

2-21-2008

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Executive Committee Meeting, Thursday, February 21, 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 21, 2008" (2008). *Executive Committee Minutes*. Paper 79.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ec/79

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 21, 2008

Members Present: Rick Vitray, Sharon Carnahan, Paul Harris, Roger Casey, Don Davison, Wendy Brandon, Barry Levis, Laurie Joyner

- I. Approval of Executive Committee Minutes – The minutes from the February 7, 2008 meeting of the Executive Committee were approved with clarifications.

- II. Announcements – Davison announced that the Executive Committee needed to make nominations to fill vacancies on FEC. Foglesong, LeRoy, and Schmalstig will need to be replaced with tenured full professors. He has asked PSC to come up with some names and also requested information from the Associate Dean of eligible Full professors and also the names of individuals coming up for tenure or promotion. Davison also mentioned that the Faculty party will be on April 5 at the Cornell Fine Arts Museum Patio from 6-8 PM.

- III. Old Business
 1. Academic Affairs Committee— Carnahan presented Academic Credit Proposal presented with revised language to conform with SACS requirements. (See Addendum 1) Davison asked if the review of the AAC discussion should also be sent to the faculty. Carnahan thought it would be a good idea to help faculty understand the discussion in AAC. Casey asked about the 3/2 program with Crummer and how those courses taken in Crummer would be considered. The Executive Committee agreed to add that to the proposal and sent it to the next faculty meeting.

- IV. New Business
 1. Professional Standards—Bylaw revisions: Davison said that there were three proposals for bylaw changes from PSC. He thought that the second and third changes would be easy to send forward. (See Addendum 2) Brandon said that there were controversial issues related to the first bylaw change concerning adherence to the newest criteria approved by the department. Promotion without tenure was also under question. Joyner said that she had argued against the second change, but the committee had outvoted her. Executive committee requested PSC to revisit this issue to make the process more vigorous. The third proposal

clears up confusion about formal versus informal reviews. The executive committee agreed to add these two bylaw revisions to the faculty meeting agenda. Davison discussed the first recommended change. Levis asked what was controversial about the proposal. Davison thought that someone could be evaluated for tenure or promotion on criteria that were quite old. Joyner thought that individual considered for promotion to professor must have a history of excellence in their contribution and the actual date of criteria should not matter. Casey explained that some departments have more restrictive criteria for associate than full professor. Davison observed that when the Politics department reviewed their criteria, they assumed that the new criteria would affect everyone in the department. Casey said the college's legal opinion had claimed that the college could change criteria for promotion at any time without challenging the candidate's rights. Joyner thought it was a discussion about individual needs versus institutional needs. If someone comes in with a set of criteria and remains with them, that protects the individual. Harris felt that it would be unfair to a candidate to change criteria after the mid-course review. Casey thought that the criteria could be established for a midcourse review for promotion to full professor so that the individual could adjust to any change. Davison asked if there was midcourse for full professor, and Casey said that it had been added several years ago. Davison said that we could send on to faculty the second and third revision, but the committee would delay the first until a later faculty meeting and ask PSC to study it further and also to seek help from FEC, Brandon said that associate professor members of PSC very much opposed allowing changing criteria and the junior faculty were mixed. The Executive Committee agreed to send the proposal back to PSC for further study.

2. Implementation of merit motion adopted by the faculty – Davison announced that after the faculty vote we now have to put a process into place to develop a merit plan to present to the faculty. Vitray said that he already had plans to have a discussion of the issue at Finance and Services to develop recommendations. Harris felt that the current teaching evaluation was not a useful tool for the merit system. He saw a need for more than a questionnaire filled out by students at the end of a course. Joyner felt that this process would have good unintended consequence in that we will have to develop better means of evaluating teaching. Carnahan observed that we have a department that specialized in evaluating teaching in the Education department. Brandon said that there was a significant difference in evaluating school teaching because of the emphasis on tests. Davison thought that the system will not be static because it will be constantly revised over time. It needs to be a system that is reassuring to the faculty. Levis recommended that the current task force already has the expertise to get the process started. Brandon thought that we also need to bring in experts and faculty input

from other areas. Davison thought that we needed to make it as simple as possible. He agreed with Levis' suggestion. Carnahan suggested that the task force could be expanded to include perhaps finance expert and teaching expert but right now the task force is quite balanced. They would need to call a colloquium to allow faculty to express opinions. Davison said that we have already had some conversations. He thought that some of these conversations could present to the faculty a list of guiding principles for those discussions. Brandon talked about the moral issue concerning how junior faculty seems to be valued by the administration more than senior faculty. Harris commented that during the faculty retreat praises are heaped on the new faculty as the best ever and also the salary distribution last year hit senior faculty hardest. Brandon thought that the senior faculty has not enjoyed the support system that now exists for junior faculty. Joyner stated that we needed better information about salary and where everyone is so that these adjustments could be made. Harris thought that because this will happen at the departmental level the task force should visit departments. Vitray thought that email responses might work. Joyner also said there had to be a divisional component as well to provide some standardization. Carnahan thought that there needs to be a developmental approach so that faculty can develop skills at various stages of their careers. Davison wondered how we handle library faculty. Casey said that they were more on market model rather than rank model. Carnahan asked if they were evaluated in the same way. Casey said that they were. Joyner asked why there would be a different process. Davison stated that Duncan would set aside ½ of \$470,000 pool for equity adjustments as long as they were not across the board. He felt that they could be done very quickly and easily as a way of building confidence that we can do this. He wondered what mechanism would be used? Carnahan wanted to know what was meant by historical inequities. Davison responded that many members of the faculty who have been here had salary increases well below the cost of living and salaries should be brought up to level of the median. Duncan agrees that there has been unrewarded merit historically. Duncan cannot accept across-the-board percentage increases however. Casey felt that was dead on the money. Brandon was certain that there were other considerations other than faculty promotion such as gender inequalities. Joyner felt that this would be addressed by the adjustments for equity. Casey claimed that the CUPA analysis would bring up some interesting information about the faculty. Administrators could work out the inequities on a Saturday afternoon but that process would not gain the trust of faculty. Joyner felt there needed to be faculty involved in the process who have the confidence of the faculty at large and who would sign confidentiality statements. Data that the college has currently used is not the most accurate because it depends on aggregate AAUP data that does not accurately reflect the situation at Rollins. The group could identify those eligible and ask individuals why they believe they deserve

this merit increase. Casey saw a multi-year strategy with the budget. Davison wanted to deal with the equity issue as quickly as possible but wanted to build trust with the process. Brandon suggested discussions of these issues with different interest groups of faculty. Davison thought that would not be helpful. The conversation needs to be open to everyone. Brandon countered that equity means something quite different to different groups. Vitray suggested that the task force could uncouple equity from the merit part and could act more quickly. Davison reviewed the approach of asking task force to continue also the possibility to supply some additional members. Library system will work similarly, and that the equity dispersement will also be referred to the task force.

3. Bylaw interpretation— Davison reported that the library faculty had requested a bylaw interpretation on the length of their sabbaticals. Jonathan Miller had submitted the request (See addendum 2). Davison asked the Executive Committee members to request additional information if needed.
4. Professional Standards— Brandon said that she had been negotiating a divisional location for Culture and Critical Media Studies. Two-thirds of the faculty is from the Humanities Division. Tillman had suggested a separate division of interdisciplinary studies. Joyner no one has asked about divisional placement. The Executive Committee needs to discuss at the next meeting. Davison asked if the committee needed more information.

V. Adjournment – The meeting was adjourned at 2:05 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Barry Levis,
Secretary

Proposed change to the bylaws

REVISED 02/07/2008

REVIEWED BY EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, 2/12/08

REVISED 02/14/08 (underlined)

SCHEDULED FOR PRESENTATION TO THE FACULTY ON 2/28/08

Proposed Academic Policy

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, or be approved for an academic exception under SACS guidelines by the Department or Program and Dean of Faculty. 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.

Review of discussions within the AAC

Purpose: To ensure that all academic courses taught at Rollins College receive the support and oversight associated with being part of an academic department.

Issues:

- 1) Several courses are taught by staff members with no affiliation to an academic department. There is no departmental oversight or support structure for these courses.
- 2) Because of the nature of their employment, staff do not necessarily have academic freedom. (No one is accusing anyone of any impropriety, but the system allows for the possibility of administrative pressure influencing course content.)
- 3) This change will allow only tenured and tenure-track faculty to teach courses that do not have an academic departmental or programmatic designation. (According to the bylaws, all tenured and tenure-track faculty are members of a department.) Courses taught by anyone other than a tenured or tenure-track faculty member must carry a departmental designation or the designation of an academic program approved by the faculty (e.g. Women's Studies, Honors, RCC, etc.).
- 4) Currently this change will affect very few courses, most of which will continue to be taught.
 - a. Administrators with courtesy faculty rank (e.g., Karen Hater, Jim Eck) are already associated with a department and hold the necessary credentials to teach within that department.
 - b. Courses taught by TJ's for a grade will revert to cr/nc. This was historically the case until very recently.
 - c. No IFT courses will be affected because they are all one-hour, cr/nc.
 - d. Leadership courses will revert to 1-hour cr/nc courses or will be taught within the context of an existing department.
 - e. INT 315A topics course (Pathways to College) will revert to a 1-hour cr/nc class.
 - f. INT 350 (Cornell Scholars), a 2-hour cr/nc course, will become an Honors course.
 - g. Internships are not affected.
 - h. INT 255P (Conquering the LSAT) will not be affected because it is team-taught by tenured faculty.
 - i. Intercession courses will be reviewed in accordance with this change.

- 5) This change is “house keeping” that should be taken care of before curricular reform gets underway. It will ensure that courses are taught within the departmental structure of the College, but does not exclude innovative courses that are pioneered by tenured and tenure-track faculty who have the support of an existing department.

- 6) The Department Chairs have agreed to encourage the pairing of staff and faculty in the classroom to increase the availability of staff expertise in the academic environment. The Dean of the Faculty has agreed to support this effort.
(Department Chairs meeting, 29 Nov, 2007)

Proposed Bylaw Changes for A&S

PSC
February 14, 2008

There are three proposed changes. For each proposed change, we have offered the following: the relevant section of the text of the Arts and Sciences Bylaws as it currently stands; the proposed amended text of the Bylaws; and a brief comment elucidating the reason for the proposed change.

First Proposed Change: Submitting Departmental Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to FEC

FACULTY OF THE COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES
SECTION V – BYLAWS
ARTICLE VIII: FACULTY EVALUATIONS
B. CRITERIA FOR FACULTY EVALUATION
Section 2. Departmental Criteria

[text as it currently stands]

“Each department, with the concurrence of the Faculty Evaluation Committee, shall determine how the above criteria shall be defined and applied for faculty evaluations in particular academic disciplines, providing to the FEC explicit standards for teaching, scholarship, and service, including those specific to the discipline. The department shall provide a rationale in support of their standards. The department must resubmit these criteria to the FEC and they must be accepted by the FEC before any tenure track search may be conducted.

[Note: This would take effect for the academic year 2004-2005, and for candidates recently hired the following would apply. Any department with a candidate who has a tenure-track appointment but who has not yet reached a mid-term evaluation, must submit a new set of criteria and have them accepted by FEC before the mid-course evaluation.]”

[proposed amended text]

“Each department, with the concurrence of the Faculty Evaluation Committee, shall determine how the above criteria shall be defined and applied for faculty evaluations in particular academic disciplines, providing to the FEC explicit standards for teaching, scholarship, and service for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor and Professor, including standards specific to the discipline. The department shall provide a rationale in support of their standards. The department must resubmit these criteria to the FEC every five years, or earlier if the criteria have been revised. Any department with a candidate for tenure or promotion will use the set of criteria in effect at the time of the candidate’s hiring or last promotion, whichever is most recent; this applies unless the candidate chooses to use the new criteria at the time they take effect.”

[reason for the proposed change]

The current bylaws do not specify that criteria for the rank of Professor are to be submitted to FEC, which is an oversight. Furthermore, currently the submission of departmental criteria is contingent upon requests for a tenure-track position; FEC should, however, have the most current departmental criteria for tenure and promotion readily at hand at all times. Also, PSC believes it is necessary for all departments to review their standards for tenure and promotion on a regular basis. Finally, the “untimely” note at the end of Sec. 2 has been replaced by a sentence clarifying exactly which criteria will apply, in case of changes. Note that if new criteria are put into effect, candidates may choose which set of criteria to use.

Second Proposed Change: Applying Consistent Language to Bylaws Pertaining to All Promotions

FACULTY OF THE COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

SECTION V – BYLAWS

ARTICLE VIII: FACULTY EVALUATIONS

D. PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATION OF CANDIDACY FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR

[text as it currently stands]

“D. PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATION OF CANDIDACY FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR”

[proposed amended text]

“D. PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATION OF CANDIDACY FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION”

Also, any occurrence of the phrase “for tenure or promotion to Professor” will be simplified to “for tenure or promotion.” There are two instances: Section 4, 1st para.; Section 6, 4th para.

Furthermore, any occurrence of the phrase “for decisions on promotion to Professor” will be simplified to “for all other promotion decisions.” There are six instances: Section 4, 5th para.; Section 5, 2nd para.; Section 6, 5th para.; Section 7, 1st para.; Section 8, 1st para. (twice). [Note: all of these instances deal with “due dates” for reports from the Chair of CEC, etc.]

[reason for the proposed change]

The bylaws currently allow for exceptional cases wherein an Assistant Professor may be promoted to Associate Professor without thereby immediately being granted tenure (see Article VIII, Part D, Section 1, Eligibility for Tenure; and Article VIII, Part B, Section 3, Promotion to Associate Professor). The wording throughout the bylaws regarding promotion should be adjusted to cover these exceptional cases.

Third Proposed Change: Clarifying Language Regarding Annual Evaluations and Including the Evaluation of Visiting Assistant Professors

FACULTY OF THE COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

SECTION V – BYLAWS

ARTICLE VIII: FACULTY EVALUATIONS

C. PROCEDURES FOR REVIEW OF UNTENURED FACULTY PRIOR TO THE TENURE REVIEW

Section 1. Annual Evaluations

[text as it currently stands]

“The Candidate Evaluation Committee normally conducts annual formal evaluations. The evaluation will be documented in a report addressed to the appropriate Dean and placed in the candidate's permanent file. The report should include an analysis and evaluation of the candidate's progress toward tenure, based on the criteria set forth in the by-laws and in individual departmental criteria.

Annual evaluations are to be conducted every year in which neither a tenure evaluation nor a comprehensive mid-course evaluation takes place.

Informal reviews or discussions of a candidate's progress in meeting department and College expectations are encouraged. These will not be part of the candidate's formal file.”

[proposed amended text]

“The Candidate Evaluation Committee will conduct annual evaluations. The evaluation will be documented in a report addressed to the appropriate Dean and placed in the candidate's permanent file by April 15. The report should include an analysis and evaluation of the candidate's progress toward tenure, based on the criteria set forth in the bylaws and in individual departmental criteria. These annual evaluations are to be conducted for every year in which neither a tenure evaluation nor a comprehensive mid-course evaluation takes place.

Annual departmental evaluations are to be conducted every year for Visiting Assistant Professors. The evaluation will be documented in a report and placed in the faculty member's departmental file by February 15. The report should include an analysis and evaluation of the faculty member's accomplishments in meeting department and College expectations.”

[reason for the proposed change]

Language in the bylaws regarding evaluations of untenured faculty is somewhat ambiguous, making a confusing distinction between “annual formal evaluations” and “informal reviews.” We propose to abolish this unnecessary distinction. Furthermore, we believe that it would benefit Visiting Assistant Professors, and the departments in which they are serving, if they were to be evaluated annually, as with all other untenured faculty. Also, due dates have been added. According to AAUP guidelines, non-tenure-track faculty members must be notified by March 1 whether they will be invited back for the following academic year; evaluations for such faculty members, then, should be reported by Feb. 15.

