

3-5-2009

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Executive Committee Meeting, Thursday, March 5, 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 5, 2009" (2009).
Executive Committee Minutes. Paper 68.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ec/68

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 5, 2009**

Members Present: Laurie Joyner, Paul Harris, Susan Libby, Roger Casey, Marissa Germain, Lewis Duncan, Don Davison, Mike Gunter.

- I. Call to order—Davison called the meeting to order at 12:35 PM.

- II. Approval of Minutes.--The minutes of the January 22 and February 5, 2009 meeting of the Executive Committee were approved with minor corrections

- III. Old Business—None

- V. New Business
 - A. Organize governance business for the rest of the year (see attachment 1) labeled “Pending Executive Business”—Davison had compiled a list of forthcoming business and tried to organize them in a manner to allow the faculty to handle them expeditiously. Some of the items do not necessarily need to go to the faculty. Davison has not had a resounding response to his call for candidates for faculty elections. Harris concerned that no one has been nominated for Student Life with tenure. Germain said that SGA elections will be held at the end of March so that she would let Davison know who the new president will be. Duncan reported that the Trustee Bylaws call for the trustees to elect the president of the faculty with the recommendation of the faculty. He felt that this was not a good idea. Levis observed that it had never been followed as long as he had been at Rollins. Casey suggested that some of the trustees also thought it was a bad idea. Davison recommended that Hater make her report to the faculty on Student Affairs as the elections were proceeding.

 - B. FEC Bylaw Recommendation—Davison said that there was also a series of bylaw revisions that had been sent to him by Newman (see Attachment 2). He has asked PSC to look at them before they are presented to the faculty. Libby noted that Newman proposal dealt with the number of promotion and tenure cases under FEC review at one time. Newman's recommendation conflicted with what Davison thought was an appropriate solution to the problem. Newman suggested appointing additional faculty for one year to handle a large caseload. Davison expressed concerned

about the issue of continuity on FEC with this remedy. Casey suggested a lagging member who had just gone off FEC rather than appointing a new temporary member. Harris observed that there would always be new faculty on the committee. This proposal would only increase the number of new faculty on FEC at the same time. Levis moved that since FEC should not be recommending bylaw changes related to their own committee that the issue should be considered and reviewed by PSC. Harris wondered why some of these changes such as the electronic submission of files were not procedural rather than bylaw issues. Harris then seconded the motion which passed. Davison recommended that Libby invite Papay to PSC to discuss their concerns.

- C. Libby presented the recommendations from PSC discontinuing the practice of promoting faculty to associate professor without a tenure review(see Attachment 3). Casey wondered if this bylaw would allow someone to be hired as an associate professor without tenure. Duncan felt that the college needed maximum flexibility when someone comes from the outside. Harris pointed out that there have been situations when an individual came in as associate and could possibly be promoted to full professor before receiving tenure. Joyner argued that the problem arises when we value outside experience more than the contributions made at Rollins. Duncan did not want to preclude a person brought in as full professor without tenure. Libby countered that PSC only wanted to deal with promotion issues and not hiring. She thought that Casey's recommendation to add the phrase "at Rollins" be used to clarify the intention. Joyner said that in the last two hiring cycles no one had wanted to use previous experience to count toward the tenure clock. They want to take the entire time allowed. Davison hoped that PSC could consider the parallel issue of promotion to professor at the same time. Libby felt that PSC could have a proposal ready for the next Executive Committee meetings.

- D. Composition of Candidate Evaluation Committee—Libby also presented a revision to the Bylaws regarding the composition of the Candidate Evaluation Committee (see Attachment 4). Davison wondered about the nature of the discussion regarding the inclusion of non-tenured members of the CEC. Libby said that many expressed concerns about a non-tenured individuals serving on an CEC which could be a very compromising position. Casey noted that some departments require non-tenured faculty to participate in the CEC. Libby also pointed out that some departments allow non-tenured faculty to participate but not vote so that they can understand the process. Levis wondered if non-tenured faculty had the option to opt out if they wanted. Libby said that in some cases departments required participation. Levis was concerned that it was possible that in a department with only one tenured faculty that individual could make a determination on tenure. He recommended that each CEC

must have at least three tenured, voting faculty members. Joyner argued forcefully that the non-tenured faculty needed to be involved in the process. Harris wondered about voting, and she replied that she was less concerned about voting but having junior faculty being part of the process. Joyner observed that when a faculty member is first hired, it is assumed that the new faculty should be able to join in all aspects of being a faculty member and therefore to join in tenure and promotion discussions. Libby pointed that the CEC consisted of at least three faculty members. Levis questioned the voting of non-tenured faculty which might occur under certain circumstances. Davison felt that this question now had been dealt with long enough and was an issue that could be raised and discussed at the faculty meeting. The Executive Committee agreed to send to proposal to the faculty.

- E. Faculty Participation on the Board of Trustees—Davison also raised the issue of faculty participation in Board of Trustees committee meetings (see Attachment 5). Davison reported his discuss with Czekaj and his feeling that there needed to be some regularity to interaction between faculty and trustees. He has asked F&S to establish procedures for these to take place. Davison wondered how he should proceed with this resolution. Duncan felt that the resolution might pose difficulties with the trustees. He felt that the open invitation will continue but in case there is a problem then the resolution could be brought forward. Levis expressed concern that that there had been a faculty request, and the Executive Committee has some obligation to bring something to the faculty. Joyner felt that since this recommendation had gone through a whole series of reviews and that the outcome had led to faculty inclusion in meetings, she thought we had to take a stand. Duncan believed that the term “representation” was not correct and rather use the term “participation.” What is only needed is a procedure to select the participants: declare victory and stop fighting. Davison said that he would report what has transpired and that F&S would provide the procedure for the selection of faculty participants.
- F. Graduation Hours—Brandon reported that AAC would have a proposal for the reduction in graduation hours ready. The committee is also considering graduation in three years. Joyner suggested that the faculty needed to address the hours issue first. Germain expressed concerns about service-learning classes; many students felt that these courses should have increased credit but she recognized that it would not happen. Brandon pointed out that the issue of portfolios would help with this issue. Duncan said that the proposal also needed to be linked to restrictions on number of credits that student could take with tuition. Gunter raised issue of moving from four to three credit-hour courses because he feared that with the reduction of hours for gradation student would have entirely too much time on their hands. Joyner observed that the norm is five classes per semester. Brandon wondered about science courses. Duncan said that the

lab classes should be part of a regular course, and suggested that the science courses at Rollins have a much larger lab requirement than most other colleges.

- G. Other new business—Libby distributed recommendations for the faculty evaluation of administrators (see Attachment 6)
-
- VI. Adjournment—The meeting was adjourned at 1:55 pm

Respectfully submitted,

Barry Levis
Secretary

Attachment 1

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 2

From: Marvin Newman
To: DDavison@rollins.edu
CC: mnewman@rollins.edu
Date: 3/2/2009 3:43 PM
Subject: FEC By Law Revisions

Dear Don: Pursuant to the request of Dr. Twila Yates Papay, Chair of the Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) I am forwarding to you the following proposed by law changes. Members of FEC have each reviewed these provisions and are unanimous in requesting the Executive Committee to approve same and implement them immediately. In order for these by laws to be effective for the next group of tenure and promotion cases to come before it, FEC URGES that you do everything reasonably possible to have these revisions considered and hopefully adopted by the faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences at its April meeting. Note, please that some of the bylaws need to become effective by June 15: however prospective candidates should have notice of these amendments in May.

All of the following revisions are additions to the last sentence in the respective section of ARTICLE VIII of the By Laws of the College of Arts and Sciences:

Section 3: Notwithstanding any provisions contained in these by laws, all written statements, reports, and documents submitted by the Candidate Evaluation Committee (CEC) and by the candidates for tenure, promotion, mid course review or annual evaluations shall be submitted electronically via email and/or compact disc. Additionally all reports and recommendations and any responses by candidates will be submitted electronically via email or compact disc.

Section 6: In all matters within its jurisdiction FEC shall report directly to the Executive Committee of the Faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences. In those academic years

when the number of proposed candidates for promotion, tenure or mid-term review exceeds fifteen, the Executive Committee of the Faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences shall appoint an additional member of the faculty to serve on the FEC for that academic year; in those academic years when the number of such candidates exceeds eighteen, the Executive Committee shall appoint two additional faculty members to serve on the FEC for that academic year. Those appointed under this section shall be full professors and tenured members of the faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences. Appointments hereunder shall be subject to ratification by the faculty of the College of Arts and sciences.

Section 3. Promotion to Associate Professor. No person shall qualify for promotion to Associate Professor except at one of the following times: (a) simultaneously when applying for tenure; (b) subsequent to receiving tenure.

Section 2: The Dean of the Faculty shall maintain a record of the last date on which each respective department of the College has submitted criteria for promotion and tenure. On or before April 15 of each academic year, the Dean of the Faculty shall submit electronically via email and/or compact disc a notification to the chairs of all department which have not submitted to FEC and had approved by FEC within the period of four years from said date. The CEC shall submit criteria in the same manner (electronically) to the Chair of FEC on or before September 1 of the subsequent academic year for those seeking approval during the first term of the academic year, and/or on or before January 10 for those seeking approval during the second term of the academic year.

Section 6. Notwithstanding any provisions contained in these by laws, the Faculty Handbook or any other documents, the meetings of the Faculty Evaluation Committee shall be confidential and may be attended only by the members of FEC, the candidate under consideration, and any other person(s) which this section of the bylaws permit for purposes of consultation and who are invited by the FEC. Provided however, when considering department criteria, the Chair of the Department and the Chair of the Candidate Evaluation Committee may request to meet with the FEC for the purpose of reviewing the criteria of her/his respective department.

The following shall be added to Article II, Section 5 of the Faculty Handbook:

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 observations shall not apply in grievance considerations including hearing on that subject **to meetings of the Faculty Evaluation Committee.**

Attachment 3

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

...

Section 4. 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 4

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 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.

Attachment 5

Finance and Services Resolution

The Arts and Sciences Faculty request representation by full time teaching Faculty on the Board of Trustees, specifically representation on the Education as well as Business and Finance Committees of the Board.

Attachment 6

Professional Standards Committee Recommendations for Faculty Evaluation of Administrators

Article VII, Section 1 of A&S By Laws: “The Committee advises the President and Vice Presidents on the administrative structure of the College of Arts and Science, including the creation and elimination of administrative positions and the appointment, evaluation, and professional development of administrators.”

I Administrators/Directors to be evaluated on a 3-year rotational basis
(4 one year, 4 the next, 1 year off)

- President *
 - Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs *
 - Dean of the Faculty *
 - Dean of Hamilton Holt School *
 - Dean of Student Affairs
 - Dean of Admissions
 - Director of Olin Library
 - Director of Cornell Fine Arts Museum
-
- * to be evaluated Spring 09, remaining administrators/directors to be evaluated Spring 2010

II Availability of evaluation results

- Administrators being evaluated
- Executive Committee; rationale: rotating body of faculty elected by whole faculty
- Response by administrator/director to evaluations to be made available to faculty (see IV Timetable/Process, below)

II Instrument: IDEA Center: <http://www.theideacenter.org/>

- Rationale
 1. external, neutral surveys
 2. professional survey center
 3. confidentiality of results
- Cost: \$200 per administrator + \$1.50 for each recipient of survey = \$1922 (all 187 A&S Faculty); or \$1700 (all A&S faculty on continuing contracts)

IV Timetable/process

- Order surveys: ASAP
- By March 1: PSC/Exec Comm notifies administrators/directors to be evaluated
- By March 1: PSC emails faculty to tell them to expect surveys and explain process
- March 16-27: surveys available online for anonymous faculty responses
- By March 27: administrators/directors write self-evaluation, to be made available to Exec Comm (adopted from UCF administrator evaluation process)
- By April 13: Results of survey received by administrators/directors and President of Faculty
- Before end of semester: administrators/directors discuss results with Exec Comm
- By September 1: administrators write response to evaluations, comparing with self-evaluation, and make available response on Foxlink to faculty.