

3-20-2008

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee Meeting, Thursday, March 20, 2008

Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ps

Recommended Citation

Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee, "Minutes, Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee Meeting, Thursday, March 20, 2008" (2008). *Professional Standards Committee Minutes*. Paper 87.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ps/87

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 Professional Standards Committee Minutes by an authorized administrator of Rollins Scholarship Online. For more information, please contact wzhang@rollins.edu.

Professional Standards Committee
Approved Minutes from March 20, 2008
12:30 p.m. CSS 249

Next meeting: April 8, 2008.

The meeting was convened at 12:30 p.m. in CSS 249 by Wendy Brandon. Other faculty members present were: Mario D'Amato, Julie Carrington, Fiona Harper, Alicia Homrich, Alberto Prieto-Calixto, and Susan Libby. Dean Laurie Joyner was also present.

1. Agenda is attached.
2. Old Business
 - I. Minutes from February 13, 2007 were approved.
 - II. W. Brandon announced that the bylaw revisions are complete and on the agenda for the next faculty meeting. M. D'Amato will present them to the faculty.
 - III. Dean Joyner suggested that the issue with lecturer positions has seemed more complicated than necessary. Certain departments regularly need lecturers who usually carry a 3/3 course load, like all other full-time faculty. She suggested that where appropriate, they carry a 4/4 load but then get paid more than they currently do. Currently, visitors are paid close to new tenure track faculty but lecturers are much lower. Neither have any research or service responsibilities. Why not have two levels for lecturers – one for 3/3 and another for 4/4? It should be more advantageous to carry a 4/4 load than a 3/3 with two overloads. This formula was moved, seconded and passed.
 - IV. W. Brandon reminded us of our charge to create an educational piece for the CIE. She presented a draft memo to Dean Joyner that Paul Harris and Paul Stevenson should be paid \$4000 each to create an online tutorial so faculty can make graphs, etc. S. Libby said that it sounds like more work for faculty. W. Brandon said that it is needed for new faculty and so we can use the CIE for quality enhancement. M. D'Amato wondered whether this was really part of our charge. He said that we were charged with teaching faculty how the CIE should be used and we have done that. He is opposed to extra data about the data. F. Harper said that it is more than that; it is analysis of the data. S. Libby said that she understood the usefulness of the graphs but will every faculty member have to do it for evaluations? F. Harper said that it would not be a requirement but it could turn out that way. W. Brandon said that quantitative types are already doing it. M. D'Amato asked if a department head can complain about a person in the lower ten percent and whether we have made a policy about who gets what kind of access to the CIE. We approved the draft memo.
 - V. The family leave information has been uploaded to the PSC website. W. Brandon noted that the definition of a caretaker is from the Harvard Law's definition. S. Libby noted that the summer policy is what is generally happening now; the policy simply codifies it. F. Harper suggested that the

- policy is comparable to that of other colleges and better than some. W. Brandon said that the next step is to Finance and Service and the Budget committees. It is a policy so it goes to administration rather than faculty.
- VI. W. Brandon said that the Critical Media/Cultural Studies Department had agreed to be housed in the Humanities Division.
 - VII. Nominees for the at-large openings on PSC for 2008-2009 have been submitted. We still need division representatives, especially Humanities. W. Brandon is concerned that the slate consists of all new faculty and we need a mix.
 - VIII. The FEC slate has been submitted to the Executive committee. W. Brandon added our recommendations of Tom Oullette, Carol Lauer, and Rick Vitray.
 - IX. The IT grant review is set for tonight at 6:30
3. New business
- I. Dean Joyner handed out a draft revised AFAR, noting that it is much more extensive than the old version but should be because it will go to the merit committee. We will consider the revision again at the next meeting. Dean Joyner noted that, as salaries voted on in February apply the next year, the AFAR should be done for the previous calendar year. M. D'Amato asked who would be 'grading' these. Dean Joyner said that it would be a parallel process with both a faculty committee and the dean's office. W. Brandon added that there would also be a self-assessment. Dean Joyner agreed and noted that there must also be an appeals method. A. Prieto-Calixto asked if, at least the first time, there shouldn't be a way of looking back. Dean Joyner said she had talked to President Duncan about unrewarded past merit. Faculty who are behind should have a chance to submit, for example, five years of material for merit. M. D'Amato thought that five years is too many but Dean Joyner noted that the average time that Associate Professors are in rank is twelve. We do not want to create inversion by bringing in new people at higher pay so we are unable to implement market driven pay without fixing the inequity. She said that Don Davison will make a draft of principles and if we approve the half of the \$470,000 from the Board, we should be able to make up for the inequities and even to catch up to peer institutions. A. Homrich asked if Holt is included and Dean Joyner said that it is included in all analyses.
 - II. PSC has an advisory role for strategic compensation system and merit appeals system. S. Libby reported that the original committee has been asked to present a model to the faculty. The discussion revolves around how to distribute the money pool, with some for market, some for merit, etc. They do not want to faculty to feel coerced. Bob Smither suggested a simple model with three categories – meets/exceeds/doesn't meet expectations. The criteria would be left to departments. There is concern about how chairs and their roles might be affected. W. Brandon said that Dean Joyner had spoken at the Executive Committee about the many pieces there are to consider, e.g., merit, past unrewarded merit, appeals, etc. She wants to put PSC and Finance and Services into the process of determining past unrewarded merit. We agree that we want to be a part of it.

- III. We have to write a policy on who has access to the CIEs. In practice, some chairs have access and some think they do not. Les Lloyd has said that IT can not handle giving then rescinding access to chairs so people have to make their data available when they choose. M. D'Amato said that numerical data from the first two years should not be available as it was in the experimental phase and not normed. W. Brandon asked if it wasn't only the fall. The year of 2005-2006, and the fall of 2006 should not be available. From spring of 2007 onward, data is available.
4. The meeting was adjourned at 1:45 p.m. The next meeting will be April 8 at 12:30 p.m. in CSS 249.

Respectfully submitted by Julie Carrington.