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Minutes
Faculty of Arts and Sciences
23 February 2012


Guests:

I. Call to Order—Dexter Boniface opened meeting at 12:35 PM.

II. Approval of the Minutes- The minutes of the 26 January meeting of the faculty were approved as distributed.

III. Committee Reports

A. AAC
Mark Anderson reported that AAC has approved a curricular revision for intermediate Spanish to replace the three SPN 210 courses with SPN 201 and SPN 202. It also approved two study abroad programs, one in Sydney and the other at Jacob University in Bremen, Germany. He also reported that AAC had hosted three open meetings to evaluate the RP. AAC is working on a curricular proposal that can draw on the strengths of both the RP and our current general education program. The Committee is planning to bring the proposal to the faculty by March.

B. F&S
Joe Siry reported on the colloquium and the follow-up survey on merit pay. Faculty is clearly split on the issue of merit pay. He said that the finding had been sent to faculty. The report will also be sent to Dean of A&S. Strom asked if he meant dean of college to which Siry said no because the Dean of A&S asked for advice if a pool for salary increases existed next year. Kypraios thought another question should have been asked on the
survey: should merit pay substitute for cost of living adjustments. Cohen asked if committee had had conversation with Smither about how many applied for merit pay or were turned down. Smither said that 99 faculty applied, and all met merit expectations.

C. SLC
Jennifer Queen – Student Life had received a report from Gabriel Barreneche and Whitney McDonald on the LLC & RCC collaboration. Gabriel Barreneche will be in charge of academic portion of RCC as well as continuing to supervise living learning. SLC also asked Leon Hayner about the procedure for determining who will reside in Lyman Hall next year. Leon stated that due to the renovations of Bush and Strong Hall, the 30 beds in Lyman were required for freshman LLC’s next year and therefore the procedure for organizational housing applications will not be utilized. When Strong Hall comes back online as 4 small buildings, the procedure for organization applying for housing will probably be implemented at that time (possibly Fall 2013). On another front, ResLife is contending with the destruction of Mowbray house which will leave Eco-Rollins unseated through no fault of their own. Leon and his staff are working diligently on filling next year’s housing requests.

Dan Chong presented the HIP advisory board’s draft of the student travel policy. It was discussed and SLC determined that they were probably the right organization to be evaluating these requests. As such SLC thanked HIP for their excellent work and is now working on how implementation of the procedures outlined in the proposal might work.

Queen also reported on search for the Dean of A&S. It will be an internal search. She encouraged faculty to nominate or self-nominate. March 15th will be the deadline for nominations.

D. PSC
Joan Davison asked the faculty to recognize Dexter and Hoyt’s birthdays. Tillman had asked about amount of grants in the past ten years which Joan said had ranged from 65,000 to 98,000, Vitray asked if there was a trend and she replied that there had not been one. Hoyt said that when he was associate dean, there was one pot of money and that the funds had been moved around among the various individual grants. Gunter asked if a flat figure is set aside from year to year to support these grants? Has this internal funding kept up with CPI or COLA over the years or have we remained static? Are we then actually offering less funding than 10 to 15 years ago? Davison thought the funding had varied but not consistently upwards. Smither suggested that some of the funds had been granted each year, but that some had been withheld to be distributed later. Vitray asked what the point of the question. Joan said she thought there was a legitimate concern that the money available had not increased over that
ten-year period. More people are being denied or not fully funded because process is much more competitive. She fears that the budget had not been increased despite the growth in the size of the faculty and the increase in demands for research. O’Sullivan thought that one of the chief problems stemmed from the lack of transparency in the budget process. Gunter wondered how many years this budget has been the same. Joan said that the amount has not grown despite inflation and cost of travel. Greg Cavenaugh suggested that PSC should present data to the Board of Trustees about the data to show how the money has been allocated. Joan felt Finance and Service should handle that. She then highlighted the anticipated A&S bylaws revisions and identified points still under discussion between EC and PSC. (See Attachment). The bylaws will now refer to us as Arts and Sciences rather than a school or college. Also question if we should expand the number of faculty with voting privileges. Lecturers or artists in residence do not currently have voting privileges. PSC is not opposed to extending the franchise but have concerns about quorum difficulties. She thought that the faculty might consider the matter later rather that at this time. Decker felt that the change might have a significant impact on Modern Languages and asked for clarity in the bylaws because of their situation. Levis expressed concern about how engaged lecturers and artists in residence would be outside of the classroom. Charles said that they have many long time faculty colleagues and he urged that they needed to be included among the voting faculty. Cohen explained that merit pay task force faced the same concern. Are they considered on the same basis if they are not evaluated for service and scholarship. Davison said it would pose a particular problem if we only have merit pay. Vitray wondered if there could be a time-in-service requirement and also require persons to apply for voting privileges. Edge said AAUP concerns existed since if they became voting faculty members then they fall under AAUP tenure rules. O’Sullivan agreed about the complexity of issue; for instance if a vote on tenure and promotion were held in a department, should someone not eligible for tenure vote on those issues. Charles countered by expressing concern about having second class citizens. Davison said that obviously PSC needs to make a careful review.

Davison reviewed other issues regarding the bylaw revisions. For instance, petition for review requires a certain percentage of the student body to petition. What is the status of students under the new structure. The bylaws require that one-third of the relevant student body (PSC and EC have recommended reducing that requirement to one-fifth of the student body). The revisions also call for CPS representatives on the four standing committees, but they may only vote on issues which have an impact on CPS. They could not vote on A&S issues. PSC felt that since CPS objected to AAC control over departmental curriculum that they should not have involvement over A&S. Additionally PSC has concerns about
the bylaw section on authority and implementation. The committee recommended sending a suggestion to the Executive Council. Also the issue of joint appointments; in the past these faculty have all gone through the same evaluation process and been reviewed by FEC. But that process has been complicated because of the existence of two FECs. PSC is considering making joint appointments disappear or tenure someone into a department and into a college. Miller expressed concern that there are so many divisions already that such a proposal would only exacerbate the problem. Joint appointments might help end the divisions. Davison expressed concern that the CPS FEC has not even functioned yet so it is difficult to tell how this would function. Yellan wondered if it were possible to have joint appointments but only one department and dean would be responsible. For instance, CMC could share a position with Communications but the person would have to be centered in one department. Russell asked about the biochemistry position. Harper expressed concern that the CPS representative could only vote on PSC. Davison countered that the CPS representative could vote on issues regarding the gen eds or PSC grants. Richards pointed out that the ad hoc committee had recommended full membership to avoid irritations. Davison did not think that the representatives (A&S & PSC) are not necessarily equal on what they might vote on. Also she argued that the CPS member recused him or herself rather than the chair making the decisions. Davison further pointed out that the CPS departments have sovereignty making their committee merely advisory. Voting on their committees would be far less significant.

IV. Announcements

A. Institutional Planning (update) [www.rollins.edu/vp-dean-of-college/planning/index.html](http://www.rollins.edu/vp-dean-of-college/planning/index.html). Boniface pointed out the January 31 memo describing the planning process. Work groups are being populated at this time according to Joyner. Richards and O’Sullivan will serve as faculty co-chairs.

B. AACSB Accreditation (update: Provost’s response to A&S Resolution) Hoyt had originally made a motion requesting information about AACSB accreditation. Jill Jones had sent out to the A&S faculty a message forward from Carol Bresnahan from AACSB which indicated that AACSB does not prescribe faculty governance structures for the purposes of accreditation.

C. Reminder: All-Faculty Meeting next Tuesday. Boniface stressed the importance of having a strong A&S presence.

V. Old/New Business
O’Sullivan introduced a sense of faculty resolution on the Winter Park Institute to be more closely associated with Rollins. Resolved: Because we understand the value of identifying all of our major programs clearly with Rollins and because we believe that all major programs should be directly connected with our primary educational mission, we, the faculty of Arts and Sciences, ask that the Winter Park Institute be renamed either the Rollins WPI or the Rollins College WPI and that all its programs be directly and closely connected with our students and faculty. He pointed out that David McCullough had no involvement with the history faculty or students and that Porter Goss had little connection with students or faculty. Miller pointed out that he talked to Bob Moore’s class. O’Sullivan also stated that the Animated Magazine was very poorly attended despite its high costs. He argued that WPI needs to have a return to the academic program because such large sums are involved. Question was called and the motion passed with only one negative vote.

Vitray asked about AACSB requirements concerning faculty governance structure. Boniface would not answer directly but read Bresnahan’s memorandum. Edge said that there could be an all-college AAC which would not be in violation of AACSB accreditation. Richards felt that we could create all-college committees.

VI. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 1:55 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

R. Barry Levis, Ph.D.
Attachment 1
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ARTICLE I
GENERAL GOVERNANCE

Section 1.

These bylaws define the governance system for the Faculty of Arts and Sciences of Rollins College. The Trustees of the College (Trustee Bylaws, Article IV) grant the faculty the right to "adopt for its own government such principles and bylaws as shall seem desirable to promote efficiency and facilitate work." All such principles and bylaws are subject to the rules, regulations and requirements of the Board of Trustees, the provisions of the Charter of Rollins College, and the laws of the state of Florida.
Section 2.

The standards set forth by the American Association of University Professors as published in AAUP Policy Documents and Reports, 1990 (or most recent) edition, when not in conflict with the College Charter, Trustee Bylaws, and these Bylaws, shall be binding on matters of academic freedom, appointments, tenure, faculty responsibility, and accountability.

ARTICLE II
MEMBERSHIP, RESPONSIBILITIES, AND SUFFRAGE

Section 1. Faculty Membership

The Rollins Trustees (Trustee Bylaws, Article IV) define the faculty of Rollins College as consisting of "the President, the professors, and such other employees as may from time to time be designated by the Board of Trustees."

Section 2. Responsibilities of the Faculty

Among other responsibilities, Rollins College (Trustee Bylaws, Article IV) entrusts the faculty of Rollins College "with all matters pertaining to the order, instruction, discipline, and curriculum of the College," and with "immediate government and discipline of the students," subject to the rules, regulations and requirements of the Board of Trustees.

Section 3. Voting Membership of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences

The following have the privilege of both voice and vote in meetings of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences of Rollins College: the President of Rollins College, all those holding full-time positions as instructors, assistant professors, associate professors, and professors, who are appointed either to academic departments of the College, to the Hamilton Holt School, or to the library and whose primary responsibility is to teach in the College of Arts and Sciences; Arts and Sciences administrators with faculty rank or holding tenure at Rollins College in Arts and Sciences; Directors, librarians, and department chairs with faculty rank.

Section 4. Student-Delegates

There shall be nine (9) student-delegates, selected by the Student Government Association, who enjoy the privilege of voice only.

Section 5. Attendance and Participation by Other Non-Members

Comment [ER2]: Executive Committee felt that while it might be appropriate to add artists-in-residence and lecturers that it would muddy the waters to try to do so now. They suggested we wait till later in the semester.

Comment [ER3]: A change suggested by the EC, especially after the Provost noted that she didn't have a vote under the described change.
All meetings of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences and its governance committees shall be open to observation by any employee or student of the College, provided, however, such open observation shall not apply in grievance considerations, including hearing on that subject. The right of a non-member to speak at meetings of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences shall ordinarily be granted by the President of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences or the chair of the committee. A non-member shall ordinarily be limited to a combined total of five minutes in which to speak. Exceptions to the practice of open meetings or to the limit of a combined total of five minutes of speaking time for a non-member shall require a vote of the members of the committee or faculty.

ARTICLE III
OFFICERS OF THE FACULTY OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

Section 1. The President of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences

The Faculty of Arts and Sciences shall elect a President who shall serve as its Executive Officer. The President of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences shall call and preside at meetings of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences and the Executive Committee of the Faculty and shall call for the initial meetings of the Standing Committees. The President of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences represents the Arts and Sciences faculty to the Administration and to the Board of Trustees, serves on the Executive Council of the Rollins College Faculty, and shall be a tenured member of the Arts and Sciences faculty. The standing Committee chairs shall submit an annual report to the President of the Faculty on or before May 30 of each academic year. The President of the Faculty shall, on or before June 15 of each academic year, forward to the Faculty, the Provost, and the Dean of the Faculty a copy of all amendments to these bylaws which have been approved by the Faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences in accordance with these bylaws. The President of the Faculty receives two courses of release time each year of service.

Section 2. The Vice President/Secretary of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences

The Faculty shall elect from its membership the Vice President/Secretary of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. The Vice President/Secretary of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences shall be a tenured member of the Arts and Sciences faculty and shall compile and distribute the agendas and minutes of meetings of the Arts and Sciences faculty and the Executive Committee of the Faculty. In the absence of the President of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, the Vice President/Secretary shall preside over Arts and Sciences faculty meetings and meetings of the Executive Committee.

Section 3. Terms of Office

The term of office of the President of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences shall be for two years, normally beginning on June 1. The President of the faculty may not serve more...
than two consecutive terms. The term of office of the Vice President/Secretary of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences shall be for two years.

Section 4. Election of the President and Vice President/Secretary of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences

The Executive Committee of the Faculty shall nominate at least two candidates for the offices of President of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences and Vice President/Secretary of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. The slate shall be published at least ten days prior to the election meeting. The election of the President of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences and the Vice President/Secretary of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences shall be from this list of nominees and from any additional nominations made from the floor of the faculty meeting. All nominations require the prior consent of the nominee.

Section 5. Recall

The President of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences may be recalled at a regular or special meeting of the faculty by a two-thirds vote of the faculty present and voting in quorum as defined in Article IV, Section 4 of these bylaws.

Section 6. Unexpired Terms of Office

Should a vacancy occur, the position of President of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences or Vice President/Secretary of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences shall be filled for the unexpired term by faculty election, as defined in Section 4 of Article III of these bylaws. The Executive Committee of the Faculty shall prepare nominations for a special meeting of the College faculty to achieve this end.

ARTICLE IV
MEETINGS OF THE FACULTY OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

Section 1. Regular Meetings

The Faculty of Arts and Sciences shall normally meet monthly during the academic year. Elections for the President, Vice President/Secretary, and the at-large faculty representatives for the four Arts and Sciences standing committees shall be held on or before the April meeting of the Faculty. At least one meeting each semester of the faculty of the College or Arts and Sciences, or upon the request of the President of the Faculty, the Dean of Student Affairs, or his or her designee, shall make a report to the faculty about the state of the College in regard to student life. Furthermore, any serious incident shall be reported by the Dean of Student Affairs or his or her designee at either a
regular or special meeting of the faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences.

Section 2. Special Meetings

Special meetings of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences may be called by the President of the Faculty as deemed necessary or as the result of a petition as allowed in Article IV, Section 5. The Faculty of Arts and Sciences shall meet as needed to vote on and approve administrative appointments to the positions of President of Rollins College, Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, the Dean of the College and Vice President for Planning, the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, the Dean of Student Affairs, the Dean of Admissions and Student Financial Planning, the Dean of the Hamilton Holt School, and the Dean of Knowles Memorial Chapel.

Section 3. Calling of Meetings

The primary authority to convene faculty meetings resides in the President of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. Upon presentation to the President of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences or to the Executive Committee of the Faculty of a petition requesting a special meeting of the Arts and Sciences faculty, and that it is signed by one third of the faculty members required for a quorum, or one-third of the student body of Arts and Sciences, the Hamilton Holt School, the President of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences or the Executive Committee shall call the requested meeting. The meeting normally shall take place within seven workdays of receipt of the petition.

Section 4. Quorum

The quorum for regular meetings shall consist of one-third of the voting members of the Faculty. The Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences shall supply this number to the President of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences at the beginning of each regular or special meeting.

Section 5. Petitions of Review

Upon presentation to the President of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences of a petition of review signed by one third of the faculty members required for a quorum or one-third of the student body of Arts and Sciences, or the Hamilton Holt School, any decision of the College administration which changes the letter or spirit of College policy must be submitted for review to a meeting of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. Any student or faculty member may initiate such a petition. Notice of the petition and its contents shall be distributed to the Arts and Sciences faculty seven days prior to the meeting. If the faculty votes to oppose such a decision, the President of Rollins College shall resolve the issue.

Section 6. Rules to Order
Robert's Rules of Order, when not in conflict with these bylaws, shall be used as authority for the conduct of meetings of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. The faculty shall be served by a parliamentarian, who shall be appointed for a two-year term by the Executive Committee of the Faculty from among the voting membership of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. The records of the faculty's deliberations and minutes shall be open for inspection.

ARTICLE V
GOVERNANCE STRUCTURE

Section 1. Governance Structure

The Faculty of Arts and Sciences has delegated certain of its responsibilities to the Executive Committee of the Faculty and to four standing committees. These bodies shall act on behalf of and report to the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. The normal legislative process is from committee to Executive Committee to the Faculty. Service on standing committees is a professional duty of any faculty member selected.

Section 2. Elections

At-large faculty representatives shall be elected to the standing committees at the regular faculty meeting in March. The Executive Committee of the Faculty prepares at-large nominations and publishes the slate at least ten days prior to election, but additional nominations may be tendered from the floor. Divisional representatives to all committees with divisional representation shall be nominated and elected from within the divisions during the month of March, under procedures agreed upon by the members of the respective divisions. All nominations require prior consent.

Section 3. Vacancies

Should unforeseen at-large vacancies occur, the Executive Committee of the Faculty nominates a replacement at least ten days prior to approval by the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. Such elections may be accomplished by mailed ballot or during a special meeting of the faculty. Should unforeseen divisional vacancies occur, replacements shall be nominated and elected from within the divisions under procedures agreed upon by the members of the respective divisions. A majority of the electoral unit represented by any faculty committee member may recall the representative at any time.

Section 4. Procedures

The Arts and Sciences division and their constituent units are:

Expressive Arts: Art, and Art History, Music, Library Science, Physical Education, and Theatre Arts; and Dance;
Humanities: English, Modern Language and Literature, Philosophy and Religion, and Critical Media and Cultural Studies;

Science and Mathematics: Biology, Chemistry, Computer Science, Environmental Studies, Mathematics and Computer Science, and Physics;


Unless otherwise specified in these bylaws, each faculty and staff representative normally shall be elected for a two-year term of office that shall begin in September. Terms of office shall be staggered.

The standing committees shall elect a chair and recording secretary from the faculty membership of their respective committees at their first meeting. The secretaries shall keep the minutes of each meeting.

The President of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, the Vice President/Secretary of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, and the chair of each standing committee shall be tenured Arts and Sciences faculty members. No faculty member shall serve more than two consecutive terms of any standing committee. No Arts and Sciences faculty member shall serve concurrently on two standing Arts and Sciences committees.

The chairs of the standing committees and the President of the Arts and Sciences faculty shall serve as Arts and Sciences representatives on the Executive Council of the Faculty of Rollins College. When unable to attend meetings of these bodies, committee chairs shall delegate a member of their committee to represent them.

All standing committees shall normally meet each month during the academic year. The chairs of standing committees will report the activities of their committees to each meeting of the faculty and are responsible for communicating the agendas, concerns, and work of their committees to the appropriate administrators in a timely and systematic fashion.

Section 5.

Notwithstanding anything contained in these bylaws to the contrary, faculty members who serve on any Standing Committee of the Faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences Arts and Sciences, must be tenured or on official tenure track in the College.

ARTICLE VI
THE ARTS AND SCIENCES EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Section 1. Membership
The voting membership of the Executive Committee of the Faculty shall consist of the President of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, the Vice President/Secretary of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, the President of the Student Government Association, and the four chairs of the standing committees. The non-voting membership shall consist of the President and the Provost of the College and the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences.

Section 2. Responsibilities and Duties

The Executive Committee convenes and sets the agenda for the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, refers business to the appropriate committees, reviews proposed committee legislation, brings such legislation to the Faculty, acts on it (subject to their review) or returns it to committee, interprets the authority of standing committees as set forth in the Bylaws, prepares at-large faculty nominations to fill committee vacancies, interprets these Bylaws, reviews them annually, proposes any changes in them to the Arts and Sciences faculty, and acts for the faculty when a quorum cannot be assembled. Minutes of the Executive Committee shall be published and distributed to the entire College community in a timely fashion.

ARTICLE VII
STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE FACULTY

Section 1. The Academic Affairs Committee

Responsibilities. The Academic Affairs Committee shall have primary authority in all policy matters concerning curriculum, including general education requirements, student academic standards and honors, academic advising, continuing and graduate education programs of the College of Arts and Sciences and the Hamilton Holt School, the library and media services, and in all matters pertaining to academic schedules and calendars. Each year, the committee shall issue an advisory statement to the appropriate Deans on the appointment and replacement of members of the faculty.

Membership. Membership of the Academic Affairs Committee shall consist of twelve voting members: eight from the faculty of Arts and Sciences (four at large and four divisional, the latter of whom shall be selected from within the division they represent), one at large from the College of Professional Studies, and four students chosen by the Student Government Association. The students shall be appointed at the beginning of the academic year and remain on the Committee for a period of one year. The College of Professional Studies representative shall recuse him or herself from voting on matters strictly pertaining to Arts and Sciences. The Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences serves as an ex-officio, non-voting member.
Section 2. The Professional Standards Committee

Responsibilities. The Professional Standards Committee shall have primary authority and responsibility in all policy matters dealing with the criteria and procedures for professional evaluation, professional leave, and research and professional development for the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. The Committee reviews all internal grant allocations for faculty of Arts and Sciences and the College of Professional Studies and makes recommendations to the appropriate dean of grant awards. The Committee advises the President and Vice Presidents on the administrative structure of the College of Arts and Sciences, including the creation and elimination of administrative positions and the appointment, evaluation, and professional development of administrators.

Membership. Membership of the Professional Standards Committee shall consist of eleven voting members: eight elected from the faculty (four at large and four divisional, the latter of whom shall be elected from within the division they represent), one at large from the College of Professional Studies, and two students chosen by the Student Government Association. The students shall be appointed at the beginning of the academic year and remain on the Committee for a period of one year. The College of Professional Studies representative shall recuse him or herself from voting on matters strictly pertaining to Arts and Sciences. The Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences serves as an ex-officio, non-voting member.

Section 3. The Student Life Committee

Responsibilities. The Student Life Committee recommends policies and priorities with regard to student life to the Faculty and advises the administration concerning the implementation of such policies.

Student life concerns include, but are not restricted to, issues related to student housing, student services, student activities and organizations, student conduct and standards, recreation, and intercollegiate athletics.

Membership. The membership of the Student Life Committee shall consist of fourteen voting members: six elected from the faculty of Arts and Sciences, one at large from the College of Professional Studies, two members of the professional staff elected by the members of the staff (at least one of whom is drawn from Student Affairs), and five students selected by the Student Government Association. The students shall be appointed at the beginning of the academic year and remain on the Committee for a period of one year. The College of Professional Studies representative shall recuse him or herself from voting on matters strictly pertaining to Arts and Sciences. The Dean of Student Affairs serves as an ex-officio, non-voting member.

Section 4. The Finance and Service Committee
Responsibilities. The Finance and Service Committee consults with the administration and serves as an advocate on issues related to finance and general services of the College of Arts and Sciences. Such concerns include, but are not restricted to, issues related to budget, salary and benefits, student financial planning, tuition and fees, physical plant, campus safety, bookstore, food service, and personnel.

Membership. Membership to the Finance and Service Committee consists of twelve voting members: six elected from the faculty, one at large member from the College of Professional Studies, two staff members elected by members of the staff, and three student representatives selected by the Student Government Association. The students shall be appointed at the beginning of the academic year and remain on the Committee for a period of one year. The College of Professional Studies representative shall recuse him or herself from voting on matters strictly pertaining to Arts and Sciences.

Section 5. Authority

All committee recommendations become policy when approved by the Faculty.

All policies shall be implemented by the appropriate administrators of Rollins College.

When policies and their implications are unclear, administrators will be guided by the advice of the appropriate committee.

Standing committees seeking clarification of policy implementation shall confer directly with the appropriate administrator.

ARTICLE VIII
FACULTY EVALUATIONS

A. FACULTY APPOINTMENTS

For joint appointments across schools, more than one Dean will be involved in the evaluation of a candidate, and so all statements in Article VIII pertaining to a Dean should be interpreted as applying to "Deans" when this is the case. Likewise, in programs headed by a Director rather than a Dean, all statements in Article VIII pertaining to a Dean should be interpreted as applying to a "Director." All reports and recommendations and any responses by candidates will be in writing. Recommendations regarding candidacy for tenure or promotion must clearly support or not support the candidate. Notices of reappointments and non-reappointments are the responsibility of the President and will be in writing. These letters are sent out by the Provost on behalf of the President.

Section 1. New Appointments
Faculty appointments may be made to tenure-track or visiting positions. No tenure-track appointment may last beyond seven years without the faculty member being granted tenure, with the exception of faculty members on parental leave for childbirth or adoption who accept an extension in accordance with Rollins College Policy. Science Division and Psychology faculty who begin the tenure track in fall, 2012 (assuming the Bush renovation takes place on schedule) and who require specialized laboratory facilities in the Bush Science Center to conduct their research, may, at the time they submit their materials for their mid-course evaluation, declare that they wish a one-year extension of the tenure clock. That extension will convert their fifth year on the tenure track to a non-counting year, allowing them to take the fourth year course release currently offered to tenure-track faculty. This provision expires automatically once these faculty have been accommodated as described. No visiting faculty appointment may last beyond six consecutive years. Initial appointments of tenure-track faculty shall normally be for a two-year period. All faculty appointments shall be made by the President with the advice of the Provost, who may act as the President's agent, and the appropriate Dean. All tenure-track appointments will be made as the result of national searches.

The department to which the candidate will be appointed will usually conduct the search. Search committees shall have one faculty member from outside the department who will be appointed by the appropriate Dean in consultation with the department. The appointee will be a voting member of the search committee. The recruitment and selection of candidates for faculty appointments will conform with the equal employment opportunity and affirmative action policies of the College.

The Dean shall not recommend the appointment of anyone of whom a majority of the tenured and tenure-track members of the appointee's department or program disapproves. If a new appointment must be made when a majority of the members of the department or program cannot be consulted, the Dean may recommend no more than a one-year visiting appointment.

While faculty members are not normally hired with tenure, this option is permitted in the special circumstance of appointment to endowed chairs. In such a case, the candidate must possess the rank of Associate or Full Professor at the previous institution and already have been granted tenure at that institution.

If the chair is in a specific discipline, a search committee will be formed within the appropriate department with representation from at least one other department appointed by the Dean of Arts and Sciences. The committee will set out the criteria necessary for a successful candidate to the position. If the chair is not department based, the Dean will appoint a search committee consisting of representatives from relevant departments and programs.

When the search committee has reached a final decision, it will send a letter of recommendation to the FEC. The search committee and the FEC, in assessing the merit of the candidate, along with the usual evaluation of research and service, will give special consideration to teaching quality in their evaluation. The FEC will examine the
credentials of the candidate and will give the Dean its approval or disapproval of the recommendation of the search committee, based on a stringent evaluation of the candidate against the tenure guidelines of the department or program. The Dean will then pass along to the Provost his/her recommendation as well as the recommendation from the FEC. The Provost in turn will make a recommendation to the President, who then makes the final decision on the appointment.

Section 2. Reappointments

Reappointments normally occur annually after the initial appointment. However, a department or program may recommend reappointment contracts of two or three years, subject to the concurrence of the appropriate Dean. All appointments and reappointments made during a faculty member’s probationary period are terminal appointments for not more than three years. Visiting appointments are for not more than three years.

Reappointment evaluations are conducted by the Candidate Evaluation Committee (CEC). Reappointments shall be made by the President only with the approval of the CEC and a majority of the tenured and tenure-track members of the department, after review by the appropriate Dean and the Provost.

In the case of a renewable one-year academic year appointment, notice of non-reappointment must be transmitted in writing to the candidate not later than March 1. In case of a two-year academic appointment, a written notice of non-reappointment must be sent to the candidate not later than December 15. If a one-year appointment terminated during an academic year, the candidate must be notified in writing at least three months in advance of its termination. If a two-year appointment terminates during an academic year, the candidate must be notified in writing at least six months in advance of its termination. After two or more years of service, notice of non-reappointment must be given not later than twelve months before the expiration of the appointment.

B. CRITERIA FOR FACULTY EVALUATION

Section 1. General Criteria

The education of students is the primary mission of Rollins College. To that end the role of the faculty involves teaching, research and scholarship, and service as interrelated components that serve this mission. Rollins values teaching excellence above all. We see scholarship and service as concomitant to good teaching. We expect candidates for tenure and promotion to demonstrate scholarly interests and give evidence of an active scholarly life. We expect candidates for tenure and promotion to engage in service within the College and to demonstrate how service outside the College is connected to the mission of the College.

We expect candidates to make a case for tenure and promotion. Tenure and promotion represent a recognition by the College community that a faculty member has met Rollins’ standards for membership and achievement. We expect every faculty member to adhere
to professional standards, as well as to demonstrate the commitment to rational dialogue that is required for cooperative relations among colleagues and the promotion of knowledge and understanding among students. To receive tenure and promotion, the candidate must demonstrate that he or she has contributed, and will continue to contribute, to the College's educational mission and goals in spirit as well as substance. In making the case for tenure and promotion, the candidate should address the following categories:

**Teaching.** Rollins College expects the candidate to demonstrate both high competence in his/her field(s) and the ability to convey knowledge of his/her field to students. While we recognize the legitimacy of a wide variety of teaching methods, the candidate must be able to organize coherent and useful courses, stimulate student thought, challenge student assumptions, and establish a realistic but demanding set of expectations. Means of evaluation in this area include course evaluations, classroom visits, review of course syllabi, writing or conversations with colleagues that demonstrate the candidate's intellectual ability, and evidence of effective communication skills. Evaluation of the quality of teaching need not be limited to on-load courses but can include student advising and over-load teaching. The candidate must demonstrate excellence as a teacher to merit tenure or promotion.

**Research and Scholarship.** We expect the candidate to demonstrate scholarly accomplishment, as well as ongoing intellectual activity directed toward making a contribution to his or her fields(s) and/or toward the extension or deepening of intellectual competence. We recognize the value not only of scholarship in a particular academic discipline, but also in inter-disciplinary scholarship and pedagogical research. Accomplishments in this area may be demonstrated, as appropriate, by the following: scholarly writings submitted for review by one's peers and accepted for publication, presentation of papers at professional meetings, creation of art or performance, serving as a session organizer or discussant at professional conferences, participation in scholarly activities such as seminars in which written scholarly work is required, service as a referee or reviewer for professional journals and/or publishers or professional conferences, invited lectures and performances, the receipt of grants or fellowships from which scholarly writing is expected, public performance, and the publication of journal articles or books. These activities must represent a pattern of professional development, suggesting intellectual and scholarly life that will continue after the awarding of tenure or promotion.

These requirements are the same for tenure and promotion, except that the College has higher expectations for candidates for promotion to Professor. Given the time that normally elapses before a candidate can apply for promotion to Professor, he or she must be able to demonstrate a stronger record of scholarly accomplishment to merit promotion.

**College Service.** We expect every faculty member to make a contribution to the College community beyond the classroom and beyond his or her research efforts. Contribution to the College community beyond the classroom should include, for example, such services as participation in College committees, involvement in student activities, effectiveness and cooperation in departmental and inter-departmental programs, active and effective
participation in the cultural and intellectual life of the College, and service in the outside community. Development of academic, curricular, and other programs that enrich the life of the College can weigh heavily in considering a candidate’s College service.

The commitment to advising (students, organizations, programs) can also be seriously considered in evaluating a candidate’s College service. Student advising includes not only accepting a reasonable number of advisees, consistent with the candidate’s other responsibilities, and making oneself available to students outside of the class on a regular basis, but also interacting with students outside of class regarding issues and interests in the courses a candidate teaches and discussing with advisees their overall academic program, course selection, and career concerns.

Service to the College can take many forms, and Rollins recognizes the variety of contributions made by individual faculty members that contribute to the mission of the College.

Section 2. Departmental Criteria

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 reevaluate and resubmit these criteria to the FEC every five years, or earlier if the criteria have been revised. Any department with a candidate for tenure will use the set of criteria in effect at the time of the candidate's hiring, unless the candidate chooses to use the most recent criteria at the time they take effect. In all other cases, the set of criteria in effect three years prior to the candidate’s evaluation will be used, unless the candidate chooses to use the most recent criteria at the time they take effect.

Section 3. Specific Criteria for Reappointment and Promotion

No reappointment or promotion, except as provided below for instructors who receive the terminal degree, is to be regarded as automatic, but must be earned by merit as demonstrated by all applicable activities. Promotions in rank shall be made in accord with the general criteria of the College and the specific criteria described below. They will go into effect September 1 following the evaluation proceedings.

Reappointment. Criteria for reappointment shall be the same as those for tenure and promotion, with the understanding that the candidate is evaluated for the promise of excellence in teaching, research and scholarship, and College service.

Promotion to Assistant Professor. For persons employed at the initial rank of instructor pending attainment of the terminal degree, promotion to the rank of Assistant Professor
will be automatic and take effect upon official confirmation of their receiving the terminal degree.

Instructors who have not received the doctorate or the terminal degree in the appropriate field may be promoted to Assistant Professor only if the majority of the Candidate Evaluation Committee and the appropriate Dean conclude that all criteria for reappointment have been met and that the individual's continued employment is justified by exceptional conditions, such as: the individual’s contribution to the College has been outstanding, and if applicable, progress on the terminal degree is significant enough so that this degree will be awarded within a year.

No candidate without the terminal degree will be promoted without the approval of a majority of those on the Candidate Evaluation Committee.

**Promotion to Associate Professor.** Persons holding the rank of Assistant Professor may be promoted to the rank of Associate Professor upon and not before the award of tenure. (See eligibility for tenure, Section D.) If the Candidate Evaluation Committee and the appropriate Dean believe that the individual’s contribution to the College, professional growth, and potential warrant promotion, then upon their recommendations and the concurrence of the Provost, the promotion may be granted by the President. No candidate will be promoted without the approval of a majority of the Candidate Evaluation Committee. Only in exceptional cases will promotion to the rank of Associate Professor be considered for individuals not holding the terminal degree in the appropriate field and not having completed the minimum number of years. These exceptional cases will be determined by joint approval of a majority of the relevant Candidate Evaluation Committee, the Faculty Evaluation Committee, and the appropriate Dean.

**Promotion to Professor.** Faculty members with the terminal degree in the appropriate field holding the rank of Associate Professor may be awarded promotion to Professor, after a minimum of five years full time experience in a senior institution at the rank of Associate Professor, of which at least three years have been at this institution. The Board of Trustees, upon recommendation by the President, may waive this minimum duration, but only in exceptional circumstances. The delineation of these circumstances will be determined by each Candidate Evaluation Committee of the College in consultation with the Faculty Evaluation Committee and the appropriate Dean.

For promotion to the rank of Professor, the individual must receive the positive recommendation of a majority of the Candidate Evaluation Committee. The Provost will make a separate report and recommendation to the President. Promotions to the rank of Professor shall be made by the Board of Trustees and upon the recommendation of the President.

**C. PROCEDURES FOR ANNUAL REVIEW OF UNTENURED FACULTY**

**Section 1. Annual Evaluations**
The CEC (formed by December 1) will conduct annual evaluations of all tenure-track faculty. The candidate will submit materials for review, including a professional assessment statement, to the CEC by January 1. The evaluation will be documented in a report addressed to the appropriate Dean and placed in the candidate’s permanent file by February 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.

Departmental evaluations are to be conducted every year for Visiting Professors of any rank. 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.

D. POST-TENURE EVALUATIONS

The CEC (formed December 1), with the support of the appropriate Dean, is charged with the responsibility 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, 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 CEC or the appropriate Dean detect deficiencies which are particularly significant, the evaluation proceedings may be initiated at any time.

The faculty member’s professional assessment statements play 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 CEC to review by January 1. The CEC 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 by April 15 of the penultimate year before the faculty member is eligible for a sabbatical.

Deans play a central role in providing ongoing encouragement and support for faculty efforts at professional development. The Dean meets with the faculty member separately to discuss the professional assessment statement, and supporting documents, and the letter of the CEC. The Dean then writes a brief letter of evaluation, stating points of
concurrency 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, and other supporting materials, are placed in a file for the faculty member that is kept in the office of the Dean. While a faculty member has a reasonable latitude for changes of professional direction, this file is then used in decisions about release time, requests for funding, and merit awards.

Timeline for Annual and Post-Tenure Review:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Annual</th>
<th>Post-Tenure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Notification by Dean's office of eligibility</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>April 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEC formed by</td>
<td>December 1</td>
<td>December 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate materials submitted to CEC and (post-tenure only) the Dean</td>
<td>January 1</td>
<td>January 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEC's letter to Dean and candidate by:</td>
<td>February 15</td>
<td>April 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean's letter to candidate and CEC by:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>August 15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. PROCEDURES FOR MID-COURSE, TENURE, AND PROMOTION FACULTY REVIEW

Section 1. Candidate Evaluation Committee Structure and Evaluation

a. Composition

The chair of the department to which the candidate has been appointed, in consultation with members of that department, shall select a Candidate Evaluation Committee by May 15 prior to the academic year in which the evaluation takes place. The CEC normally consists of the Chair of the department (unless the Chair is being evaluated) and a minimum of two additional tenured members of the department who are selected by a majority of all full-time members of the department, without excluding tenured members who wish to serve. In addition, a member of the FEC serves as an ex officio (non-voting) member when the candidate is being evaluated for tenure or promotion. If two additional tenured members of the department are unavailable, non-tenured members may be appointed. If non-tenured members are unavailable, the department Chair, with the advice of the candidate and the approval of the CEC, will select tenured members from outside the department to serve on the CEC. If the department Chair is the candidate being evaluated, another member of the department shall be selected as CEC chair. The chair of the CEC will notify the FEC, the Dean, and the candidate of the members of the CEC by June 1.

For candidates with an appointment in more than one department or program, the CEC, with the advice of the candidate, will add to the CEC one more tenured faculty member, or non-tenured faculty member, if a tenured faculty member is unavailable. This faculty
member should have greater familiarity with the work of the candidate outside the department to which the candidate was appointed. If such a faculty member is unavailable, the Chair of the Professional Standards Committee will select a tenured faculty member to serve on the CEC.

b. Collection of Materials Required for Review

The Chair of the CEC has the responsibility for collecting additional materials required for the evaluation including letters from tenured members of the department and/or department letters signed by the tenured members of the department, and student evaluations, and making them available electronically for members of the CEC, FEC, and the appropriate Dean to review by the time the candidate submits her/his materials.

At the candidate’s request, for the assessment of the candidate’s scholarship, two peer evaluators for institutions other than Rollins will be selected by the Chair of the CEC and the appropriate Dean from a list submitted by the candidate. The Chair then contacts the peer evaluators and requests their evaluation of the candidate’s scholarship. This request must be made in writing to both the Dean and the Chair of the CEC by June 15.

c. Review by Candidate Evaluation Committee

After each member of the CEC has reviewed the candidate’s file, the CEC meets with the candidate to discuss the activities addressed in the file. Issues that the CEC considered relevant to the evaluation that might not have been addressed by the candidate are also raised here. The CEC then approves a report and recommendation written by the Chair. The report and recommendation records the vote of the CEC. The report and recommendation are sent electronically to the candidate, the Dean, and the FEC.

If the CEC makes a positive recommendation, it gives reasons for its recommendation in the report. In the cases of a recommendation against awarding tenure or promotion, the CEC gives reasons for its conclusion. No candidate is tenured or promoted without the approval of a majority of the CEC. The candidate is given a copy of the report and recommendation, and has the opportunity to respond in writing, within one week, sending his/her response to all of the appropriate entities in the process.

Section 2. Faculty Evaluation Committee Structure and Evaluation

The FEC consists of six tenured faculty members each with the rank of Professor serving staggered terms of three years. These faculty members are appointed by the Executive Committee, with some consideration given to academic diversity, and ratified by the faculty. Members of the FEC receive one course-released time every year they serve on the committee.

a. Composition
The FEC consists of six tenured faculty members, each with the rank of Professor, serving staggered terms of three years. These faculty members are appointed by the Executive Committee, with some consideration given to academic diversity, and ratified by the faculty. Members of the FEC receive one course-released time every year they serve on the committee.

b. Access to Information

The FEC has access to the candidate’s file and all other materials considered at other stages of the evaluation process, and can request additional information from the Dean. It is always appropriate for the FEC to introduce additional information that might not have been included by the CEC or the appropriate Dean. The FEC also has the authority to call in anyone it needs for consultation, especially where there is disagreement between parties at different stages of the evaluation process.

c. Review by the Faculty Evaluation Committee

The FEC conducts its own evaluation of each candidate for tenure and promotion. The evaluation will be based on the following sources: the written report and recommendation by the CEC, the department’s approved criteria for tenure or promotion, the assessment of external evaluators (when requested by the candidate), the report and recommendation of the appropriate Dean, the candidate’s professional assessment statement, an interview with the candidate, and any other material or information that the FEC has obtained in the exercise of its duties. The FEC may also consult with the CEC, the appropriate Dean, or any other member of the community.

Meetings of the Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) must be confidential, regardless of subject matter under consideration and may be attended only by the duly appointed members of the FEC. Candidates for tenure, promotion, and mid-course reviews will attend their scheduled FEC interviews as well as additional meetings at the request of the candidate or FEC. At the invitation of the FEC, other persons, who by the bylaws may be consulted, may attend meetings of the FEC to which they are invited. This bylaw supersedes all other bylaws or faculty handbook rules, which may be contrary.

The FEC cannot challenge substantive requirements of a department for tenure or promotion that has approved criteria. The FEC will require the evaluation from the CEC to adhere to its approved criteria, both procedural and substantive.

Upon completion of its review of its candidates, the FEC writes a report and recommendation. The recommendation of the FEC may agree or disagree with that of the CEC or of the Dean. In the event of a negative evaluation by the FEC, the FEC will consult with the CEC on points of disagreement. If the FEC is still not satisfied with the arguments of the CEC, it submits its negative recommendation to the Provost for his/her report and recommendation.

Section 3. Comprehensive Mid-Course Evaluation
Prior to the tenure review, each candidate for tenure and promotion will receive one comprehensive mid-course evaluation. The CEC, the appropriate Dean, and the FEC will each prepare a written report detailing the perceived strengths and weaknesses of the candidate, including specific comments regarding directions the candidate might pursue to strengthen his or her case for tenure or promotion.

A candidate for promotion to Professor has the right to make a written request to the relevant department head and Dean for a comprehensive mid-course evaluation. The subsequent evaluation for promotion can take place no earlier than two years after the mid-course evaluation.

### a. Notification

Normally, the comprehensive mid-course evaluation will take place in the spring of the candidate’s third year, but no later than two years before the evaluation for tenure is to take place.

The review for tenure or promotion is conducted in the academic year preceding the award. Tenured appointments or promotions commence September 1 the year following the award.

By April 15 of each year, the appropriate Dean notifies, in writing, those faculty members eligible for tenure review and/or promotion evaluation the following fall. Having received the Dean’s notification of eligibility, candidates seeking evaluation must inform the appropriate Dean in writing by May 15. The Dean then provides him/her with a timetable for the evaluation process and a description of the materials s/he must assemble for the evaluation file (the professional assessment statement, course syllabi, information the candidate deems relevant to the evaluation).

### b. The Candidate

At the time of the tenure and/or promotion evaluation, each candidate is expected to make a written statement of his/her activities since her/his last evaluation. All relevant professional activities are addressed: teaching, research and scholarship, and College service. The statement includes the candidate’s assessment of his or her successes and failures, as well as a plan for future development. In the area of scholarly research, the College is particularly interested in knowing:

- how the candidate has developed professionally since the last formal evaluation
- how the candidate’s research interests and professional activities constitute a coherent path of development, and
- how the candidate’s research interests are connected to his or her academic life

Since each candidate’s application is judged by colleagues from the general College community, as well as those from his or her particular academic discipline, the professional assessment statement plays a critical role in making determinations about the
candidate’s professional competence and quality of mind. While a faculty member has reasonable latitude for changes of professional direction, the professional assessment statement is used to make determinations about the candidate’s professional development in subsequent evaluations and may be consulted when determinations are made about requests for funding and release time support.

The candidate must submit their materials electronically to the CEC, appropriate Dean, and FEC by December 15.

c. Evaluation by Candidate Evaluation Committee

Having reviewed the candidate’s file, interviewed the candidate, and deliberated, the CEC writes a report and recommendation, which makes a case for or against the candidate and sends it electronically, along with the letters from the outside evaluators if applicable, to the FEC, with copies to the Dean and candidate, by February 15. The candidate may choose to write a response to the report and recommendation, and should send this response electronically to the FEC, the Dean, and the CEC within one week.

d. Evaluation by Appropriate Dean

Based on the candidate’s file as well as her/his knowledge of the candidate, the appropriate Dean conducts a separate evaluation. The Dean may also consult with the CEC, the candidate, or any other members of the community.

For mid-course evaluations, the Dean submits a report and recommendation to the candidate, the CEC, and FEC no less than one week before its meeting with the candidate. The candidate may choose to write a response to the report and recommendation, and should send this response electronically to the FEC, the Dean, and the CEC within one week.

e. Evaluation by the Faculty Evaluation Committee

Having received the recommendations of the CEC and the appropriate Dean, and after reviewing the candidate’s file, interviewing the candidate, and deliberating, the FEC will write a report and recommendation and send it to the candidate, the CEC, and the Dean by May 15.

Section IV. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor Evaluation

a. Eligibility

Normally, a candidate is eligible for the awarding of tenure in her/his seventh year of a tenure-track appointment at Rollins, with the possibility for earlier consideration if the candidate has had prior experience. Individuals with three years full-time experience at the Assistant professor level or higher at other institutions may be awarded tenure in their sixth year at Rollins. Individuals with four or more years full-time experience at the
Assistant Professor level or higher at other institutions may be awarded tenure in their fifth year at Rollins. Individuals who have had full-time experience at the Assistant Professor level or higher at Rollins in a visiting position may use their Rollins' visiting experience as tenure-track, or may utilize up to the full seven-year tenure-track probationary period.

b. Notification

The review for tenure or promotion is conducted in the academic year preceding the award. Tenured appointments or promotions commence September 1 the year following the award.

By April 15 of each year, the appropriate Dean notifies, in writing, those faculty members eligible for tenure review and/or promotion evaluation the following fall. Having received the Dean's notification of eligibility, candidates seeking evaluation must inform his/her department chair and the appropriate Dean in writing by May 15. The Dean then provides her/him with a timetable for the evaluation process and a description of the materials each candidate must assemble for the evaluation file (the professional assessment statement, course syllabi, samples of exams and other assignments, samples of written work, and any other information the candidate deems relevant to the evaluation).

c. The Candidate

At the time of the tenure and/or promotion evaluation, each candidate is expected to make a written statement of his/her activities since his/her last evaluation. All relevant professional activities are addressed: teaching, research and scholarship, and College service. The statement includes the candidate's assessment of her/his successes and failures, as well as a plan for future development. In the area of scholarly research, the College is particularly interested in knowing:

-How the candidate has developed professionally since the last formal evaluation

-How the candidate’s research interests and professional activities constitute a coherent path of development

-How the candidate’s research interests are connected to his/her academic life

Since each candidate’s application is judged by colleagues from the general College community, as well as those from her/his particular academic discipline, the professional assessment statement plays a critical role in making determinations about the candidate's professional competence and quality of mind. While a faculty member has reasonable latitude for changes of professional direction, the professional assessment statement is used to make determinations about the candidate's professional development in
subsequent evaluations and may be consulted when determinations are made about requests for funding and release time support.

The candidate must submit their materials electronically to the CEC, Dean, and the FEC by July 1.

d. Evaluation by the Candidate Evaluation Committee

Having reviewed the candidate’s file and deliberated, the CEC writes a report and recommendation, which makes a case for or against the candidate and sends it, along with the letters from the outside evaluators if applicable, to the FEC, with copies to the Dean and candidate, by October 1. The candidate may choose to write a response to the report and recommendation, and should send this response electronically to the CEC, the Dean, and the FEC within one week. Should the CEC make a negative recommendation, the candidacy cannot go forward except on appeal.

e. Evaluation by Dean

Having received a positive recommendation of the candidacy by the CEC, the appropriate Dean will conduct a separate evaluation. This will be based on the Dean’s review of the candidate’s file as well as her/his knowledge of the candidate. The Dean may also consult with the CEC, the candidate, or any other members of the community.

For tenure decisions, the Dean submits a report and recommendation addressed to the Provost but sent electronically to the FEC, the candidate, and the CEC at least one week before the candidate’s meeting with FEC. The candidate may choose to write a response to the report and recommendation, and should send this response electronically to the CEC, the Dean, and the FEC within one week.

f. Evaluation by the Faculty Evaluation Committee

Having received the recommendations of the CEC and the appropriate Dean, and after reviewing the candidate’s file, interviewing the candidate, and deliberating, the FEC will write a report and recommendation and sent it to the candidate, the CEC, and the Dean by December 15. Should the candidate wish to challenge the recommendation of the FEC, s/he may send an electronic response addressed to the Provost, but also sent to the FEC, the Dean, and the CEC within one week.

It is the responsibility of the FEC to make the following materials available to the Provost by December 15: the candidate’s file; the report and recommendation, together with the letters from outside evaluators, of the CEC; the report and recommendation of the Dean; the report and recommendation of the FEC and additional materials it used in its evaluation; and any optional responses to any of these by the candidate.

g. Evaluation by Provost
Assessing the recommendations from the CEC, FEC, and the Dean, the Provost reviews the candidate’s file and makes a recommendation to the President. For tenure decisions, this letter is submitted to the President by January 15. If the Provost accepts a positive recommendation of the CEC and recommends overturning a negative recommendation of the FEC, s/he submits reasons for his/her decisions in writing to the FEC and the candidate.

When a conflict occurs between the FEC and the CEC, or when the FEC receives permission from the Provost to extend the date for submission of its report, the President may extend the date for the Provost’s recommendation for a period not exceeding thirty calendar days from receipt of the FEC report and recommendation. The candidate will be notified by the President of such extension(s) and given a revised date for the Provost’s recommendation to the President.

h. Recommendation by President

Upon receiving the Provost’s letter, the President makes a recommendation to the Board of Trustees. For tenure decision, this recommendation is made at the February Board meeting. The decision of the Board is communicated to the candidate in writing five business days after the meeting. In the case of a negative decision, the candidate has until August 1 to file an appeal. Appointment to tenure and promotion to Professor will go into effect September 1 following the vote of the Board.

Section 5. Promotion to Professor

a. Eligibility

Faculty members with the terminal degree in the appropriate field holding the rank of Associate Professor may be awarded promotion to Professor, after a minimum of five years full time experience in a senior institution at the rank of Associate Professor, of which at least three years have been at this institution. The Board of Trustees, upon recommendation by the President, may waive this minimum duration, but only in exceptional circumstances. The delineation of these circumstances will be determined by each CEC of the College in consultation with the FEC and the Dean.

b. Notification of the Candidate

The review for promotion to Professor is conducted in the academic year preceding the award. Promotions commence September 1 of the year following the award.

By April 15 of each year, the appropriate Dean notifies, in writing, those faculty members eligible for promotion evaluation the following fall. Having received the Dean’s notification of eligibility, candidates seeking evaluation must inform his/her chair and the Dean in writing by May 15. The Dean then provides her/him with a timetable for the evaluation process and a description of the materials that s/he must assemble for the evaluation file (the professional assessment statement, course syllabi, samples of exams...
and other assignments, samples of written work, and any other information the candidate
deems relevant to the evaluation).

c. The Candidate

At the time of the promotion to Professor evaluation, each candidate is expected to make
a written statement of his or her activities since his/her last evaluation. All relevant
professional activities are addressed: teaching, research and scholarship, and College
service. The statement includes the candidate’s assessment of her/his successes and
failures, as well as a plan for future development. In the area of scholarly research, the
College is particularly interested in knowing:

- how the candidate has developed professionally since the last formal evaluation
- how the candidate’s research interests and professional activities constitute a coherent
  path of development, and
- how the candidate’s research interests are connected to her/his academic life

Since each candidate’s application is judged by colleagues from the general College
community, as well as those from his/her particular academic discipline, the professional
assessment statement plays a critical role in making determinations about the candidate’s
professional competence and quality of mind. While a faculty member has reasonable
latitude for changes of professional direction, the professional assessment statement is
used to make determinations about the candidate’s professional development in
subsequent evaluations and may be consulted when determinations are made about
requests for funding and release time support.

The candidate must submit their materials electronically to the CEC, Dean, and FEC by
July 1st.

d. Evaluation by the Candidate Evaluation Committee

Having reviewed the candidate’s file and deliberated, the CEC writes a report and
recommendation, which makes a case for or against the candidate and sends it, along with
the letters from the outside evaluators if applicable, to the FEC, with copies to the Dean
and candidate, by November 1. The candidate may choose to write a response to the
report and recommendation, and this response will be sent to the CEC, the Dean, and the
FEC within one week. Should the CEC make a negative recommendation, the candidacy
cannot go forward except on appeal.

e. Evaluation by Dean

Having received a positive recommendation of the candidacy by the CEC, the appropriate
Dean will conduct a separate evaluation. This will be based on the Dean’s review of the
candidate’s file as well as her/his knowledge of the candidate. The Dean may also consult with the CEC, the candidate, or any other members of the community.

For promotion to Professor decisions, the Dean submits a report and recommendation addressed to the Provost but sent electronically to the FEC, the candidate, and the CEC no less than one week before FEC’s meeting with the candidate. The candidate may choose to write a response to the report and recommendation, and should send this response electronically to the CEC, the Dean, and the FEC within one week.

f. Evaluation by the Faculty Evaluation Committee

Having received the recommendations of the CEC and the Dean, and after reviewing the candidate’s file, interviewing the candidate, and deliberating, the FEC will write a report and recommendation and send it to the candidate, the CEC, and the Dean by April 1. Should the candidate wish to challenge the recommendation of the FEC, s/he may send a response addressed to the Provost, but sent also to the FEC, the Dean and the CEC within one week.

It is the responsibility of the FEC to make the following materials available to the Provost by April 1: the candidate’s file; the report and recommendation, together with the letters from outside evaluators, of the CEC; the report and recommendation of the Dean; the report and recommendation of the FEC and additional materials it used in its evaluation; and any optional responses to any of these by the candidate.

g. Evaluation by Provost

Assessing the recommendations from the CEC, FEC, and the Dean, the Provost reviews the candidate’s file and makes a recommendation to the President. For promotion to Professor decisions, this letter is submitted to the President by April 15. If the Provost accepts a positive recommendation of the CEC and recommends overturning a negative recommendation of the FEC, s/he submits reasons for his/her decisions in writing to the FEC and the candidate.

When a conflict occurs between the FEC and the CEC, or when the FEC receives permission from the Provost to extend the date for submission of its report, the President may extend the date for the Provost’s recommendation for a period not exceeding thirty calendar days from receipt of the FEC report and recommendation. The candidate will be notified by the President of such extension(s) and given a revised date for the Provost’s recommendation to the President.

h. Recommendation by President

Upon receiving the Provost’s letter, the President makes a recommendation to the Board of Trustees. For promotion to Professor decision, this recommendation is made at the May Board meeting. The decision of the Board is communicated to the candidate in writing five business days after the meeting. In the case of a negative decision, the
candidate has until August 1 to file an appeal. Appointment to Professor will go into effect September 1 following the vote of the Board.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event Description</th>
<th>Mid-Course Evaluation</th>
<th>Tenure &amp; Promotion</th>
<th>Promotion to Professor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dean notifies Candidate re: eligibility</td>
<td>April 15</td>
<td>April 15</td>
<td>April 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate notifies Dean re: intention, CEC formed</td>
<td>May 15</td>
<td>May 15</td>
<td>May 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEC Chair notifies Dean, candidate, and FEC of CEC make up</td>
<td>June 1</td>
<td>June 1</td>
<td>June 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate electronically submits materials to CEC members, Dean, and FEC members</td>
<td>December 15</td>
<td>July 1</td>
<td>July 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEC submits letter to candidate, Dean, and FEC Chair</td>
<td>February 15</td>
<td>October 1</td>
<td>November 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean submits letter to candidate, CEC Chair, and FEC Chair</td>
<td>At least 1 week before Candidate’s FEC meeting</td>
<td>At least 1 week before Candidate’s FEC meeting</td>
<td>At least 1 week before Candidate’s FEC meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEC submits letter to candidate, CEC Chair, and Dean</td>
<td>May 15</td>
<td>December 15</td>
<td>April 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEC submits letter to Provost</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>December 15</td>
<td>April 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ARTICLE IX**

**AMENDMENT PROCEDURE**

These bylaws, or any provisions thereof, may be abrogated or amended at any meeting of the faculty by vote of two-thirds of those present, assuming a quorum, provided that a notice one week prior to the meeting shall contain a copy of the proposed amendment or amendments. The amendment ultimately made need not be in the exact form in which it was sent to each faculty member, but must deal with the same subject matter.

*Rev. 7-17-09*
*Reviewed 7-27-09*
*Rev. 11-01-11*
Proposed Amendment #1

Concerns: Requirement that privilege of voice and vote be reserved for permanent faculty.

Proposed By: Dr. Singleton

Existing text:

Article II now states: "The following have the privilege of both voice and vote in meetings of the faculty of Rollins College: the President of Rollins College; administrators with faculty rank or holding tenure at the College; librarians, Directors, Vice Presidents, Deans and department chairs, with faculty rank; and all those holding full-time positions as lecturers, instructors, assistant professors, associate professors, and professors whose primary responsibility is to teach in the College."

Proposed amendment:

"The following have the privilege of both voice and vote in meetings of the faculty of Rollins College: the President of Rollins College; administrators with faculty rank or holding tenure at the College; librarians, Directors, Vice Presidents, Deans and department chairs, with faculty rank; and all those holding full-time permanent positions as lecturers, instructors, assistant professors, associate professors, and professors whose primary responsibility is to teach in the College."

AHFAC Notes: Amendment was proposed after AHFAC concluded business.
Proposed Amendment #6

Concerns: Faculty Appeals Committee Members Must Hold Rank of Professor

Proposed By: Dr. Schutz

Proposed Revision:

ARTICLE VI FACULTY APPEALS COMMITTEE
Section 1. Membership and Terms of Office
The Faculty Appeals Committee shall consist of four tenured faculty members: one from the Crummer Graduate School who shall be elected by the Crummer faculty, one from the College of Professional Studies who shall be elected by the Professional Studies faculty, and two from Arts and Sciences, who shall be elected by the Arts and Sciences faculty. Committee members shall serve staggered terms of three years. Four alternates (one from the Crummer School of Business faculty, one from the College of Professional Studies faculty, and two from the College of Arts and Sciences faculty) shall be elected for the same terms. Members of the committee may not participate in committee deliberations or actions in cases dealing with their own individual appeals, nor may they participate in committee actions or deliberations in appeal cases in which they participated as members of an evaluation committee. Members of the committee may not participate in committee deliberations or actions in grievance cases in which they are either petitioners or named in the grievance. In such circumstances, the member shall be replaced by a corresponding alternate.

PROPOSED CHANGE

ARTICLE VI FACULTY APPEALS COMMITTEE
Section 1. Membership and Terms of Office
The Faculty Appeals Committee shall consist of four tenured faculty members holding the rank of Professor: one from the Crummer Graduate School who shall be elected by the Crummer faculty, one from the College of Professional Studies who shall be elected by the Professional Studies faculty, and two from Arts and Sciences, who shall be elected by the Arts and Sciences faculty. Committee members shall serve staggered terms of three years. Four alternates (one from the Crummer School of Business faculty, one from the College of Professional Studies faculty, and two from the College of Arts and Sciences faculty) shall be elected for the same terms. Members of the committee may not participate in committee deliberations or actions in cases dealing with their own individual appeals, nor may they participate in committee actions or deliberations in appeal cases in which they participated as members of an evaluation committee. Members of the committee may not participate in committee deliberations or actions in grievance cases in which they are either petitioners or named in the grievance. In such circumstances, the member shall be
replaced by a corresponding alternate.

**Rationale:**
In practice--this committee has always been composed of full professors. This is an important aspect of shared governance and protection of academic freedom within the institution. The office of faculty member should be one of independence--that can only come from the rank of full professor.

**AHFAC Notes:** We did not consider rank in our deliberations regarding FAC membership. The current bylaws do not require that members be full professors. However, customary practice apparently has been consistent with Dr. Schutz's recommendation.
Proposed Amendment #7

Concerns: Append College Bylaws

Proposed By: Dr. Taylor

Proposed Revision:

Colleagues,

This is intended as a friendly amendment to the all-faculty Bylaws. I was unable to find any listing of the Trustee Bylaws that were evidently used to supercede the faculty ByLaws when the formation of a new College was announced by the President last spring. To make for better future communication with the faculty about Presidential intentions and Board prerogatives and to reinvest ourselves in a democratic framework, I propose we add, as an appendix, the Trustee ByLaws to this document. Otherwise, the A&S faculty may well feel that faculty governance is in the hands of an unknown set of principles, or even arbitrary.

Kenna Taylor

AHFAC Notes: None.
Proposed Amendment #9

Concerns:  Executive Council Composition Change

Proposed By:  Dr. Schutz and Dr. Brandon

Proposed Revision:

"We would also propose that an All College level committee be created - named, e.g., the All College Evaluation Standards Committee (ACESC) - for overseeing and approving all tenure/promotion criteria developed by faculties/departments in all the colleges. A single section inserted just before or after Article V Section 3, in which are described the membership and responsibilities of that committee, would accomplish that. We would hope that could be accomplished at the next All College meeting following the upcoming."

AHFAC Notes:  This is an interesting idea and the issue of equitable standards was certainly present in AHFAC meetings. However, it clearly exceeds the scope of what AHFAC did and we would consider it an appropriate topic to be processed through faculty governance or to be considered at the mandated two-year review of the proposed bylaws. Again, our minimalist philosophy argued against creating any new committees if at all possible.
Dear Colleagues,

At the December 7 meeting of the A & S meeting, a Resolution was passed (below) inquiring about AACSB accreditation and curriculum committees. The Resolution asked that the Provost inquire about these issues.

Please see the Provost's answer below. If there are any further questions or follow-up questions to this matter, please let me know.

best,

Jill

Jill C. Jones
Assoc. Professor of English
President of the A & S Faculty
Rollins College
Winter Park, FL
32789

---

From: Carol Bresnahan
Sent: Thursday, February 02, 2012 4:47 PM
To: Joan Davison; Jill Jones; Dexter Boniface; Jennifer Queen; Joe Siry; Gloria Cook; Alexandria Mozzicato; Bob Smither
Subject: Agenda item we did not get to in today's meeting

Dear Colleagues,

I agreed to respond by email to the agenda item we did not get a chance to discuss today:

Discuss Resolution passed at the Dec. 7 A & S meeting that asks that the Provost inquire about the possibility of an all-undergraduate-college academic affairs or curriculum committee. Specifically the resolution asks that the Provost clarify directly with AACSB (the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business) to ascertain whether or not such an all-undergraduate-college committee structure is an impediment to the International Business (INB) Department’s accreditation at Rollins. Furthermore, the resolution asks the Provost to ascertain whether or not the creation of a separate college (the CPS) was indeed necessary for INB accreditation.

As I mentioned, my recollection (and I am sorry not to have the faculty's resolution in front of me) was that the question really asked the provost to inquire with AACSB whether the creation of CPS was necessary for accreditation of INB. Note, by the way, that this question is technically not accurately posed, as AACSB accredits an institution (eg, Rollins) and not individual programs (eg, INB). All programs that are relevant have, therefore, to meet AACSB's standards for the institution to be accredited by AACSB.
I had Craig McAllaster inquire with colleagues and contacts in AACSB, and in mid-Dec, Jerry E. Trapnell, Executive Vice President & Chief Accreditation Officer of AACSB, responded. I'll quote from what he emailed and then comment.

"AACSB Standards and accreditation policies do not prescribe the organizational/administrative structure under which business programs are conducted. Schools are allowed flexibility in this regard. However, AACSB standards and peer review processes do expect business programs subject to our review to have an administrative structure and processes that provide the authority, responsibility, and accountability systems to effectively develop, support, and evaluate business degree programs as well as support processes that ensure continuous improvement in support of the mission of the business school. Again, we are flexible on the organizational structure, but operational effectiveness and the ability to effect appropriate changes are essential.

"I will be glad to discuss this if needed.

"Sincerely,

So, what Dr Trapnell said was — as I think everyone knows — the creation of CPS was not required by AACSB, but it did allow INB to meet the requirements of AACSB. In addition, the AACSB site visit team, which just left Monday, was clear that the creation of CPS was likely the best solution to the curriculum challenges faced by INB. It saw the resulting structure as a strong development for INB. The team referenced verbally the difficulties that INB faced in obtaining the autonomy AACSB requires of business programs before the creation of CPS. When the final written report comes out, I suspect it will reference the advantages that INB realized via the creation of CPS. I should add that the team had praise for the shared liberal learning component that unites all Rollins undergraduates, including those in INB.

Please let me know if this answers the question. Thanks.

Carol
Jill C. Jones
Assoc. Professor of English
President of the A & S Faculty
Rollins College
Winter Park, FL
32789