

2-26-2004

## Minutes, Arts & Sciences Faculty Meeting, Thursday, Feb. 26, 2004

Arts & Sciences Faculty

Follow this and additional works at: [http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as\\_fac](http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_fac)

---

### Recommended Citation

Arts & Sciences Faculty, "Minutes, Arts & Sciences Faculty Meeting, Thursday, Feb. 26, 2004" (2004). *College of Arts and Sciences Faculty Minutes*. Paper 86.  
[http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as\\_fac/86](http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_fac/86)

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Arts and Sciences Minutes at Rollins Scholarship Online. It has been accepted for inclusion in College of Arts and Sciences Faculty Minutes by an authorized administrator of Rollins Scholarship Online. For more information, please contact [wzhang@rollins.edu](mailto:wzhang@rollins.edu).

**Minutes of the Meeting  
Arts and Sciences Faculty  
February 26, 2004**

**Members Present:** B. Allen, M. Anderson, B. Balak, W. Boles, R. Bommelje, D. Boniface, A. Carpan, S. Carrier, B. Carson, R. Carson, R. Casey, J. Chambliss, D. Charles, M. Cheng, G. Child, J. Child, E. Cohen, G. Cook, D. Crozier, D. Davison, J. Davison, P. Deaver, J. Eck, H. Edge, D. Eng-Wilmot, R. Foglesong, E. Friedland, B. Galperin, S. Geisz, J. Gorman, E. Gregory, D. Griffin, M. Gunter, D. Hargrove, P. Harris, J. Henton, A. Homrich, J. Houston, G. Howell, M. Hunt, R. James, P. Jarnigan, D. Jones, S. Klemann, S. Lackman, T. Lairson, C. Lauer, L. Laws, E. LeRoy, R. Levis, D. Mays, E. McClellan, C. McInnis-Bowers, M. Mésavage, G. Meyers, T. Moore, R. Moore, L. Musgrave, S. Neilson, T. Papay, P. Pequeno-Rossie, S. Phelan, J. Provost, J. Puhalla, R. Ray, D. Rogers, A. Rosenthal, S. Rubarth, M. Ruiz, J. Schmalstig, M. Shafe, A. Skelley, J. Small, M. Smith, P. Stephenson, M. Stewart, W. Svitavsky, M. Throumoulos, L. Tillman-Healy, A. Voicu, G. Williams, J. Yellen, W. Zhang.

- **Call to Order:** Yehudit Greenberg called the meeting to order at 12:35.
- **Approval of the Minutes:** The minutes from the January 29, 2004, meeting were approved as distributed.
- **Announcements:**
  - The new technology enhancements were introduced.
  - Dean Casey commented on Cornell Faculty Endowment, announcing that Ed Cohen is heading a group of Endowed Chairs who are designing an implementation of Cornell Distinguished Faculty Award. Dick James is heading a group of non-tenured faculty. The money is available for only part of the budget cycle.
  - The Dean also remarked he is courting the Mellon Foundation for grant to encourage junior and senior faculty working together, and at U. So. Alabama - \$50,000 – looking at ways to enhance advising.
  - Update on Presidential Search (Thom Moore) – the choice is Lewis Duncan, from Dartmouth College (Dean of Thayer School of Engineering); who is passionate about the liberal arts. Information will be mailed to faculty to arrive Monday morning.
- **Old Business:** Continuing discussion of Evaluation of Tenured Faculty. (Judy Schmalstig):
  - A.** After a review of the changes and some brief conversation, there was a vote on proposed change to the **VIII: Evaluation of Tenured Faculty** [below]. Ayes carried. The PSC was thanked for their work.

## **Article VIII: Faculty Evaluations**

### **F. EVALUATION OF TENURED FACULTY**

The Department Evaluation Committees, with the support of the appropriate Dean or Director, are charged with the responsibilities of encouraging improved teaching and professional development for all members of the faculty. Tenured faculty will normally be evaluated every seven years, two years before their eligibility for a sabbatical.

Exceptions may be recommended by the appropriate Dean(s) or Director(s), with the approval of the Professional Standards Committee.

While the primary purpose of continued assessment is to promote improved teaching and professional development, it also assists tenured faculty in the identification of strengths and correction of any deficiencies. Should the Department Evaluation Committee or the appropriate Dean(s) or Director(s) detect deficiencies which are particularly significant, the evaluation proceedings may be initiated at any time.

#### **Section 1. Department Evaluation Committee**

The faculty member's professional assessment statement plays a primary role in these seven-year evaluations. The faculty member creates a professional assessment statement called the Faculty Development Plan. This plan, with supporting documents goes to the members of the Department Evaluation Committee to review. The Committee then meets with the faculty member to discuss the professional assessment statement and writes a brief letter of evaluation in response to it, noting their developmental assessment of the faculty member and how the plans fit into the department's goals. This letter is sent to the appropriate Dean(s) or Director(s) by April 15 of the penultimate year before faculty member is eligible for a sabbatical.

#### **Section 2. Evaluations by Deans or Directors**

Deans and Directors play a central role in providing on-going encouragement and support for faculty efforts at professional development.

The Dean(s) or Director(s) meet with the faculty member separately to discuss the professional assessment statement and the letter of the Department Evaluation Committee. The Dean(s) or Director(s) then write a brief letter of evaluation, stating points of concurrence or disagreement. The faculty member receives a copy of this letter by August 15 of the evaluation year.

Both letters, along with the Faculty Development Plan, are placed in a file for the faculty member that is kept in the office(s) of the Dean(s) or Director(s). While a faculty member has a reasonable latitude for changes of professional direction, this file is then used in decisions about released time, requests for funding, and merit awards.

The question was successfully called, and a vote taken on the proposed change to the VIII: Evaluation of Tenured Faculty. Ayes carried.

The PSC was thanked for their work.

#### **• New Business: Motion for change in Oral Communications (T) General Education Requirement. (S. Klemann with L. Tilman-Healey assisting)**

#### **Proposed Oral Communication (T)**

Oral communication is the process of sending and receiving verbal and nonverbal messages to create shared meaning. Students graduating from Rollins College will be able to use oral communication skills to shape public dialogue by offering perspectives,

sharing facts, raising questions, and engaging others in discussion. To achieve this goal, students will be able to organize ideas and concepts persuasively, tailor messages to a particular audience, adapt to listener feedback, and – employing appropriate technology – make effective oral presentations.

**Goal 1 :** Prepare and deliver an effective oral presentation.

**Assessment:** A competency-based rubric will be used to assess students' oral presentations.

**Standard:** Students will show improved performance on their oral presentations.

**Goal 2:** Critically analyze and evaluate oral presentations.

**Assessment:** Using a competency-based rubric, students will analyze and evaluate oral presentations.

**Standard:** Students will show improvement in their ability to analyze and evaluate oral presentations.

Handouts also included examples of assessment rubrics.

Comments included that there was concern that all students would be able to learn to communicate effectively orally in one term, but, as with all general education courses, it was assumed students would have the opportunity to practice in several courses. There was a question about this revision as a prelude to infusing the T into the curriculum, and Klemann acknowledged that this revision was needed in order to bring a proposal for infusion of the T into the curriculum to the faculty later in the semester. The question was successfully called, and the motion was accepted by voice vote.

• **New Business: Motion to accept Proposal on General Education Assessment “Standards”** - (S. Klemann):

Faculty teaching general education courses will design their own course-specific, rubric-based procedures for assessing how their courses meet the goals established within the guidelines of the general education curriculum. Each time they teach a general education course, faculty will document assessment procedures and results for at least one goal through the General Education Assessment Matrix. Over time, it is assumed that individual faculty will assess all goals for each course.

Klemann explained that the practice in the past has been statements such as “Standard: a minimum of 80% of the students will receive better than C- on the assessment.” This language is unacceptable. We need to have a language of progress.

Questions arose over specifying the degree of improvement, and the response was that the issue is not putting a value on our evaluation. There must be more reflective ways of measurement, i.e., pre- and post-tests.

It was noted that visiting faculty would be in a difficult situation, and Casey responded that, the methodology was to create communities who have experience in a certain letter in order to evaluate the coursework.

Klemann: The assessment is not in the context of the department or agency, but a group who will convene every three years to examine the information in the assessment matrix. This proposal is simply asking the professor to set up the rubrics.

There appeared to be general confusion about the implications of carrying out the methodology as proposed. The AAC, working with Carol Lauer, was asked to (perhaps) give the faculty some examples. Then, in the interests of time and quorum, the motion was tabled.

- **Quality Enhancement Program** (Lancaster) – plan proposals have generated quite a bit of fruitful discussion. “There is a question that this will be the only goal of the college and will take all our energy and resources; this is not it. We need to have a specific quality enhancement plan. We need to have a plan that gives us the ability to enhance the quality of what we do; this might not mean that we need to throw a lot of money at it. The QEP is one small part of our work together. It is important we have this plan.” The students were convinced that one of the keys to improving Rollins is to have an emphasis on responsible citizenship and ethical leadership both locally and globally.

**Motion:** Adopt the dratt proposal for the Quality Enhancement Plan: Education for citizenship and leadership in local and global communities.

There was no discussion. Question called.

Motion carried.

- **New Business** : A motion was made for the faculty to meet Monday to discuss the presidential candidate: identify issues we wish to talk about; we are more likely to generate informed consent. The search committee agreed to provide information to the faculty ahead of the colloquium.

**IX.** Meeting adjourned at 1:46.