

3-18-2008

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Executive Committee Meeting, Tuesday, March 18, 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, Tuesday, March 18, 2008" (2008).
Executive Committee Minutes. Paper 80.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ec/80

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
March 18, 2008

Members present: Roger Casey, Rick Vitray, Wendy Brandon, Julian Chambliss, Don Davison, Laurie Joyner, Stephanie Schuldt, Sharon Carnahan

- I. Call to Order – Davison called the meeting to order at 12:35 PM.
- II. Approval of Executive Committee Minutes – The minutes from the March 6, 2008 meeting of the Executive Committee were approved.
- III. Old Business
 1. Merit Task Force – Davison wanted to bring the Executive Committee up to date about the activity of the Merit Task Force. He wanted to know if he is faithfully carrying out the faculty motion. The Merit Task Force met on March 7. One of the questions raised concerned the option of allocating ½ of \$470,000 for equity broadly defined including unrewarded merit. Duncan has said that he is amenable to this as long as it is not an across-the-board increase. The Merit Task Force would like to work solely on the merit portion because most of their research had been in this area. They would like to have the equity issue handled elsewhere and also would like to have a faculty endorsement for the division of the \$470,000 pool. Carnahan asked Joyner how equity decisions would be made. Davison said that traditionally it has been done in the dean's office so that is one option. But because of the amendment to the faculty motion called for consultation with the faculty in these decisions, he is sensitive to that vote. He thought that Joyner along with Brandon from PSC and Vitray from Finance and Services should make those decisions. He also suggested that there should be an outside member of the faculty on the committee and recommended Don Griffin because of his previous administrative experience. Levis felt that faculty endorsement and involvement was essential at this time. Joyner pointed out that this could normally be handled by the administration. Vitray observed that this situation is different because this time it is not across the board. Joyner said that this process would be more difficult than it might seem. There is a need for criteria for the decision making process. She can identify individuals who have fallen below their CUPA quartile but then she has to determine if that individual would be qualified for increase. She thought that could be done within eight weeks. Davison asked Casey when letters went out. Casey said at the end of April, but the letters indicate that changes may be forthcoming.

Joyner saw that there would be three stages: the traditional across-the-board increase, then the equity adjustments, and finally the merit adjustment, which would take place in the fall. Casey stated that as long as decisions are made before August most of these increases could be included in the September paycheck. Carnahan asked how market forces would operate in this decision. Joyner said that CUPA took into consideration discipline differences. The CUPA data is very good and so we can determine whether a person is actually behind where they should be. Davison said he would draft a resolution to pass around to the members of the Executive Committee before presentation to the faculty. Joyner wondered if the faculty would need more information. Casey suggested that he could provide information about how Crummer handles merit and market. Joyner also thought that it would be good to look at gender inequity. She does not sense any inequities from examining the data, but she thought it was a good idea to have other eyes looking at it. Davison said that the Merit Task force was going to meet again next Monday morning. He thought that the task force could divide into pairs and then operationalize the three areas that we evaluate: service, teaching, and scholarship. He thought it would allow them to work more efficiently and effectively. He also hoped that in the next month they could indicate where they are in the process to the department chairs. There would also be some faculty forums are well. Davison thought that probably it would not be until September or October before this process could be completed in a way that is acceptable to the faculty. Brandon wondered whether departmental criteria would be incorporated into the system. Joyner felt that this process was only a starting point. It would also need to have divisional standardization. She is working on a revision of the AFAR and wanted to complete that before the Merit Task Force breaks into its groups. Casey said that a standard time for the submission of AFAR data needs to be established so that the evaluation system would consider the same materials for a round of merit. Davison said that there would also need to be some sort of appeals process. He wanted to assign that question to PSC so that they could begin working on it. Then in that way all these pieces could come together at about the same time in the Fall. Casey wondered why the dean would not serve in the appeals capacity. Joyner felt that generally there would be two committee groups: one to recommend merit to dean and the other to handle appeals that would also be recommended to the dean. Davison said that he wanted to present a statement of principles to the faculty; he would take the first pass at it and present it to the Executive Committee. Carnahan argued that we must define merit as we define it now in our core principles. It cannot just be publications but also teaching and committee work. Also she did not want to rush the process but do it right. The faculty could never make a decision by May. Joyner also pointed out that we need to

make certain that every college document be revised to reflect these changes so that there are no inconsistencies.

IV. New Business

1. Governance Elections (see attachment 1) – Davison presented the slate as it currently stands for faculty who are running for committee positions. Casey questioned Jonathan Miller's nomination to serve on AAC. While deans or directors normally do not serve on standing committees, the Bylaws do not restrict it. Chambliss wondered if the concern was only AAC or any committee. Vitray thought it was the broader issues. Davison said that then the Provost or even the President could serve on a committee. He also pointed out that there is a problem with non-tenured faculty being able to hold all the positions on a committee, since only a tenured member of the faculty can serve as chair. Davison asked if it was a good idea for an administrator to hold a position on committee. Casey asked about the possibility of interpreting the Bylaws to mean that no deans or director could serve in that capacity. The Executive Committee agreed that the Bylaws exclude directors and above from holding a committee position. Casey felt that there still needed to be a Bylaw change to reflect this clearly.
2. FEC slate (see attachment 1) – Davison reported that Thomas Ouellette, Carol Lauer, Rick Vitray had agreed to stand for FEC.
3. Status of motion regarding faculty/student representatives on the Board of Trustees – Davison reported on status of his investigation of faculty representation on boards. He forwarded his research to Finance and Services and asked them to develop a recommendation. Vitray reported that they were meeting on Thursday. Joyner wondered about the possibility of serving on board committees and not to the full board.
4. Status of Curriculum Committee -- Davison reported that he had asked Cook for a status report. He wondered if we should ask him for a brief report to the faculty. Carnahan thought they are working more slowly than they had hoped. Joyner thought things were moving and that they had accomplished quite a bit by this time. She felt that the communication is important and not the lack of activity.
5. Critical Media Studies home – Brandon reported that the temporary home of CMS will be the Humanities division.
6. Other new business – Brandon presented bylaw change (see attachment 2). The Executive Committee approved placing the proposal on the faculty meeting agenda.

V. Adjournment – The meeting was adjourned at 1:50 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Barry Levis,
Secretary

Attachment 1

Arts and Sciences Governance Elections Candidates as of 03/17/2008

Academic Affairs (2): Jim Small
Jonathan Miller

Finance and Service (4): Eric Schutz
Steven St. John
Lisa Tillman
Ed Royce

Student Life (3): Madeline Kovarik
Derrick Paladino
Marie Shafe
Creston Davis
Denise Cummings

Professional Standards (2): Elton Graugnard
Dana Hargrove
Emily Russell

Flexible: Yvonne Jones—willing to serve on any committee.
Susan Lackman—willing to serve on AAC, F&S, or PSC.

FEC Slate

Current Members:

Rick Fogelsong (term ending)
Ed LeRoy (term ending)
Judy Schmalstig (term ending)
Marvin Newman
Twila Papay
Margaret McLaren

Possible Candidates:

Carol Lauer

Rick Vitray

Proposed Bylaw Changes for A&S

PSC

February 14, 2008

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.