

2-7-2008

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Executive Committee Meeting, Thursday, February 7, 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, February 7, 2008" (2008). *Executive Committee Minutes*. Paper 78.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ec/78

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 of the Arts and Sciences Faculty
February 7, 2008

Members present: Paul, Harris, Don Davison, Barry Levis, Rick Vitray, Sharon Carnahan, Wendy Brandon, Laurie Joyner, Roger Casey, Lewis Duncan, Stephanie Schuldt.

The meeting was called to order at 12:35 PM.

- I. Approval of Executive Committee Minutes from January 25, 2008 – The minutes of the January 25, 2008 meeting of the Executive Committee were approved.
- II. Old Business

None
- III. New Business
 1. Merit Task Force – Davison reported that the task force report had been sent to faculty and a colloquium is scheduled in Galloway Room next Tuesday. The faculty meeting will be held on the following Tuesday. There will also be a discussion at department chairs meeting on Thursday. Joyner asked Duncan what the trustees would want from the faculty to approve the increased salary pool. She wondered if a vote of intent would be sufficient. Duncan was not sure what the board would do with a no vote. He hoped to see a system similar to Gettysburg that included across the board increases, merit, and adjustments for past inequities. Davison said that he wants to keep the question as simple as possible for the faculty discussion. Duncan wondered if the adjustments for past inequities would come out of the 4% pool or out of the merit pool. Casey stated that it had been handled differently, sometimes as part of traditional pool and at other times as a different pool. He expressed concern about those who expect 4% raise but get less because some of the pool is set aside for promotion increases. Joyner thought that the faculty needed to provide a yes or no vote and then good faith needs to be established on both sides because circumstances will change from year to year. The institution's core principles will be built into the system, but there is a need for flexibility. Casey wanted to use the term historical salary pool rather than cost-of-living increase because COL is misleading. Carnahan asked if the executive committee was bringing a proposal to the faculty for merit system on principle but we will not be

voting on a specific system. Duncan said that he would not go to the trustees with a no vote. The 3% pool would be gone, although they might be willing to bank it for a year in order to give the faculty time to work out a system. Vitray argued that the faculty thought that if their salaries are not keeping up with cost of living increases then their salaries are actually decreasing every year. Duncan stated that the Trustees are committed to staying at or above the media salaries of a basket of schools that they have identified. Salaries will keep up or exceed that level if the faculty will establish a strategy for allocating those funds because we want to be better than the average institution. Davison suggested that the traditional pool and merit pool should not steal from each other. Duncan said that we might have established problems for the future because the size of traditional pool is 4%, which is higher than normal. He said that the faculty traditional pool should never be less than the increase of the staff pool. Davison observed that the faculty has expressed concern about setting up a suitable program with such short notice. Could the money be set aside in order to give faculty time to work out an appropriate system? Casey said that the money could be an encumbrance on the budget. Duncan asked how long the funds needed to be held. It makes a difference if it is a few months or much longer. Harris said that the faculty just could not put it together in a short time. The process needs to be transparent which cannot take place in just three months. Joyner suggested that the funds could be divided to deal with certain aspects of equity, and the rest could be distributed later. Duncan thought that having to report about our comparisons to bench marked institutions every year would be too cumbersome. He felt that perhaps the faculty could be divided by rank and comparisons could be conducted every three years. Carnahan said that presenting this proposal to the faculty would be very difficult. Davison said the task force had not made a recommendation for a merit system if the idea of merit pay was approved, although he asked them to be ready to present a recommendation if asked. Joyner did not think the faculty understands that this proposal is part of a strategic effort to improve salaries. Levis thought that was not how the faculty saw it presented at the faculty meeting. Casey argued that the presentation had been rehistoricized by Marvin Newman's comments at the beginning of the presentation. Carnahan expressed concern that the system must reward a broad group of faculty who had made a conscientious effort. Duncan claimed that Rollins already has a merit system for stars with the endowed chairs. Carnahan countered that system depends heavily on the wishes of the donors since there are not many endowed chairs in the Social Science.

2. Academic Affairs Committee --

- a) Academic Credit Proposal. Carnahan reported that the proposal addressed concerns about courses offered by staff for credit (See addendum 1). Davison asked if this proposal is in a clear and straightforward fashion to go to the faculty. He also asked a procedural question if the proposal represented a bylaw change or a change in policy. He thought the proposal feels like policy. Casey wondered why it would be considered appropriate for a bylaw. Joyner expressed concern about how the change would be handled administratively and include the voice of the faculty. Carnahan stated that most of the concern was expressed about INT courses. AAC had rejected the original proposal, and this was the compromise that evolved. Casey questioned the statement about credentials because of SACS concerns. He recommended referring to credentialed and those holding exception statements as also being credentialed. Joyner said that her office is already doing that. She pointed out that Marvin Newman felt this proposal was a procedural change and not bylaw change – Duncan thought there needs to be a serious discussion about what the purpose of RCC should be. Davison felt that there has been a series of add-ons that have caused the program to evolve and it needs to be reevaluated. Davison saw the proposal as a policy change that would go into the faculty handbook but because it concerns curriculum the faculty needs to discuss it, and if they approved it would be implemented. Duncan did not think the staff would receive this proposal well. It would question their credentials and suggest that their efforts were not welcome – Carnahan said that AAC had talked to most staff who said they had no problem with this change and that they looked forward to working with the faculty.
 - b) Changes to the INB major. Carnahan stated that INB majors are required to have direct international experience. There had been some question about how this experience could be satisfied by students prior to attending Rollins. The INB faculty had proposed a clarification to the current policy (see addendum 2). The Executive Committee gave unanimous consent to these changes.
3. Other new business --Davison reported that FEC needs to have three vacancies filled. PSC will make the nominations. He also announced that elections are coming up in March and asked committee chairs to determine who is leaving and how many slots need to be filled.

IV. Adjournment. The meeting was adjourned at 1:50.

Addendum I

Any course taught by an instructor who is not a tenured or tenure-track faculty member, for which a student receives either graded academic credit or more than one hour of academic credit without a letter grade, must be offered within an academic department or academic program of the Arts and Sciences, and the instructor must hold the credentials required under the guidelines of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools to teach within that department or program. Exceptions to this policy may be made for internships, where a student may be awarded up to four hours of academic credit (without an associated letter grade) for an internship outside of the context of a department or program during a semester.

Addendum 2

This requirement may be satisfied by: (a) participating in a Rollins semester abroad program, (b) participating in an **approved** Rollins study abroad course, (c) by experience as an international student studying in the U.S., or (d) by extensive experience living or working abroad **at age 16 or older. Students should document their experience, including dates, location, activities, etc., provide supporting evidence of overseas travel from a copy of entry/exit stamps from their passport, and write an essay (minimum length 2 pages, double-spaced) describing how their overseas experience has helped them to cope with, deal with, and appreciate another culture. An INB faculty member, appointed by the Chair of the department, will review the essay to determine whether or not the international experience satisfies the requirements for the INB major.**