

10-9-2008

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Executive Committee Meeting, Thursday, October 9, 2008

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 9, 2008" (2008). *Executive Committee Minutes*. Paper 73.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ec/73

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.

Minutes
Executive Committee
October 9, 2008

Members Present: Susan Libby, Marissa Germain, Don Davison, Roger Casey, Barry Levis, Mike Gunter, Wendy Brandon, Laurie Joyner

Guests: Ryan Musgrave, Richard James, Joan Davison

- I. Call to order—Davison called the meeting to order at 12:35 PM.
- II. Approval of Minutes from October 2, 2008—the minutes were approved as distributed.
- III. Old Business
 - A. Executive Committee
 1. Replacements for Faculty Appeals—The Executive Committee recommended that Davison approach Edna McClennen and John Sinclair about serving on the appeals committee.
 2. Dean of Student Affairs search—Davison reported that he had extensive discussions with Hater about the Dean of Student Affairs position. The question remains whether to offer the position to Hater or carry out a national search. Davison suggested that the college extend her interim position for one additional year to allow time for a complete assessment of the student affairs office and its relations to the academic mission of the college. Then the college could conduct a national search with Hater allowed to apply as a candidate. Casey reported that she is open to any alternative. Gunter asked about the advantages of waiting a year for the search. Davison replied that it allowed more stability in the division, allowed time to work on the mission of the division, and also allowed the college to have a clear idea of what we want. Libby thought that this would be a good idea. Casey suggested that the interim term was not helpful and suggested a year terminal contract as dean. Gunter agreed, citing Edge's position as interim dean of the faculty. Libby thought it might scare people away from applying for the position. Joyner agreed. Brandon felt that more candidates would hesitate to apply with a dean rather than an interim. Gunter saw the need to define the role of student affairs so that we don't have the friction that we have now. He thought that an interim could not do that. Brandon disagreed and saw interim as a facilitator. Germain do not want a new position defined so rigidly that candidates will not want to apply. Davison did not want someone who has ideas that are out of sink with what we want. He does not see the term "interim" deterring from a leadership role. Casey asked how many felt that Hater should continue in the position no matter what we call it, that she should continue through 09-10. Levis argued that then we would have time to set up a task force to study the division. Casey asked if anyone wanted to hire Hater at this point. No one supported. Harris felt that we could not judge her in such a short time. The Executive Committee requested that Davison report to the faculty about its logic.

Germain asked if a report should also be presented to SGA. Davison said of course but that faculty had responsibility for student affairs issues. Davison and Brandon will edit the motion.

IV. New Business

A. Executive Committee

1. Merit proposal—Davison reported that he had consulted with the parliamentarian, who had concerned about what was to be p[resented] to the faculty. He recommended adding the grounding principles to the protocol (see attachment 1). Newman was also concerned that the Faculty Salary Committee could be considered a standing committee and so he wanted to clean up the language so that FSC reports to Finance and Services. Musgrave said that it had already been changed. James said that some additions had been made to clarify its connection to a standing committee. The Executive Committee agreed the protocol was ready to go to the faculty. Davison then discussed the procedures for the faculty meeting. Levis said that there probably would be concern about what the trigger amount would be. J. Davison said that there had been extensively discussed and the Task Force had thought about a figure like \$1000. Joyner said that it would be determined by the FSC. She believed that the President would not accept a dollar amount. J. Davison said that the task force was concerned about including the grounding principles in the protocol. The Task Force had thought that they should not be included but felt that the faculty would not approve unless it was incorporated. James said that the determination of the threshold wage could not be given to "the faculty," but the Executive Committee should be given that authority to determine the threshold since it contained all the committee chairs. Brandon thought that the grounding principles need not be included in the motion. Musgrave said that some felt that the principles should be included in the document for future deans. Libby felt that the faculty might need the spirit of the document. Levis argued that they should be included because this step represents such a major change that even if there is some repetition it would not hurt. Casey said that some aspects of principles were not correct and so we have to change them if they are going to be part of legislation. For example, there is no salary adjustment for tenure, only promotion. Brandon thought that some aspects of the statement are not included in the protocol such as the fact that most faculty members are meritorious. J. Davison thought that some faculty thought that the grounding principle be passed as a resolution rather than as part of the motion. Some faculty want these principles stated again even though she thought they have been the guiding principles of the protocol. Joyner argued that the directive materials in the guiding principles must be included in the resolution. Brandon thought that the inclusion was distracting. Musgrave wondered if they could be included at the end of the protocol as sort of a footnote. Brandon thought that the procedural aspects should be part of the procedures. Joyner felt that all the procedures were there. Davison suggested that the grounding principles could be voted into the minutes. Harris said that any procedures that are not listed from the grounding principles must be moved into the rest of the document. James felt that some aspects of the criteria are not clearly incorporated into the procedures. Davison said that we have made some minor changes to the document. We

need to scrutinize the grounding principles and integrate any procedures into the list of procedures. The Executive Committee approved this process.

B. Academic Affairs/Executive Committee

1. Calendar for AY 2009-2010—The adjusted calendar was approved (see attachment 2).
2. Classical Studies update—The revisal of the program is in process, Brandon report. An external review team coming at the end of October.
3. Asian studies major proposal—Brandon reported that the AAC is working on that proposal
4. Critical Media Studies major/minor map changes—AAC had approved some minor changes. They have also approved changes in the English, biology and biochemistry major but sent African American minor back for further revision.

C. Professional Standards

1. Parental leave update—Libby stated that the proposal is currently stalled. Martinez made some recommendations for changes that the committee rejected. She argued that a male could not serve as a primary caregiver for a child. —Harper is now back at work on this proposal. It was agreed that Joyner would serve as a “hired gun” and attend the meeting with Martinez. Casey felt that objections need to presented productively.

D. Finance and Services—Casey shared the budget assumptions to be taken to the Board of Trustees. On October 30th during common hour Eisenbarth will make a presentation to the faculty. If he is wrong about the budget, Casey will take a second job at Publix as a bagger to make up the differences. Joyner asked if money for salary increases was in the budget, and Casey assured her that it was. Germain asked if there had been discussion of fixed tuition. Casey said that is an issue that is going to be considered. Brandon wondered when the merit distribution would take place, and Joyner said might not happen until the spring because of need to get the process set up. Casey expressed considerable concerned about AAUP data that has to be sent in by November. Joyner said the adjustments could not be done earlier. Davison asked if the three-minute rule should apply to the debate on the merit protocol. The Executive Committee agreed.

V. Adjournment—the meeting was adjourned at 2:03 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Barry Levis
Secretary

Attachment 1

Grounding Assumptions for the Rollins A&S Faculty Strategic Compensation Plan

The grounding assumptions that follow are intended as guiding principles for the establishment and operation of the Faculty Salary Council (FSC) and the Merit Pay Appeals Sub-committee.

- The Faculty Salary Council will work from the assumption that the majority of Rollins faculty are performing at a meritorious level (*i.e.*, meets expectations.)
- Any strategic compensation system must be linked with the College's mission statement.
- As stated in the college by-laws, the primary mission of the institution is teaching.
- The merit pay system will exist in addition to (*not as a substitute for*) the current system of tenure and promotion salary adjustments, annual across-the-board percentage increases to base pay, equity adjustments, and special teaching and service awards.
- The assessment of faculty professional performance for merit purposes begins with the faculty member assessing his or her own performance.
- The FSAR provides the opportunity for a faculty member to demonstrate how their practices and activities meet or exceed professional expectations. The *Faculty Handbook*, Section V, Article VIIIB states the "Criteria for Faculty Evaluation". While this criterion was established for Tenure and Promotion decisions, the definitions of expectations of Rollins' faculty in the categories of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service apply to any merit pay evaluations.
- Merit pay will be an increase in the base pay for a faculty member and not treated as a one-time bonus.
- A minimal "trigger" amount for the merit pay pool will be established to ensure that the results of the merit evaluation process will result in "meaningful" increases to faculty salaries. **Evaluations after "lean" years will include a consideration of previously unrecognized meritorious activities.**
- A fair Rollins merit pay system must be simple, streamlined, clear, and transparent.
- The procedure for assessing and awarding merit pay will involve as much faculty input as possible. It will involve as little extra administrative work and bureaucracy as possible.
- A fair Rollins merit pay system will begin as a pilot with on-going evaluation by the FSC.
- **In order to support transparency, the Dean of the Faculty and the FSC will provide an annual cumulative report including profiles of faculty, with their approval, deemed to have performed above expectations.**

STRATEGIC FACULTY COMPENSATION IMPLEMENTATION PROTOCOL

Preamble: To implement the Strategic Faculty Compensation System, the Arts and Sciences Faculty will create two entities as oversight mechanisms: the **Faculty Salary Council (FSC)** and the **Merit Pay Appeals Subcommittee**. The charge of the FSC is to work in a spirit of collegiality with the Dean of Faculty to ensure the mission and goals of the College are clearly reflected in the criteria used to assess merit across areas of professional responsibility as outlined in the Faculty Handbook. The FSC and the Dean of Faculty share responsibility through the process of oversight and review holding each other to the highest standards of fairness, transparency, and accountability. The FSC is a subcommittee of the College of Arts and Sciences whose authority shall be limited to those specified herein. The Merit Pay Appeals Subcommittee further guarantees standards of fairness, transparency, and accountability by providing faculty members a process to appeal their merit evaluations on grounds of substance or procedure. The Strategic Faculty Compensations System will begin as a pilot with on-going evaluation by the FSC and reports to Professional Standards Committee.

Strategic Faculty Compensation Process:

Each fall the Dean of Faculty will convene a meeting of the FSC to share information regarding the likely size of the total salary raise pool and to seek advice regarding criteria, data sources, and rules of evidence. The FSC will recommend to the Dean that the merit process not be initiated if the merit salary pool does not meet or exceed the minimal amount determined by the A & S Faculty Executive Committee. In addition, the Executive Committee and FSC will guarantee the merit pay system exists in addition to (*not as a substitute for*) the current system of promotion salary adjustments, annual across the board percentage increases to base pay, and equity adjustments. Merit pay will be an increase in the base pay for a faculty member and not treated as a one-time bonus. The FSC will reach agreement with the Dean on the division of the merit salary pool into “Exceeds”, “Meets”, and “Falls Below” amounts. The Dean will not begin the process of evaluating faculty until after the FSC meeting.

The assessment of faculty professional performance for merit purposes begins with the faculty member assessing his or her own performance. The Faculty Self- Assessment Report (FSAR) provides the opportunity for a faculty member to demonstrate how his/her practices and activities meet or exceed professional expectations. The *Faculty Handbook*, Section V, Article VIIIB states the “Criteria for Faculty Evaluation.” While this criterion was established for Tenure and Promotion decisions, the definitions of expectations of Rollins’ faculty in the categories of Teaching, Scholarship, and Service apply to any merit pay evaluations.

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* professional expectations. The FSC will review the aggregate results of the Dean’s evaluations as well as reach agreement with the Dean on all faculty evaluated as

exceeding or below expectations. The FSC will assist the Dean, as necessary, to clarify or validate a specific faculty member's contributions. In addition, the FSC will assist the Dean in making any necessary modifications to the FSAR to improve its utility and to the overall system to better link evaluation to a system of recognition and rewards that most appropriately expresses the value that the College places on its faculty.

FSC Membership: Membership of the FSC shall consist of the four elected Division Heads from the College of Arts and Sciences and one tenured faculty member elected by the Executive Committee. If a Division Head is not tenured then the affected Division will elect a tenured faculty member to serve on the FSC. The Chair of the FSC will be elected by the committee from the elected members of the Council. The Dean of the Faculty serves as an *ex-officio* member.

FSC Implementation Responsibilities: The FSC will confer with the Dean of the Faculty to clarify the use of evaluation criteria, data sources, and rules of evidence to implement the Strategic Faculty Compensation System. In addition, the FSC will:

- a) review and reach agreement with the Dean on all faculty selected for *Exceeds Expectations* or *Below Expectations* categories;
- b) assist the Dean in the preparation of the annual report on the characteristics of the *Exceeds Expectations* faculty member contributions;
- c) undertake an annual review and recommend changes in all areas related to the salary decision-making process including possible revisions to the FSAR, the procedures for evaluation/review, and the appeals process and make procedural recommendations to the Dean for inclusion in subsequent years; and
- d) work in collaboration with the Dean of the Faculty to continue ongoing discussions and consensus building regarding the values underlying what we consider a productive and contributing faculty member at Rollins College.
- e) review the aggregate outcomes of the merit evaluation process before the final salary decisions are made;
- f) serve as a source of counsel in compensation awards;
- g) advise the Dean of the Faculty in cases where a faculty member believes that the assessment of their contributions is not fair and/or equitable

Strategic Faculty Compensation Appeals Process

Membership of Merit Pay Appeals Subcommittee: The faculty salary appeals will be evaluated by a sub-committee of the Professional Standards Committee (PSC). Membership shall consist of four full professors from the A&S Faculty. If the PSC does not have sufficient number of full professors, the faculty will elect subcommittee members from candidates nominated by the Executive Committee. This sub-committee cannot include any members of the FSC. The Merit Pay Appeals Sub-committee should have a gender balance and should represent all four divisions of A&S. The sub-committee members will serve a two-year term.

Appeal Procedures: Faculty members will have 14 days after the start of the semester following receipt of his/her salary letter to submit a written request for a re-evaluation. Faculty members may request a meeting with the Dean or the FSC prior to submitting a

re-evaluation request to gain insight into the decisions employed in determining the faculty member's merit classification. The faculty member submitting an appeal can select three of the Merit Pay Appeals Sub-committee members to hear his/her case. One of the three will represent the division of the appealing faculty member. The faculty member deserves an expeditious handling of his/her case. The appeals sub-committee must respond to the faculty member within 14 days after receipt of the re-evaluation request. Any adjustments to the faculty member's salary as a result of the appeal process will be made at the same time as other merit adjustments. If warranted, retroactive salary will be provided.

Attachment 2

DRAFT No. 2

ROLLINS COLLEGE ARTS & SCIENCES ACADEMIC CALENDAR 2009-2010

FALL TERM 2009

New Students Report	Tuesday, August 18
Returning Students Report	Saturday, August 22
First Day of Class	Monday, August 24
Schedule Changes (Drop/Add) August 28	Monday, August 24, through Friday, August 28
Credit/No Credit Deadline	Friday, September 4
Last Day to Drop a Class without Notation ('W' Deadline)	Friday, September 4
Labor Day Holiday (No Classes)	Monday, September 7
Fall Break (No Classes) Tuesday, October 13	Saturday, October 10, through Tuesday, October 13
Last Day to Drop a Class without Penalty ('WF' Deadline)	Friday, October 30
Academic Advising for Spring 2010 Sunday, November 6	Monday, November 2, through Sunday, November 6
Thanksgiving Recess (No Classes) Sunday, November 29	Wednesday, November 25, through Sunday, November 29
Classes End	Friday, December 4
Reading Days December 6	Saturday, December 5, and Sunday, December 6
Final Exams December 8	Monday, December 7, and Tuesday, December 8
Reading Day Final Exams December 11	Wednesday, December 9 Thursday, December 10, and Friday, December 11
(Contingency Days Friday, December 18)	Monday, December 14, through Friday, December 18

Count: 69 In-Class/3 Reading/4 Exams/6 Holidays • Days: 13 Mon./14 Tues./14 Wed./14 Thur./14 Fri.

SPRING TERM 2010

Winter Intersession January 8	Monday, January 4, through Friday, January 8
New Students Report	Monday, January 11
First Day of Class	Tuesday, January 12
Schedule Changes (Drop/Add) Tuesday, January 19	Tuesday, January 12, through Tuesday, January 19
M.L. King, Jr. Day (Holiday)	Monday, January 18
Credit/No Credit Deadline	Tuesday, January 26
Last Day to Drop a Class without Notation ('W' Deadline)	Tuesday, January 26

Spring Break (No Classes) March 14	Saturday, March 8, through Sunday,
Last Day to Drop a Class without Penalty ('WF' Deadline)	Friday, March 26
Academic Advising for Fall 2010 April 2	Monday, March 29, through Friday,
Classes End	Tuesday, April 27
Reading Day	Wednesday, April 28
Final Exams 30	Thursday, April 29, and Friday, April
Reading Days	Saturday, May 1, and Sunday, May 2
Final Exams	Monday, May 3 and Tuesday, May 4
Commencement	Sunday, May 9 (Mother's Day)

***Count: 70 In-Class/3 Reading/4 Exams/6 Holidays • Days: 13 Mon./15 Tues./14
Wed./14 Thurs./14 Fri.***

APPROVALS:

Academic Affairs Committee 10-07-08 - Executive Committee, XX-XX-XX- RLT Group, XX-XX-XX; Vice President for Academic Affairs
and Provost, XX-XX-XX