

2-15-2010

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Executive Committee Meeting, Monday, February 15, 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, Monday, February 15, 2010" (2010). *Executive Committee Minutes*. Paper 52.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ec/52

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
February 15, 2010**

Members Present: Rick Foglesong, William Boles, Jim Small, Lisa Tillmann, Lewis Duncan, Joan Davison

Guests: Don Davison

- I. Call to order—the meeting was called to order at 4:00 PM.
- II. Approval of Minutes—the minutes of the February 4, 2010 executive committee were not approved at this time due to the special nature of this meeting. Foglesong announces the decision to wait until the regular executive committee meeting scheduled for February 17.
- III. Old Business
 - A. Merit Pay – Foglesong explains the executive committee has three documents with which to work: the latest CAMP proposals, the Dean's letter highlighting the amendments from CAMP which she supports, and a document incorporating the proposals as amendments into the existing Strategic Faculty Compensation Implementation Protocol. Foglesong notes three questions exist: 1) whether to submit the proposal separately or en bloc; 2) whether EC recommends the proposals or simply moves CAMP's proposals to the faculty; 3) whether CAMP or EC presents the proposals. Foglesong notes faculty members might raise extraneous issues at the faculty meeting particularly regarding the legality of two evaluation systems. D. Davison asks what the specific legal question is. Boles states some concern exists with the current system because FSC does not evaluate every faculty member, but he notes the new proposals provide for the FSC and Dean to discuss and evaluate each individual so this issue should be moot with the amendments. Foglesong again asks whether EC should submit en bloc or separate the proposals. The members of EC all favor submitting the proposals separately. Foglesong asks about support for the first proposal which is for the department chair to submit a generic letter. Tillmann seeks a clarification about the meaning of contextual information and EC agrees to specify this refers to the department and its discipline, that is peculiarities related to departmental resources and demands and disciplinary challenges. EC agrees to recommend department chairs submit letters about the context. EC further agrees that the Dean and FSC should evaluate each faculty member based on the FSAR and professional judgment considerations; this proposal also will move forward. Duncan comments about the desirability of maintaining flexibility so the merit system can be adjusted in the future as the institution changes. He specifies that as some faculty members earn higher salaries the standard applied for such high earning faculty members to receive an

evaluation of 'exceeds merit' also should increase. Davison suggests this partially is accounted for in the current combination of the merit award being a combination of flat sum and a percentage of current salary. Davison further notes Duncan's point does relate to the issue of compensation for service and whether some compensation for service is so significant that in fact the 'service' becomes part of a faculty member's job and should not also be deemed meritorious. She emphasizes the importance of the report Casey is committed to delivering to EC on compensation above base. Foglesong then suggests EC continue to look at the suggested changes point by point. The EC agrees debate will occur concerning CAMP's suggested 1-5 scale for teaching. Duncan asks whether a 1-5 scale means that 3 is average teaching. Foglesong raises the concern that a 1-5 scale for teaching devalues scholarship and service categories. Foglesong further states a measurement issue exists because women, minorities, and older faculty members tend to receive lower evaluations from students. He elaborates that even if one thinks teaching ought to be counted more than scholarship and service, the imperfection of measurement creates a problem. D. Davison agrees that weighting teaching with a scale from 1-5 is a problem without providing criteria to inform the metric. D Davison also notes embedded in the weighting of teaching is a question about the institution's aspirations. He explains there are large, complex issues which ought to be fleshed out and discussed in order to define the relationship between teaching, service and scholarship. He concludes faculty members who believe strongly in weighting teaching see the teaching mission rooted in the bylaws, but at this time the dean of the faculty office will have implementation issues because of the lack of specific criteria. EC concurs these are important issues to discuss in a sustained fashion but given the substantial ambiguity associated with evaluating teaching it seems as if this is the wrong time to increase its weight. Duncan says one problem is teaching correlates with class size and also with grades given. Davison moves and Tillmann seconds "not to move forward item number 2, and instead to maintain assessment points 1-3 in each category; therefore exceeds expectations will be 8-9 total points, meets expectations will be 6-7 points, and below expectations is 1-5 points." The motion passes unanimously. Foglesong states he will explain to the faculty why EC did not move forward to the faculty floor the proposal to weight teaching on a 1-5 scale. EC then addresses the proposal that the faculty member be notified in writing with an explanation of the ranking. D Davison asks whether the intention is for the dean or provost to send this letter. Davison notes it is not clear in the proposal. Boles comments this was an important issue for faculty members. Davison concurs it was cited at the dean's forum and Small states it was significant to faculty members at the colloquium. EC agrees to support the proposal that faculty receive notification as to whether they meet, exceed, or are below expectations, with a break-out of points in each category, but not a detailed explanation of how the points awarded. EC agrees the next provision allows a faculty member to accept or challenge rankings and to gain interpretations from the FSC and the Dean. Then, if still dissatisfied with re-evaluation,

faculty members can appeal to a separate appeals committee. EC concludes and agrees to advance four proposals at the faculty meeting: 1) each faculty member will be notified in writing by the Dean with an explanation of the ranking; 2) each faculty member can request a re-evaluation from FSC and the Dean, and if still dissatisfied can appeal to the Merit Pay Appeals Subcommittee; 3) preceding the process, department chairs will submit generic letters to the FSC and Dean to provide contextual information about the department not available in the FSAR; 4) the available points for assessment will be: 1-3 for teaching, 1-3 for service, and 1-3 for scholarship. The Dean of the Faculty will review each faculty FSAR and rate the faculty member within the categories of *Meets Expectations*, *Exceeds Expectations*, or *Below Expectations* based upon the points for assessment. *Exceeds Expectations* will be awarded for 8-9 total points, *Meets Expectations* for 6-7 total points and *Below Expectations* for 3-5 points. The FSC will review each faculty member; evaluation will be based on the FSAR and professional judgment considerations identified by the department chair. The FSC will reach agreement with the Dean on all faculty evaluated. Foglesong states he will present the amendments to the faculty using powerpoint with both the language of the existing protocol and tracked changes as well as the four separate proposals. Foglesong says we will move changes 1-4 as amendments to the text. Foglesong concludes the agenda will have four proposals under new business.

IV. New Business - none

V. Adjournment—The meeting was adjourned at 5:10pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Joan Davison
Vice President/Secretary