should be sent back to committee for revision. Tillmann moves and Small seconds that

“CAMP’s two options will be presented at the faculty meeting only for information purposes and preliminary questions and comments. A colloquium will be scheduled for further discussion, followed by an opportunity for CAMP to refine its proposal. Then a special faculty meeting will be scheduled to handle the issue.” D. Davison and Casey reiterate the administration question regarding the intent of the option relative to existing protocol and policy. Foglesong states the arguments for the existing system also should be explained at the colloquium. Tillmann’s motion passes.

- C. Proposal for Senior Administrator Feedback from Professional Standards— Moore introduces the proposal. (See Appendix 5.) Foglesong asks whether EC should discuss this proposal with the President (as PSC recommends) and then submit it to the faculty. Moore suggests the process might accomplish the faculty’s goals without an adversarial focus. Davison asks why all of EC will be able to see future qualitative results given EC did not see Joyner’s qualitative results. She specifies her concern whether results which discuss other people will be withheld. Small asks about how this process differs from the current evaluation system. Moore differentiates administrative feedback and evaluation, and states this is a formal method of feedback with discussions between faculty member and administration. Moore explains Duncan will design a separate evaluation process and the faculty role in the evaluation will be discussed apart from the issue of feedback. Moore notes Duncan has not yet provided any information on the final document. Small expresses concerned that administrators might not support the process. Boles asks whether evaluation supersedes feedback. Moore explains the feedback process gives administrator an opportunity for reflection and possible change prior to the evaluation. Foglesong asks how the new process addressed the administrative concern that faculty does not know what a particular administrator does. Moore responds the administrator and PSC jointly develop the questions for feedback. Moore explains the current document cannot be moved or presented to the faculty for vote; rather this is a background document for which Moore seeks authorization to discuss with administrators. Foglesong asks “should PSC discuss this proposal with the president, provost, and deans and then to submit to the faculty.” Davison moves and Boles seconds “to authorize PSC to discuss the proposal with administrators and then shape the response into a succinct motion to bring to floor of the faculty.”
- D. Agenda for Jan. 28 Faculty Meeting: Foglesong identifies the agenda for the meeting: vote on the slate for the provost search committee; vote on the slate for F&S representation; vote on the F&S proposal regarding faculty membership on the Board of Trustees; and introduce the options brought by CAMP.

V. Adjournment—The meeting was adjourned at 1:51pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Joan Davison
Vice President/Secretary

APPENDIX 1

CAMP

Option B Proposal

Step One	Faculty Member Submits Material
-----------------	--

Faculty will submit
-complete the Merit pay cover page
- their FSAR
- a current CV and any other relevant material
to: 1) their Department Merit Pay Committee (DMPC) and 3) the designated FSC representative.

The cover page simply summarizes the faculty member's contributions in teaching, scholarship and service; it assumes that the details will be outlined in the FSAR narrative. In the overall assessment of merit, teaching will count as 50% of the faculty's total score. The faculty member can choose what percentage to assign to scholarship and service depending on which area one has concentrated the greatest effort in.**

For example:	Teaching 50%	Scholarship 30%	Service 20%
	Teaching 50%	Scholarship 40%	Service 10%
	Teaching 50%	Scholarship 10%/	Service 40%

** Each Category of scholarship and service must have a minimum of 10% assigned to it.

Step Two DMPC and FSC representative meet to evaluate both the quantity and quality of faculty effort and accomplishment based on the submitted material and department information.

The DMPC will evaluate each of these and assign a qualitative score of 0 to 5.

A designation of zero means that the criterion reported by the faculty is not relevant as a consideration for merit.

A designation of one means that the criterion reported by the faculty does not meet expectations for merit.

A designation of three means that the criterion reported by the faculty does meet expectations for merit.

A designation of five means that the criterion reported by the faculty exceeds expectations for merit.

Designations of two and four are intended to award a qualitative value for criteria reported by faculty that tend to fall between the values of 1, 3, and 5. Think of twos and fours as pluses or minuses.

Example:

For every criteria that the faculty chooses they are awarded a quantitative score of one.

A Faculty has reported in their cover letter that they have taught:

- a new course 1 point,
- taught an overload due to department need 1 point,
- taught an RCC class 1 point,
- taught a capstone class 1 point,
- and co-taught an interdisciplinary class 1 point.

The DMPC will evaluate each of these and assign a qualitative score of 0 to 5. If the student evaluations and or DMPC feedback indicate that the new class was exceptional in content and or skill development the DMPC will assign a value of 5 for the new course taught.

If the capstone class received poor student evaluations and the DMPC concurs, the DMPC will assign the qualitative score of 1.

The five criteria chosen by the faculty in this example after evaluation by the DMPC would score in the range of 0 to 25. For now, let's assume that all other criteria chosen by this faculty receive the qualitative score of 3 so that this faculty has scored a 15 in teaching.

The same process would be followed for qualitatively judging scholarship and service.

Continuing with our example, the faculty reported to have published:

- a musical score 1 point
- and edited a book 1 point
- and has presented at a conference 1 point.

As to scholarship, the DMPC has judged:

the musical performance as exceptional, assigning a value of 5,

the edited book is assigned a value of 5,

the conference presentation is given a 3 because the topic is still relatively underdeveloped but very promising.

Therefore, out of a range of 0 to 15 for this faculty, the total score for scholarship is 13 points

Following the same process, assume that this faculty has chosen only one item from the criteria for service and that the score for service assigned by the DMPC for this faculty is a 2.

The final score is now calculated by weighting teaching by 50% and the scholarship and service by the percentages determined by this faculty in their cover letter.

This faculty having spent more time on scholarship than teaching may have chosen a 40% share for scholarship and a 10% for service.

This example will result in the following total score:

Teaching	50%	15	*	0.5=	7.5	points
Scholarship	40%	13	*	0.4=	5.2	points
Service	10%	2	*	0.1=	0.2	points

A total score of 12.9 points

This score and a summary report are then submitted to the Dean of Faculty. The FSC representative, who has met with the DMPC during their deliberations, also submits a brief statement of agreement if concurring; otherwise, a statement of disagreement and the reasons for this disagreement are submitted to the Dean of Faculty.

Step Three Dean Reviews and Recommends

At this point, the Dean of Faculty reviews the faculty member's material, the FMPC recommendation and the FSC representative's recommendation, and either concurs or disagrees with this final score.

If there is any disagreement between the three parties (DMPC, FSC representative, and Dean of Faculty) the case is referred to the full FSC. The full FSC will meet with the Dean of the Faculty and a representative from the DMPC. This group then collectively decide if, and what, adjustments need to be made to the faculty score.

Note that up to this stage, there has been no determination as to whether the faculty has not met, met, or exceeded expectations.

Step Four Merit Pay Determination

Every faculty score is then included in the distribution of all faculty scores. The **top 10%** of scores in this distribution will be awarded "Exceeds Expectations". The **bottom 10%** of this distribution will "Not Meet Expectations". **80%** (eighty percent) of this distribution of scores will "Meet Expectations".

For example, with 120*** faculty eligible for merit pay 10% or the top 12 faculty scores will receive the exceeds expectations designation. The bottom 10% or the lowest 12

faculty scores would not meet expectations for merit pay. Faculty scores that fall within this range would meet expectations and receive merit pay.

Continuing the example from above, if the 12.9 score falls in the top 10% of all faculty scores then this faculty would receive the exceeded expectations determination. If this score falls within the 80% range, then it is awarded the meets expectation designation. If this score falls within the bottom 10% of the faculty wide distribution of scores, it is awarded the does not meet expectations designation.

All individual faculty scores that fall in the bottom 10% of the distribution will be reviewed by the full FSC, the Dean of the Faculty and a representative from the DMPC. This group then collectively decides whether that faculty's score is an accurate reflection of that faculty's performance and what adjustments, if any need to be made to the faculty score.

Step Five Faculty Member accepts or Appeals Decision

The faculty member can accept the decision;
The faculty member can appeal the decision to the Merit Pay Appeals Committee.

Advantages of Option B

As in Option A, every criterion presented for consideration will have both a **quantitative and qualitative** component.

Final determination of award will be based on a **comprehensive faculty wide basis** rather than by department, Dean, and or FSC.

This method is **relatively more objective**. Department evaluation committees, the Dean and the FSC representatives will evaluate faculty work and performance for each criterion chosen by faculty on its own merit, independently of final determination.

Option B will **minimize the friction** that is likely to arise between faculty expectations for the final award and the potential or perceived politics of the final determination by Department evaluation committees, Dean, FSC and or among departments and divisions.

Given a comprehensive distribution of all faculty scores, the **objective of limiting** the “does not meet” or “exceeds” expectations to a certain percentage of the faculty is met.

Option B would eliminate most if not all of the potential conflicts between merit pay and department tenure and promotion decisions.

Given that the list of criteria is intended to be inclusive (the X factor), there will be a natural concern that other faculty will inflate their reported activities. This concern will arise because we are all limited by time and responsibilities and faculty will find their scores to be small relative to the potential. The transparency of this system should keep a check on that concern.

*** With 124 faculty the 10% rule implies that 12.4 faculty would fall in the upper or lower range. I would suggest that this number be rounded up (13 in this example) to include more faculty for the exceeds expectations and rounded down (to 12 in this example) to include less faculty for those that do not meet expectations.

APPENDIX 2

CAMP

OPTION A Proposal

MERIT PAY PROCEDURES

Step 1. Faculty member submits material

The faculty member submits Merit Pay Cover Sheet, FSAR, and current CV to departmental Merit Pay Committee, Department FSC representative, and Dean of Faculty.

Step 2. Departmental committee evaluates and makes recommendation to Dean

Composition of the departmental Merit Pay Committee to be determined by individual departments. Whenever possible, however, the merit pay committee should be the same as the department's Tenure and Promotion Committee.

The committee members may meet as a group or may rank individually with one department member or staff charged with determining average rankings for each individual.

Scoring guidelines

Teaching: 1-5 points

Service: 1-3 points

Scholarship: 1-3 points

10-11 points: Exceeds expectations; must score at least 3 in teaching and 2 in one

other category

7-9 points: Meets expectations

3-6 points: Below expectations

Step 3. FSC representative reviews rankings and makes recommendation to Dean

In cases where FSC rep disagrees with a departmental ranking, rep submits a brief statement explaining the reasons for the disagreement to the Dean.

Step 4. Dean reviews department and FSC rep recommendations, agrees or dissents.

Possible outcomes

Dean, department, and FSC rep agree: Faculty member is notified in writing of his or her ranking.

Dean, department, and FSC rep disagree: Ranking will be referred to full FSC to resolve.

Step 5. Faculty member is notified in writing of merit ranking.

If the faculty member disagrees with the ranking, he or she can appeal to an independent appeals committee that can review both the process and content of the merit application.

ACCOMPLISHMENT RECORD SUMMARY

2009 – 2010

Name: _____

Teaching

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Scholarship

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Service

- 1.
- 2.

- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Other Accomplishments

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Suggested Criteria for Evaluation of Merit Pay

Teaching

Inside the classroom

created a new class
received teaching evaluations in top 10% of college evaluations
taught course with community engagement/service learning
received teaching grants/awards
offered an interdisciplinary course with member of another department
served departmental needs (capstone, extra students, early classes, unpopular courses for the major)
served college needs (RCC, Honors, RP)

Outside the classroom

mentor/committee member for independent studies
mentor/committee member for honors thesis
significant work with students in preparation for performance, laboratory work, independent studies
domestic/international travel with students

Scholarship

For the purpose of expanding the body of knowledge
published a book or creative equivalent

published an peer-reviewed article, essay, book review, etc. or creative equivalent
published a chapter in a book or creative equivalent
published/produced a creative equivalent with a student
edited journal/book
recognized for scholarship by group outside of the college

Related to professional activities

presented at a conference
organized scholarly seminar, colloquium, panel, or conference
served as peer reviewer for journal/book/grant
served as officer in scholarly society
recognized for contributions to profession outside by group outside of the college

Service

To the college

chaired/served on standing committee
chaired/served on other campus committee
volunteered for admissions related recruitment
provided help on special projects related to Holt, Advancement, Finance, IT, or other departments of the college
participated in Cornell Scholar Weekend

To the community

represented Rollins on committees outside the college
donated time and expertise to non-scholarly organization

To the department

served on departmental subcommittee (explain)
advising of students
To the profession

organized panels/discussions

To the students

faculty advisor to student organization

Other

Taught overloads

APPENDIX 3

The Arts and Sciences faculty request the following:

- 1) Two A&S faculty participants (the A&S faculty President and one at-large representative, elected to a 3-year term) on the Board itself
- 2) Two A&S faculty participants (the chair of the A&S Academic Affairs governance committee and one at-large representative, elected to a 3-year term) on the Education subcommittee
- 3) Two A&S faculty participants (the chair of the A&S Finance and Services governance committee and one at large representative, elected to a 3-year term) on the Business and Finance subcommittee
- 4) Two A&S faculty participants (the A&S faculty President and one at-large representative, elected to a 3-year term) on the Committee on Trustees.

APPENDIX 4

Proposal for A&S Faculty Presence on Board of Trustees

History of Initiative

Spring 2008: Finance and Services charged by A&S faculty to study faculty presence on Boards of Trustees

Fall 2008/Spring 2009: F&S faculty collect data from peer and aspirant schools

10/2/2009: faculty colloquium reveals unanimous support for faculty presence

10/7/2009: faculty lunch with Trustee Jon Fuller reveals openness to more faculty/board interaction

11/2/2009: F&S presents research and proposal to Crummer faculty to ascertain their interest in pursuing a joint or parallel proposal; Crummer declines.

Research Questions for Peer and Aspirant Schools

1. How many full-time teaching faculty serve on your Board of Trustees?
2. If full-time teaching faculty serve on your BoT, do they have voting status?
3. On what BoT committees do full-time teaching faculty serve?

Research Results

School	# of faculty BoT participants	BoT committees with faculty presence
Peer Schools		
Colorado	0	Advisory status on Budget and Finance; Investment
Elon	0	Chairs of Academic Council; Student Life; Curriculum attend corresponding BoT committee
Furman	1	Athletics; Student Life; Enrollment and Marketing; Academic Affairs; Development
Gettysburg	0	Academic Affairs; College Life; Development & Alumni Relations; Enrollment & Educational Services; Endowment
Rhodes	3	Student Life; Student Learning; Finance
Southwestern	0	None but sponsors faculty/trustee lunch between 4 faculty division representatives, BoT officers and chair of education committee
Trinity	0	None
Sewanee	3	Unspecified committee participation
Stetson	0	Unspecified committee participation
Villanova	0	Academic Affairs (2); Investments (2); Physical Facilities (2); Student Life (2)
Willamette	3	Atkinson Graduate School; Campus Spiritual and Ethical Life; College of Law; College of Liberal Arts; Facilities
Aspirant Schools		

Bowdoin	2	All major committees
Bucknell	0	Unspecified committee attendance
Carleton	0	All major committees except Executive Session
Colby	2	Education; Compensation; Budget & Finance
Colgate	0	Honorary Degrees and Awards; Residential Life; Nominating
Davidson	0	Unspecified presence on 7 of 8 committees
Macalester	0	Academic Affairs; Admissions; Advancement; Campus Life; Finance; Infrastructure
Middlebury	0	Honorary Degree; Conference (charged with transparency and communication concerns)
Oberlin	13	Academic Affairs (3); Budget & Finance (2); Capital Planning (1); Development (3) Investment
U. of Richmond	0	Academic Affairs; Advancement
Washington and Lee	8	Undergraduate Academics and Admissions; Development & External Affairs; Law School; Finance

Summary of Research Results:

8/22 peer/aspirant schools have full-time teaching faculty serving on Boards of Trustees

1/22 Boards (Sewanee) includes faculty with voting status (though the Sewanee BoT is not the primary policy-making body there)

21/22 peer/aspirant schools have institutionalized presence on BoT

Rationale for faculty presence on Board of Trustees:

1) diversify perspectives (academic and corporate; micro details of teaching, scholarship, and service at Rollins and macro-level visioning; current opportunities/challenges and long-term sustainability)

2) potentially improve decision-making.

3) promote transparency and demystify policy-making.

- 4) humanize the relationship between faculty and the Board.
- 5) follow models established by our peer and aspirant schools

Draft Language of A&S proposal:

A colloquium on 10/2/9 revealed unanimous support among A&S faculty in attendance for a faculty presence on the Board of Trustees in four venues:

- 1) Two faculty participants (the A&S faculty President and one at-large representative, elected to a 3-year term) on the Board itself
- 2) Two faculty participants (the chair of the Academic Affairs governance committee and one at-large representative, elected to a 3-year term) on the Education subcommittee
- 3) Two faculty participants (the chair of the Finance and Services governance committee and one at large representative, elected to a 3-year term) on the Business and Finance subcommittee
- 4) Two faculty participants (the A&S faculty President and one at-large representative, elected to a 3-year term) on the Committee on Trustees.

The status of these faculty would be non-voting participant-observers.

Description of Rollins BoT Committees:

Audit: elected by Board; reviews College's financial statements as prepared by external auditors; communicates with College auditors

Business & Finance: reviews/recommends annual operating budget; oversees physical plant

Committee on Trustees: elected by Board; nominates Board members

Compensation: determines President's salary; reviews/approves President's recommendations for VP compensation

Development: reviews financial needs of College; recommends programs for raising funds to meet those needs

Education: reviews/recommends new degree programs; candidates for tenure and promotion; candidates for promotion to full professor; candidates for emeritus; assures/protects academic freedom

Executive: elected by board; acts on behalf of Board when Board is not in session

Investment: oversees College's fund managers

APPENDIX 5

Guiding Principles for Faculty Feedback to Senior Administrators

Purpose

To develop a system that provides for a regular and candid flow of information between the faculty and senior administrators concerning each administrator's performance in the aspects of the position that affect the faculty. This system is primarily intended to provide constructive feedback that the administrators can reflect upon and respond to, with the ultimate goal of improving the effectiveness of the administration and their relationship with the faculty.

Goals

The goal of the system is to provide a method for administrators to receive feedback directly from the faculty at large and for the faculty to have some method to inform administrators of their opinions on administrative performance on matters directly relating to their interaction with the faculty. These matters may include such things as the educational process and program; student life issues; issues pertaining to salaries, promotion and tenure; and issues concerning the interaction between the administration and the faculty. This mechanism will also provide an opportunity for the faculty to hold administrators accountable for their decisions as well as for administrators to identify concerns relating to their performance and to reflect on and respond to these concerns.

Guiding Assumptions

- 1) The process will be undertaken in a spirit of collegiality, with the intention of assisting in the professional development of the administrator and improving communication between the faculty and administration.
- 2) The mechanism will include feedback from the entire faculty.
- 3) A questionnaire format will be used and the questions will be developed in a spirit of cooperation between the faculty and administrators. However, the faculty will have the final responsibility for deciding what questions will be asked.
- 4) The Executive Committee of the Arts and Sciences will have access to all of the information provided by the faculty at large and will meet with the administrator to discuss what was learned.

- 5) The administrator will respond to the feedback in writing. This response will be available to all members of the faculty.
- 6) The feedback mechanism will be a biennial event that will not necessarily be linked to the period of evaluation.

Process

The process will eventually include all senior administrators; however, the initial effort will be to implement a program that includes the President, Provost, Dean of the Faculty, and Dean of Student Affairs. The feedback process will occur on a continuing two-year cycle beginning with the Provost and Dean of Student Affairs during the 2009-10 academic year.

The method for feedback will be a survey conducted on-line anonymously and all faculty will be asked to participate. The questions will be open ended and allow for both specific and general comments. There will be a two-week window in which faculty will be able to respond.

Once all faculty have been provided an opportunity to respond, the collected responses will be provided to the administrator and the chair of the PSC. The chair of the PSC will summarize the results in a report to the Executive Committee that will form the basis of a discussion between the administrator and the Executive Committee; however, all of the responses from the faculty will be available to members of the Executive Committee should they wish to review them. The Executive Committee will meet with the administrator to discuss the results, and the administrator will write a response to the feedback that will be available to the entire faculty.

The Professional Standards Committee will review this policy during the fall of 2011 and report to the faculty on the effectiveness of the process and any proposed changes.

Laurie's experience and qualitative