

9-17-2009

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Executive Committee Meeting, Thursday, September 17, 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, September 17, 2009" (2009). *Executive Committee Minutes*. Paper 63.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ec/63

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
September 17, 2009**

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

Guests:

- I. Call to order—the meeting was called to order at 12:39 PM.
- II. Approval of Minutes—The Executive Committee approved the minutes of September 3, 2009.
- III. Old Business
 - A. Merit Pay Assessment – Foglesong reminds EC it must move to begin a review of the faculty merit pay system given its first round of decisions and appeals. Moore and Boles raise questions about whether additional merit funds are available. Joyner states she believes \$180,000 is allocated and ready to be spent for merit, and therefore it is important to agree on assessment. Casey concurs that \$180,000 is available. Duncan guarantees money not spent has not been swept. Joyner reminds EC the legislation adopted and placed in the handbook for merit pay specifies ongoing evaluation by the FSC. Foglesong concurs that division chairs must be organized for the review process. The current chairs are Paul Stephenson, Sharon Carnahan, Ed Cohen, and John Sinclair. The EC then discusses names for the EC appointment to FSC giving special consideration to balance of gender and rank. Foglesong will contact the suggested candidate and ask the nominee to serve.
 - B. Transparency in Governance-Foglesong presents a transparency agenda. He believes three methods exist to enhance participation in governance. He suggests, first educate faculty on Roberts Rules. Foglesong explains the rules exist to facilitate participation and decision-making not to impede the process. No one should feel excluded from participation and no one should gain any privilege in using the rules. Foglesong intends to make available a summary explanation of Roberts Rules in order to try to promote participation. He also encourages people to contact the parliamentarian, Carol Lauer, with questions for help. Foglesong then identifies the second problem for governance is insufficient time at faculty meetings and colloquia to discuss important issues. Therefore he announces he plans to use Blackboard to hold virtual deliberations through threaded discussions on Blackboard. He requests affirmation to

the use of blackboard. Foglesong identifies transparency as the third method to promote participation and good governance. Foglesong then presents his proposal for open meetings, which reinforces and further specifies provisions in the bylaws for “open observation of the meetings of the A&S faculty.” He refers to Article II, Section 5 on Attendance and Participation by Other Non-Members. The relevant passage from Article II, Section 5 is: “All meetings of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences and its governance committees shall be open to observation by any employee or student of the College, provided, however, such open observation shall not apply in grievance considerations, including hearing on that subject.” The section elaborates: “The right of a non-member to speak at meetings of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences shall ordinarily be granted by the President of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences or the chair of the committee. A non-member shall ordinarily be limited to a combined total of five minutes in which to speak. Exceptions to the practice of open meetings or to the limit of a combined total of five minutes of speaking time for a non-member shall require a vote of the members of the committee or faculty.” Foglesong then offers his proposal: “1. The time, place, and agenda for all governance meetings shall be announced in advance on the Governance Web site. This shall be the responsibility of the committee chair and his/her departmental administrative assistant. 2. Anyone attending a governance meeting who are not members of the committee may speak at the meeting only with the permission of the committee chair. 3. All governance committees should meet in rooms with enough space to accommodate non-members. 4. All governance committee minutes should be posted on the Governance Web site as soon as they are approved. This shall be the responsibility of the committee chair. 5. Application: The above rules shall apply to all standing committees of the faculty and the subcommittees that they create. These rules shall not apply to the Faculty Evaluation Committee, Faculty Salary Committee, Merit Pay Appeals Committee, and Grievance Committee and other committees and subcommittees which deal with confidential personnel information. We invite other faculty committees wishing to use the good offices of Faculty Governance, such as the Diversity Committee and the Internationalization Committee, to comply with these rules as well. 6. In addition, we will use Blackboard on our Governance Web site to make possible asynchronous communication among faculty on issues of faculty concern.” EC members then voice concern about the burden of posting the schedule and minutes of meetings. Foglesong explains John Sharkey will provide further training to administrative assistants. Duncan questions whether the policy goes far enough in guaranteeing transparency. Duncan contends a true commitment to transparency would include open meetings when grant awards are considered. He explains it is useful for grantees to know why they are denied or funded relative to other requests. Casey suggests adoption of transparency should include a rule against ex parti communication. Foglesong responds ex parti

communication can occur whether meetings are open or closed. Casey emphasizes he is concerned about ex parte communication. Foglesong responds to Duncan's concern that grant meetings be opened and that the proposal be understood to exclude from the open meeting concept only those meetings in which personnel confidential information is discussed. Foglesong then suggests he needs EC affirmation in order to make the open meeting concept a de facto reality. Moore moves to adopt the six points as practice. Boles seconds, and EC unanimously adopts the points. Casey adds for the record that he will instruct ad hoc committees which report to the Provost to follow the policy. Davison qualifies that now that grant meetings are open Casey's position also will include meetings to select Arthur Vining Davis and Cornell chair recipients. Boles comments that with the open meeting policy he will need a large room for the colloquium on student housing.

IV. New Business

- A. Nomination Replacement Members for AAC and PSC—Small states he needs a replacement for Lackman who is on sabbatical and suggests a few names for consideration. Foglesong states he will contact the individuals and prepare a slate. He also will seek nominations from the floor of the faculty meeting. Casey suggests informing the faculty of AAC's membership so it can consider issues of diversity. Moore states PSC also has an at large vacancy. Additional names are considered with an emphasis on the need for tenured faculty members on PSC. Foglesong confirms he will try to build a slate for both positions for the faculty meeting. He also will check last year's ballots for the names of those who ran for a position.
- B. Faculty Priorities—Foglesong proposes looking at faculty priorities. He states there is a need for a detailed discussion when time allows. Joyner explains the primary priorities from the faculty retreat day survey are: competitive compensation, increased resources for travel and teaching materials, and advancement of the academic culture. She notes that this year faculty also listed the need to improve IT services.
- C. Agenda for September 24, 2009 Faculty Meeting—Foglesong presents the proposed agenda for the faculty meeting. He asks committee chairs to provide brief reports about what they plan to do this year. He encourages chairs to discuss with faculty both issues which are missing and committee topics which the faculty might view as unnecessary. There is no old business for the faculty meeting. New business includes election of a replacement member to AAC and PSC, the report on FSC and EC's

nominee to FSC, the report on the transparency in governance agenda, and Casey's discussion about the Dean of Students search.

- D. Trustee Retreat-Duncan announces he finally solidified the trustee retreat agenda for 10/8 and 10/9. He explains the trustees have an Audit meeting from 3:30-4:30 which some members probably will not attend. Duncan invites the faculty to organize a forum on issues of shared interest or concern. Small motions "to organize a forum on issues of faculty-trustee shared interest." Moore seconds, and the motion passes unanimously.
- E. Evaluation of the Dean: Foglesong explains two sets of issues exist regarding administrative evaluation. He states the first, senior administration evaluation bounced back to PSC, and EC will wait for PSC to report on the issue. The second issue is the evaluation of dean of the faculty. Joyner wishes to make a statement but two members of EC must leave. The meeting is suspended at 1:48pm and EC agrees to resume the meeting at 5:00pm on Friday, September 18 in the Dean of the Faculty office. The meeting resumes at 5:02pm on Friday, September 18. All members present at the beginning of the meeting on September 17 attend except for Duncan.
- F. Statement of the Dean of the Faculty-Joyner explains her views on the faculty feedback and evaluation of the Dean of the Faculty. She states she has become uncomfortable with the administrative feedback and evaluation process in the last few weeks based on conversations with people who have only partial or misinformation. Joyner elaborates the principles which directed her decisions supporting feedback and evaluation over the year. She enumerates: 1. I made clear when I interviewed for the Dean's position that I believe in faculty, staff and administrator evaluation with an emphasis on professional development geared toward continuous improvement and linked to a rational compensation system; this is not a new position for me, I drafted the original guidelines for administrative evaluation at my former institution which included faculty feedback as a basis for discussion and review; 2. I understand there is some disagreement regarding the interpretation of the Bylaws outlining the responsibilities of the Professional Standards Committee, but our Handbook does state that "PSC advises on the appointment, evaluation, and professional development of administrators." I viewed this early attempt at developing a system of ongoing evaluation of administrators as falling into the professional development area of this statement (i.e., a chance for faculty to provide constructive feedback on my performance); I also am influenced by the AAUP Redbook that endorses faculty members' contributions to "judgments and decisions related to administrators", therefore it seems obvious to me faculty have a legitimate role in the process of providing feedback regarding the performance of the Dean of the Faculty; 3. I accept and wish to support

my colleagues on EC and PSC who twice in the spring affirmed the use of the IDEA survey as the preferred course of action in the process of evaluation – from my perspective they dealt with the issue in an open, forthright, collaborative, and transparent way. In mid April I received an e-mail from Don Davison [president of the faculty, 2007-2009] saying they intended to use the IDEA survey for administrative evaluation, and he and I both saw its use in a professional manner and in the spirit of collegiality and development so we can continue to collectively advance the mission of Rollins. I did not hesitate to participate in this process because it was consistent with my beliefs and to do otherwise might be seen as duplicitous given my past comments of consistent support for an integrated approach to evaluation, development, and compensation; also to refuse would undermine decisions and interpretations of the Bylaws and undermine the work of my colleagues on PSC who I believe acted in good faith; yet I did prefer that I have the opportunity to provide a self-assessment before the survey was distributed. Despite this background, the process, and my beliefs, a few people have expressed concern given that I have chosen to move forward with this process. I am not sure where such fear comes from on our campus or how it gets perpetuated but let me make clear the decision to go forward has nothing to do with any real or perceived conflict with the President or Provost. In fact I had multiple conversations with the Provost who expressed support for me participating in the IDEA survey and stated that he felt this was appropriate and could be helpful in my position. I understand from Rick [Foglesong] we now are faced with the decision about how to proceed with the results and my usual tendency is to err on the side of openness, but something unexpected happened in the faculty's response. In comments in the qualitative section of the survey multiple other people are mentioned and this creates discomfort, as I do not wish to put others into an awkward position on what is an evaluation of me. I thought I could share with the faculty president or EC the quantitative portion of the results in order to protect the rights of others but this approach does complicate the interpretation of my findings given the absence of contextual information. Perhaps the EC can discuss the quantitative results and interpretation given by IDEA and interpreted by IDEA as positive given its norm. Only the quantitative results would be seen and discussed. Another suggestion that we may consider is perhaps the EC can see and discuss the quantitative results but we can limit the release of the qualitative results only to the faculty president, and then having me provide a report to the EC that includes my reflection regarding the results of this exercise. Of course, if the President of the Faculty feels that I am unfairly presenting or excluding any key themes that emerge we can have that discussion in the presence of EC members. This approach would allow the President of the Faculty on behalf of the EC to report what has been done to the full faculty. My intent from here is to work with the EC in a way that is consistent with the spirit of the faculty intention without hurting others or creating further

institutional upset. Foglesong then asks which method Joyner prefers to proceed with her evaluation. Joyner states she wants to hear the opinions of the faculty members on the EC because she wishes to be true to the real intent of the decision for faculty evaluation of administrators and so seeks the opinion of EC on the process. Foglesong repeats the EC decided at the previous meeting it would proceed with the evaluation on a step-by-step basis only with permission from Joyner on each step. Small states as the only person to vote against proceeding with Joyner's evaluation he appreciates faculty input and believes all administrators should have evaluations but sees evaluations of someone as organized by the superior and in Joyner's case Casey should control the process but that process should include faculty input as well as input from other offices of the college. Small notes he is only aware of what Joyner does in part of her job and only from limited interaction with her. Therefore, the evaluation must go through Casey. Casey states he does not see the current process as an established process, and does not even know exactly what the process is. He explains he is afraid of doing much with evaluation and contends what happened is badly flawed. He sees IDEA questions as problematic and therefore does not think the process is fair. Casey states he shared with Libby [last year's PSC chair] that he disagreed with PSC and EC's interpretation of the bylaws and believes it only applies to A&S. He notes PSC can comment on A&S but argues its power does not extend beyond that domain. He continues that the institutional process of evaluation is defined by the Board of Trustees for people at the VP level and above and the Board requires quadrennial level review of administrator activities and then reaches its decision. Casey states he explained to Libby the four-year process and indicated to her his evaluation was the following year [2009-2010]. He also explained to her the Board understands it must include multiple constituencies yet he swears responsibility to the Board; they are for whom he works. He tells Libby the process will include opportunity for feedback. Casey also mentions Duncan wanted to push the Board process to the dean and director level and that started with Erdmann the previous year [2007-2008]. It was to extend to McAllister [Dean of Crummer] last year [2008-2009] but was suspended because the possibility a merit increase based on the evaluation might not be available at the end of year given the economy. Therefore, Casey talked with Joyner about the administrative evaluation process but could not participate because of his contractual obligation to the Board. Casey also mentions he did participate in an IDEA evaluation when Rita [Bornstein, previous president] instituted it in his 2nd or 3rd year as provost [sic, Casey was Dean of the Faculty at that time] and he too was shocked by opportunities taken by faculty members to critique other people on his administrator evaluation. Casey states he learned from these evaluations as well as from peer evaluations. He states he believes the results still are in the office on file with Karla [Knight] and faculty could see these results. Casey continues he wants to be explicit that the faculty can do what it wishes

regarding administrative evaluation but in no way can that [a faculty] process be called an official evaluative process. Foglesong says Casey's comments have moved the discussion away from the current issue which is what to do with the dean of the faculty evaluation. He emphasizes it is necessary to distinguish between the issues of Joyner's evaluation and senior administrator evaluation. Foglesong states with respect to Joyner he proposes Joyner meet with "faculty on EC to talk about quantitative results and then hold a meeting only with me to talk about qualitative results, and then Laurie will respond to EC based upon these conversations and that response will become part of EC's minutes". Joyner states she is comfortable with this process. Tillmann responds this process is desirable with regard to the question of what to do with the Dean's results because the process is in the interest of maximum transparency and the process achieves the goal of insight from faculty colleagues for the Dean to consider. Tillmann continues and asks how to understand the rest of the faculty evaluation process of administrators and how can EC now facilitate the rest of the process because Tillmann thinks the process was flawed and finds IDEA questions flawed. Small says the process Foglesong proposes should not be seen as an evaluation but a chance for feedback and Joyner can respond to this feedback as she deems desirable. Small believes faculty members do not need to look at the results. Tillmann states she seeks more confidence in the measure before she sees results. Foglesong states reasons exist for people to see the results and reasons exist for people not to see the results. Foglesong emphasizes Joyner does not wish to undermine the governance process and in fact multiple governance votes multiple times favored following this process. Joyner concurs with Foglesong's statement she does not wish to undermine her colleagues on governance and multiple votes endorsed this process. Tillmann states she wants to proceed at every step with Joyner's consent. She states she "opposes a confrontational, oppositional, adversarial process and communication climate." Davison states the faculty resolution in support of the bylaws and faculty evaluation of administrators, which passed unanimously at the final faculty meeting of last year, is inconsistent with Tillmann's interpretation of faculty opposition to the process. Davison elaborates that only Jill Jones publicly questioned the process and focused on the problem of quantitative surveys such as the IDEA survey. Davison continues the faculty resolution unanimously endorsed the work and positions of the EC and PSC on the authority and process for administrative evaluation. She suggests that as the PSC moves forward with reconsidering the process unanimously supported by last year's PSC that the committee should invite Susan Libby, as the previous chair to PSC, to meet with them and explain the decision-making rationale from last year. Davison also notes a seeming inconsistency exists between challenges to the faculty's ability to evaluate administrators when students evaluate faculty in every course every semester and indeed these student evaluations are increasingly significant

for the tenure, promotion, and pay of faculty members. Davison states just this week department chairs were given access to the teaching evaluations of all members of their departments. She asks EC and in particular the PSC chair [Moore] to consider the issue of consistency in its attitude toward evaluations whether of faculty members or administrators. Joyner says that she seeks to balance the process and she desires to take into account her commitment to accountability to the faculty and her commitment to hear faculty feedback. Joyner further states she wishes to provide faculty with a chance to ask questions about her work and to give her feedback. Joyner welcomes an opportunity to discuss with EC her role as Dean and then to report to the whole faculty. Davison raises the question whether there is any potential issue or inconsistency about only Foglesong reading and discussing the qualitative section of Joyner's IDEA survey given Dave Richards' assertion in his merit pay report that a single evaluator is unacceptable. Small refocuses the issue and states he sees the process as feedback not evaluation. Joyner reiterates she sees the question of how to proceed both about accountability to the faculty and respect for the vote of her faculty colleagues on the evaluation process. Small explains he supports evaluation of administrators, they should be evaluated, but the faculty's role is only one of input and the faculty's input is only one part of the process. Joyner states the process as envisioned offers this opportunity for input. Boles comments merit pay is different than Joyner's evaluation because the IDEA surveys contain comments about others and therefore the EC should approach the Dean of the Faculty evaluation from the frame of mind of a pilot program. Moore states, "there is a time for compromise and this is the time for compromise." Wallrapp concurs. Casey "asks for point of clarification on the point the faculty vote on the process was not by the full faculty but rather in EC and PSC". Joyner asks whether the survey results be confidential within EC. Foglesong responds the EC will conduct itself concerning the evaluation as FEC does on personnel matters and not release results of the survey. Foglesong states only Joyner's response will be released. Tillmann asks why PSC did not bring the question of administrator evaluation to the vote of the whole faculty. Joyner answers many issues are decided within committees and the EC, and that at the last meeting the unanimous consensus was to move forward with evaluation. Tillmann says faculty members thought the last faculty meeting of the year would be a time for celebrating retirement, raising toasts, and drinking champagne but the events at the beginning of the meeting left many faculty members stunned into silence. Joyner states if that is the case then perhaps Jim [Small] is right and perhaps we should have a discussion with the full faculty and throw out all that has been done. Small responds, "If we ask the faculty if it supports administrative evaluation the answer will be 100% yes but the problem is the process". Casey asks what would happen if there is a change in language to clarify who is in charge of evaluation, and Small says colleagues will not vote for such legislation. Tillmann then identifies

the larger issue about the bylaws and what the bylaws indicate the EC decides and what goes forward to the faculty to vote. Foglesong states perhaps that is an issue but it is not the current issue. Foglesong also reminds EC that whether or not they “like the result the faculty did vote unanimously at the last faculty meeting to support EC and PSC on administrator evaluation”. Davison concurs and states further that this was not the first time the issue of administrator evaluation was brought to the full faculty. Both the president of the faculty and the chair of PSC made reports throughout the year at faculty meetings which noted the plan and progress for administrator evaluation. Davison suggests the EC and PSC could logically interpret the lack of questions or challenge to their reports as an indication this was not a controversial issue for the whole faculty and therefore could occur without a full vote. She also states this EC interpretation is indeed consistent with the bylaws which gives EC power to decide on the course of legislation. Casey again notes the process is imperfect, and he and Duncan backed away from the process when they received certified notes from IDEA requiring them to accept the IDEA survey as the official process for evaluation. Foglesong asks the EC to return to the issue which is how to proceed with the Dean of Faculty evaluation. Wallrapp asks if she as a voting member of EC may be included in the evaluation process by EC, and the membership of EC accepts. Davison moves “the voting members of EC will discuss and offer feedback to the Dean of the Faculty regarding the quantitative results of the IDEA survey, the Dean of the Faculty will hold a separate meeting only with the chair of EC to discuss the qualitative results, then the Dean of the Faculty will respond to EC based upon these conversations and that response will become part of EC’s minutes.” Boles seconds the motion. The motion passes 6-1. Small opposes.

V. Adjournment—The meeting was adjourned on Friday at 5:45pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Joan Davison
Vice President/Secretary