

10-15-2009

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Executive Committee Meeting, Thursday, October 15, 2009

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, October 15, 2009" (2009). *Executive Committee Minutes*. Paper 61.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ec/61

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
October 15, 2009**

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

Guests: Udeth Lugo, Leon Hayner, Hoyt Edge

- 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 October 1, 2009.
- III. Old Business
 - A. Dean of Student Affairs Study Committee – Foglesong restates the faculty motion which passed: “EC will appoint a committee to examine the structural relationship of the Dean of the Student Affairs Office to the rest of the institution and report back to the faculty in 30 days with a recommended decision about what to do next, including the possibility of moving forward with a search.” He then recalls at the last executive meeting the EC appointed itself as the study committee to examine the issue and report back to the faculty with a recommendation including the possibility of moving ahead with a search. He states he favors appointing the interim as dean for a set time period while the issue of the relationship between the Dean of Student Affairs and Dean of the Faculty is examined. Small comments he sees Foglesong’s recommendation as reasonable. Tillmann states past faculty minutes show that at the October 2008 meeting it was announced there would be a national search. She asks why it took until October 2009 to raise the issue of a study of structure and investigate different models. Boles explains the search was planned for this year because last year was dedicated to revision of the mission statement. Davison expresses concern the faculty would not favor this solution, that is appointing the interim as dean and then beginning the examination of the structure. She states she believes the faculty minimally should discuss the issue further before EC recommends a decision. Small responds restructuring is a big issue, there are a variety of models to consider, and many models require extensive change beyond merely student affairs. Small explains the issue is too important and holds too long term of consequences to act quickly without adequate study. Foglesong suggests EC and A&S confront an imperfect choice with which not everyone will be satisfied. He explains the situation already is problematic for multiple reasons including potential candidates read

minutes, the position is only at the dean's level, and the faculty lack authority to change structure on its own. Foglesong suggests as a possible quid pro quo to support the appointment of the interim as dean and then begin a study of structure with administrative support. Foglesong also states the faculty need to care about student affairs, and the uncertainty caused by the lack of a dean in the position for the past few years. Foglesong again suggests an offer of the dean's position to the current interim for three years beginning now, and then the appointment of a committee with the charge to report back to the faculty in a year with structural options. Tillmann states EC needs to take the issue to the faculty and present options. Small reiterates EC must indicate to the faculty that the issue of realignment of the administration is a larger issue than A&S because it touches offices which extend beyond A&S. Boles states he likes the proposal given the reality of no perfect answer; he also opposes discussing all options as confusing. Tillmann objects, contends it is not confusing, and argues for transparency. Tillmann states she personally desires to hear from faculty members before reaching a decision. Small says he believes the floor of a faculty meeting offers inadequate time to handle the complexity of the issue. Tillmann asks what else is on the agenda for the upcoming faculty meeting, and argues there will be adequate time. Moore states EC is discussing the issue as if it is our decision as to whether or not the administration will make an appointment. Edge asserts he had something larger in mind when he spoke about restructuring. He explains his particular concern with the issue: the need for the faculty to consider the issue of centrality of A&S. He states he thought the faculty should engage in a larger conversation not merely about restructuring but also regarding centrality. Edge also explains the issue is not simply about naming positions (whether dean or vp) but also understanding what these positions include. Small says the issue is one which cannot be decided in 30 days; 30 days does not provide sufficient time to effectively think about the structure of institution. Foglesong states in order to pursue any serious process to consider restructuring the faculty must have some administrator buy-in to process. Tillmann expresses concern about the language of a three year position which is not terminal, and asks whether there is a guarantee of a national search at the end of that time period. Tillmann states whether and when a national search will be held must be made clear to our colleagues. Foglesong suggests reconsidering his initial proposal and modifying the proposal so that the dean is appointed, and the president and provost consider the timetable. Tillmann voices an objection to the possibility EC did not study the issue, but now might eliminate the possibility for a national search. Boles expresses concern that a search probably is not a good idea given problems previously identified; he asserts the search could be a waste of time and money. Wallrapp asks if A&S could say it will do a national search, but simply push the time table out. Tillmann suggests extending the dean for another year as interim while undertaking

the study, and then holding the search. Foglesong expresses willingness to offer Tillmann's suggestion as a possibility to the faculty. Foglesong suggests presenting to and discussing with the faculty three options, and then asking for a vote of affirmation for the EC choice. Foglesong presents the three alternatives: Tillmann's proposal – a two year interim dean, a study of the structure, and then a national search with the interim welcome to apply; Foglesong's initial proposal – appoint the interim to the dean's position and then study the structure; and the third option – immediately undertake a national search while simultaneously studying the structure. Wallrapp raises the issue of the number of interims and the importance to place a year limit on the interim position. Lugo explains the difference between an acting and interim position. Tillmann moves to present to faculty members all three options. Moore seconds and it passes 6-1 with Boles dissenting. Small then moves the EC endorse to the faculty the option which appoints the interim as DOSA and also appoints a committee to examine the administrative structure of the college. Boles seconds the motion which passes 5-2.

IV. New Business

- A. MPAC Report – Moore suggests the MPAC report on merit pay should be attached to the minutes from the EC. All concur. Moore introduces a motion to attach the report and the motion unanimously passes.
- B. Maymester Pay Review – Moore raises the point the executive committee still must address the question whether PSC or F&S will undertake a comprehensive review of compensation, including Maymester pay, this year. Davison identifies the need to look for gender inequities in stipends for various director positions particularly associated with Holt because in the past only when such stipends were included was the gender inequity in compensation identified. Due to time EC agrees this discussion will continue at a future meeting.
- C. Diversity Council Liaisons – Foglesong explains the Diversity Council would like liaisons from the various standing committees and suggests this could be perceived as odd because the Council is not part of faculty governance. Davison states this could give legitimacy to a council which is not representative and on which faculty governance reps would constitute a meaningless minority. Tillmann states she thought the Diversity Council only wanted a person to contact on the various committees. Tillmann offers to try to clarify the actual request. Due to time constraints, discussion will continue at a subsequent meeting.
- D. Agenda for October 22 faculty meeting- Tillmann suggests the meeting be dedicated to discussion of the three options regarding the DOSA and the examination of restructuring. She also suggests the faculty operate as a committee of the whole. Davison concurs and encourages Foglesong to present each option with pros and cons. EC agrees upon this issue and process for the October 22 faculty meeting.

V. Adjournment—The meeting was adjourned at 1:44pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Joan Davison
Vice President/Secretary

Appendix A MPAC Report

To: Executive Committee of the Arts and Sciences
From: Merit Pay Appeals Committee
Date: October 5, 2009
Subject: Observations on the merit pay process

The members of the Merit Pay Appeals Committee have identified the following concerns about the process used for awarding salary increases based on merit. In most cases recommendations are provided, however, the complex nature of the process does not lend itself to simple solutions. The issues are complicated, sometimes nuanced, and often controversial. Therefore, the recommendations are not always of a specific nature.

1) There were no concrete and objective criteria for each category of evaluation. Thus the evaluation had a strong component of professional judgment. Furthermore, the FSC did not review faculty members that were rated by the dean as meeting expectations. Therefore, unless a faculty member was rated as not meeting expectations or as exceeding expectations the only review was by the dean. Recommendation: The expectations of the College should be explicitly stated, or it should be stated that the evaluation will be based on the professional judgment of the FSC. If the latter is chosen, both the dean and the FSC should review the performance of every faculty member.

2) Since the criteria were never publicly stated or debated, there was some misunderstanding about what constituted the expectations of the FSC. Recommendation: A significant effort should be made to ensure that the criteria for evaluation are debated and understood by all faculty *before* FSARs are submitted and the evaluation process begins.

3) Over 35% of the faculty was rated as exceeding expectations. Therefore, being rated as meeting expectations was viewed by some as a punitive designation. This feeling was acute among those who dedicate a large fraction of their time to the institution but were rated as only meeting expectations. Recommendation: The faculty should undertake a serious discussion of what the expectations actually are and what they should be; other terms should be substituted for “meets expectations” and “exceeds expectations”; and

other methods of gradation should be explored, including having only two categories (“meets expectations” or “does not meet expectations”) or limiting the number in the topmost category to a smaller fraction of the faculty.

4) Several faculty members were disappointed in the appellate process because the process for deciding merit pay was not open to appeal. Recommendation: Both the FSC and the dean should review every faculty member and a second review by the FSC should be the first level of appeal. Only after a second review by the FSC should the case be forwarded to the MPAC.

5) The criteria for merit pay do not appear to parallel the criteria for tenure and promotion. In the merit pay system the three areas of teaching, scholarship, and service are equally weighted; in the tenure and promotion system teaching is weighted more heavily and service less heavily. Also, the criteria for tenure and promotion are framed in six-year increments while the evaluation for merit pay only covers three years. Therefore, it is possible that a faculty member must choose between enhancing the possibility for tenure and promotion or enhancing the possibility for merit pay. Recommendation: The expectations for receiving merit pay and those for tenure and promotion should be aligned.

6) The use of the Course and Instructor Evaluation forms as the only method of evaluating teaching effectiveness is problematic. The limited experience and narrow perspective of the average undergraduate student can lead to results that are not representative of the effectiveness of the teacher. There was also an indication that the number of students dropping a class was considered in cases where the faculty member was determined not to meet expectations in the area of teaching. Recommendation: A method for the comprehensive evaluation of teaching should be developed and then used for all evaluations. This should involve some method that provides the faculty member the opportunity to reflect on the CIEs, as well as comment on both successful and failed classroom experiments. Once developed, the results should not be restricted to use in the evaluation for merit pay but should be used in the evaluation for tenure and promotion as well.

7) Several faculty taught overloads with the understanding that they were assisting the department and the students who needed specific classes for graduation, which they viewed as service to the College. However, they believe that there was no consideration of this in the determination of merit pay, and indeed they believe that they were penalized because overload teaching was performed in lieu of other service to the College. Similarly, there appeared to be no departmental context in the evaluation of teaching. Faculty who did not teach service courses, RCC classes, or develop new courses were penalized (in the sense of not being considered to exceed expectations). Yet in some cases they believed that this was impossible due to departmental demands. Recommendation: There should be more departmental input into determining the expectations of each faculty member and the faculty member should know what this input is.

8) Actions over a three-year time frame were used to decide whether a faculty member met the expectations of the College. In some cases it appears that this was not an adequate time frame, especially if there was significant service or scholarship within a four- or five-year time frame. Therefore, in some cases the three-year time frame did not allow for a balance within the three areas of responsibility. This was especially important if the faculty member had genuinely excelled in one area at the expense of another over the three years under consideration. One important concern in this regard is the fear that due to budgetary restrictions compensation for meritorious service will not continue. Therefore, some faculty believe that they have been unfairly penalized because the FSC did not consider a longer time period. Recommendation: The College should either publicly commit to continued annual merit pay increases or lengthen the period of consideration.

9) Some actions that faculty members viewed as service to the College were heavily compensated and therefore not considered as service by the FSC. These faculty members believe that because they spend an inordinate amount of time in these roles, they have no time for uncompensated service and are therefore not eligible to be rated as exceeding expectations. Thus, there are mixed signals. Should faculty members take on compensated service that is important to the College, or should they do uncompensated service that may be of lesser importance but may reap greater financial reward in the long term? It also appears that there is some service that should be compensated at a higher level, but if it were, the faculty member would lose the opportunity to be rated as exceeding expectations. Also, it is not clear what the limit of compensation was that moved a responsibility from being service into the category of an action that is expected. Finally, there appear to be numerous service opportunities that are compensated by awarding a one-course overload to the faculty (which must be taken in salary, not as release time), while there are others that appear to take approximately the same amount of time but are either not compensated or are extensively compensated. Recommendation: The College should institute a cohesive compensation strategy, be clear about what will be considered as service for the purpose of awarding merit pay, and ensure that this is consistent with the tenure and promotion process. Also, if a faculty member performs compensated service, it should be clear what the expectations are so that both the FSC and the individual will understand if she or he is exceeding or not meeting them.

10) Teaching evaluations from the Holt School were either not available or not consistent with those of the Arts and Sciences. Therefore, it was difficult to compare the evaluations of faculty with a significant role in Holt to those faculty whose entire role is within the Arts and Sciences. This was especially true when graduate classes were involved, where the evaluations by the students can vary considerably from those of undergraduates due to the different form of the evaluation as well as the maturity of the student. Recommendation: The expectations for teaching in the A&S, Holt undergraduate, and Holt graduate programs should be explicitly stated so that it is clear when a faculty member has not met or has exceeded these expectations.

11) Since there was a lack of departmental input into the decision process, a faculty member could easily spend a significant amount of time and effort attempting to exceed the expectations of the department while not meeting or exceeding the expectations of the College. This is important in any case, but it is crucial if the faculty member is untenured. Recommendation: The simple solution is that there should be significant departmental input into the merit pay process. However, the Committee recognizes that the system at Rollins College does not support a strong administrative role for the department chair in personnel matters. Furthermore, many department chairs are not comfortable being involved in evaluating the faculty within their department.

12) There was concern by some faculty that the decision by the FSC concerning merit pay was going to be used for other purposes. This concern was heightened by the perceived differences between the requirements for tenure and promotion and those of the merit pay process. Recommendation: Until the criteria for the decision on merit pay are explicitly stated, the results of the process should not be used for any other purpose.

13) Some faculty did not put enough effort into completing the FSAR, assuming that information on their CV or familiarity with their teaching, research and service would be considered. Recommendation: The submission of the CV should be decoupled from the submission of the FSAR and the importance of submitting a complete FSAR with ample justification should be reemphasized.