

3-19-2009

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Executive Committee Meeting, Thursday, March 19, 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, March 19, 2009" (2009). *Executive Committee Minutes*. Paper 67.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ec/67

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
March 19, 2009**

Members Present: Wendy Brandon, Susan Libby, Barry Levis, Don Davison, Mike Gunter, Marissa Germain, Paul Harris, Jim Eck

- I. Call to order—the meeting was called to order at 12:40 PM.
- II. Approval of Minutes--the minutes of the March 5, 2009 Executive Committee Meeting were approved as distributed.
- III. Old Business
 - A. Announcements—Davison announced that the faculty party will be held on April 4th on the Cornell Fine Arts Museum patio. He also mentioned that he had sent out the two Bylaw amendments from PSC (see attachment 1). Libby suggested that the suggested inclusion of the sentence regarding the requirement that the CEC must include three tenured members of committee resulted in some contradictory language in the Article. PSC wanted to drop that requirement and leave the bylaw as is. Levis felt that the possibility of only one tenured person on a committee was unacceptable. Gunter and Harris both agreed that it was problematic. Libby said that PSC took a more positive view that junior faculty would not be intimidated to vote against their views by tenured members. Gunter asked what other institutions like Rollins did in these situations. Libby said that the committee had not done a survey. Harris said that the Psychology department does not allow non-tenured voting. Brandon observed this was very significant at Rollins because of the power of the CEC in tenure decisions. Harris said there were two separate questions: whether non-tenured faculty could vote since in some departments they can and in others they cannot. There is also the question of the minimum number of tenured faculty on a committee. The Executive Committee agreed that the proposal needs to be sent back to PSC, and it will be considered at a later date. Davison said that when these procedures were originally adopted, it was largely untenured faculty so that context has to be taken into consideration. Davison expressed concern that an ABD could actually have a vote on a CEC decision under the current Bylaws.
 - B. Finish organizing governance business for the rest of the year—(see attachment 2 labeled “Pending Executive Business.”)

1. Diversity Committee Resolution—(see attachment 3) —Brandon said that AAC has reviewed the proposal and felt that there were a number of omissions that they noted. Germain thought that the statement was very inclusive since it listed other than just traditionally underrepresented groups. Libby observed that the more the list contains the more that are left out. She said it was a statement of values; what could be wrong with that. Davison asked Eck if "historically underrepresented" was a legal term to which Eck agreed. Brandon felt that this statement will not help certain groups on campus because it is not overarching enough. Germain observed that the Diversity Committee's main purpose was attempting to encourage the retention of minority faculty. Brandon said that this committee would not really be able to accomplish that. The Diversity Committee has no sustainability; it is not representative of the faculty since it is not elected. She did not want a committee outside the governance structure not elected by their peers and therefore not necessarily representative of the faculty to undertake this responsibility. AAC felt that PSC should also provide input for the resolution. Libby felt that there needed to be some committee that would undertake this initiative rather than an expectation that all parts of the institution would assume responsibility. Harris felt that the resolution asks for the creation of a committee to begin this process. Harris felt that the college should establish such a committee and let them work out the details of the resolution and what should be included. Levis said that originally the committee was established under Bornstein and was representative of faculty, staff, administration, and students. Why couldn't they undertake this task? Harris felt that the Executive Committee should send resolution back to the Diversity Committee to reconsider. The resolution should be broadened and also deal with the issue of representation. The motion passed by a vote of 4-2.
2. Internationalization report—Davison thought that the report should be passed through PSC. Libby said that Alon and Jennifer Campbell would be meeting with the committee shortly.
3. Evaluation of Senior Administrators (see attachment 3)—Davison reported that Levis, Libby, and he had met with the Duncan to discuss the president's concerns with the process. He had suggested changing some of the questions. Libby reported that so far members of PSC had not wanted to change the questions. Eck pointed out that this same survey had been used in the evaluation of administrations when Bornstein was president. Davison wondered where the report would go. Libby said the President, and PSC also thought it should go to the Executive Committee because it was generally a doubly elected body. Harris argued that it must be in executive session because of the sensitivity of the materials. Brandon asked who would be the audience

for this evaluation. Eck said that it should be the supervisors of the person being evaluated. Libby felt that the material needed to be seen by someone. Harris thought it would not be useful unless the administrator discussed the results with the Executive Committee. Libby urged that what PSC had conceived should happen. Davison replied that the question of who would have access to the report still was open, and also if the Executive Committee were to see the results if a bylaw change would be required. Levis pointed out that a Bylaw change would need to go to the faculty in the April meeting.

VI. Adjournment—the meeting was adjourned at 2:00 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Barry Levis
Secretary

Attachment 1

A) PSC recommendation for composition of CEC's, which is to let the current By-Law stand. PSC was asked to reconsider whether non-tenured faculty should serve on CEC's and decided that it is for the good of the institution for junior faculty to serve on CEC's.

Article VIII Section D, 4

Section 4. Candidate Evaluation Committee Structure and Evaluation

Reappointment evaluations are normally conducted by the Candidate Evaluation Committee. The chair of the department to which the candidate has been appointed, in consultation with members of that department, shall select a Candidate Evaluation Committee by June 15 prior to the academic year in which the evaluation takes place. **The Candidate Evaluation Committee shall consist of a minimum of three tenured faculty members.** The Candidate Evaluation Committee normally consists of the Chair of the department (unless the Chair is being evaluated) and a minimum of two additional tenured members of the department who are selected by a majority of all full-time members of the department, without excluding tenured members who wish to serve. In addition, a member of the Faculty Evaluation Committee serves as an ex officio (non-voting) member when the candidate is being evaluated for tenure or promotion. **If two additional tenured members of the department are unavailable, non-tenured members may be appointed.** If non-tenured members are unavailable, the department Chair, with the advice of the candidate and the approval of the Candidate Evaluation Committee, will select tenured members from outside the department to serve on the Committee. If the department Chair is the candidate being evaluated, another member of the department shall be selected as Candidate Evaluation Committee chair.

For candidates with an appointment in more than one department or program, the Candidate Evaluation Committee, with the advice of the candidate, will add to the Committee one more tenured faculty member, **or non-tenured faculty member if a tenured faculty member is unavailable.** This faculty member should have greater familiarity with the work of the candidate outside the department to which the candidate was appointed. If such a faculty member is unavailable, the Chair of the Professional Standards Committee will select a tenured faculty member to serve on the Candidate Evaluation Committee.

B) PSC recommendation for By-Law change regarding promotion to associate professor without tenure.

Article VIII, B

Section 3. Specific Criteria for Reappointment and Promotion

Current wording:

Promotion to Associate Professor. Persons holding the rank of Assistant Professor may be awarded promotion to the rank of Associate Professor after a minimum of six years of full-time teaching in a senior institution at the Assistant Professor level, of which at least four years have been at this institution.

If the Candidate Evaluation Committee and the appropriate Dean believe that the individual's contribution to the College, professional growth, and potential warrant promotion, then upon their recommendations and the concurrence of the Provost, the promotion may be granted by the President. No candidate will be promoted without the approval of a majority of the Candidate Evaluation Committee. Only in exceptional cases will promotion to the rank of Associate Professor be considered for individuals not holding the terminal degree in the appropriate field and not having completed the minimum number of years. These exceptional cases will be determined by joint approval of a majority of the relevant Candidate Evaluation Committee, the Faculty Evaluation Committee, and the appropriate Dean.

The PSC recommends that the practice of promoting faculty to associate professor without tenure be discontinued because there is no formal extra-departmental review process involved in the decision to promote, and that promotion before the award of tenure makes it difficult not to award tenure if such a decision is otherwise warranted. The new policy states that promotion is awarded upon award of tenure; this would not affect tenure review and award for faculty with previous experience, as stipulated in D, Section 1.

Recommended new wording:

Persons holding the rank of Assistant Professor at Rollins are promoted to the rank of Associate Professor upon the award of tenure. (See eligibility for tenure, Section D).

...

D. PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATION OF CANDIDACY FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION

Section 1. Eligibility for Tenure

Normally, a candidate is eligible for the awarding of tenure in his or her seventh year of a tenure-track appointment at Rollins, with the possibility for earlier consideration if the candidate has had prior experience. Individuals with three years full-time experience at the Assistant Professor level or higher at other institutions may be awarded tenure in their sixth year at Rollins. Individuals with four or more years full-time experience at the Assistant Professor level or higher at other institutions may be awarded tenure in their

fifth year at Rollins. Individuals who have had full-time experience at the Assistant Professor level or higher at Rollins in a visiting position may use their Rollins' visiting experience as tenure-track, or may utilize up to the full seven-year tenure-track probationary period.

Attachment 2

Executive Committee Meeting, March 5, 2009

Pending Executive Committee/ Faculty Business

1. Governance elections (March faculty meeting)
2. Dean of Student Affairs report to faculty (March meeting)
3. FEC—bylaws (March and April meetings)
4. PSC—bylaws (March and April meetings)
5. F&S—Resolution regarding faculty representation on Board of Trustee committees* (March meeting)
6. Graduation hours (April faculty meeting)
7. Diversity Committee's resolution
8. Internationalization Report—when will PSC receive the report?
9. PSC—Administrator evaluation (in process; scheduled for April)
10. SLC—Report on faculty involvement in student organizations
11. Student Affairs mission statement
12. Executive Committee recommendation regarding merit pool—pending budget decisions by Board of Trustees
13. Request for foreign language residential learning community

14. Other new business?

Attachment 3

From: Kathryn Norsworthy
To: ddavison@rollins.edu
CC: blevis@rollins.edu,slibby@rollins.edu,Mgunter@rollins.edu,Pharris@rollin...
Date: 10/8/2008 11:38 PM
Subject: For the EC meeting on Thursday, October 9

Hi all,

I hope I have covered all the members of the EC in this email. On behalf of the Diversity Committee, I am requesting that the EC put forward a resolution to the faculty that supports the acclamation made by the faculty at the last meeting:

"Toward the larger goal of creating a fully inclusive Rollins community, we the faculty affirm the goal of developing and IMPLEMENTING a strategic, institutional plan for recruitment and retention of faculty and staff of color and other historically under-represented groups."

I would like to request that the resolution going forward to the faculty be approximately the following: Toward the goal of creating a fully inclusive Rollins community, a committee will be formed to collaborate with senior administration and staff leadership in developing and implementing a strategic, institutional plan for recruitment and retention of faculty and staff of color and other historically under-represented groups.

As you can see, the intention of the resolution is to set up a mechanism for proceeding forward with this project whereby we hold ourselves and various constituents accountable for keeping this project alive and following through in development and implementation. Perhaps you will have resolution wording that further articulates the goals outlined here. Thank you very much for your attention and follow-through on this very important project.

Sincerely,
Kathryn Norsworthy
Co-Chair
Rollins Diversity Committee

Kathryn L. Norsworthy, Ph.D.
Professor/Licensed Psychologist
Rollins College
Graduate Studies in Counseling
1000 Holt Ave.
Winter Park, FL 32789
407 646-2132

