

12-6-2007

## Minutes, Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee Meeting, Thursday, December 6, 2007

Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee

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

---

### Recommended Citation

Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee, "Minutes, Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee Meeting, Thursday, December 6, 2007" (2007). *Professional Standards Committee Minutes*. Paper 91.  
[http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as\\_ps/91](http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ps/91)

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](mailto:wzhang@rollins.edu).

Professional Standards Committee  
Approved Minutes from December 6, 2007  
12:30 p.m. CSS 249

Next meeting: To be determined.

The meeting was convened at 12:30 p.m. in CSS 249 by Wendy Brandon. Other faculty members present were: Julie Carrington, Fiona Harper, Alicia Homrich, Alberto Prieto-Calixto, Susan Libby, and Anca Voicu. Associate Dean Deb Wellman was also present.

1. Agenda is attached.
2. Old Business
  - I. Minutes from November 13, 2007 were approved as written.
  - II. F. Harper summarized her prepared PowerPoint presentation for the colloquium on the family leave policy. D. Wellman will get the number of junior faculty that might have future pregnancy issues. W. Brandon noted that the package might also be significant to senior faculty, although they would not have need of the tenure clock extension. F. Harper noted that recent history has been one four-credit course release but in the sciences, one course might be six credits. Both Smith and Yale have tenure extensions but we need to be sure that that policy is not in violation of AAUP. President Duncan has pointed out that any extension can't be renewable, even if, for example, the baby has health problems. Yale has no limit. Smith has a maximum of two years. We have a recent case of a faculty member using her Cornell eight-credit course release to allow her time with her new baby. W. Brandon wonders why she should have to use her scholarship money for pregnancy. We have no policy so she is put at a scholarship disadvantage. W. Brandon said that the Executive Committee wants to make sure that any policy that is written goes to Human Resources for assessment, to the Dean's office, and to budget planning all before going to the Executive Committee. They want to be sure all bases are covered before going to the faculty so that the policy can't be undermined by any remaining controversy. F. Harper noted that she has been asked about timing; there are other important compensation issues on the table right now. S. Libby suggested that this is also important and is also a compensation issue. D. Wellman pointed out that the policy needs to have some flexibility built in for individual cases.
  - III. W. Brandon reported on the bylaws wording review. The new wording doesn't give a candidate for promotion to full professor a choice in the case of criteria changes. S. Libby and A. Homrich noted that that could result in a good way to limit a candidate; even tenured faculty don't always have input into changes, depending on the culture of a department. D. Wellman suggested that they have a choice of the new criteria or those in place at the time of tenure. A. Homrich also suggested giving the candidates a choice but not if the criteria are more than eight years in the past. W. Brandon mentioned that some departments don't have criteria at all. For example, her

department hasn't had anyone go up for promotion to Full Professor in 20 years. A. Homrich suggested that at the point guidelines are changed, an Associate Professor will have the choice of criteria in place at the time of tenure or the new ones. The decision must be made at the time the criteria are implemented. Another bylaws change was made in how visiting faculty are evaluated. D. Wellman noted that by AAUP guidelines, a non-tenure track faculty member must know by March 1 if s/he is not going to be invited back the following year. Thus, evaluations must be done in January and reported by February 15.

IV. Grant proposals are due on January 18 so we set a date for the review meeting of January 30 at 6:30 p.m.

3. New business

I. We noted that S. Libby is on the merit pay task force.

II. W. Brandon questioned our role in advising administration. We have no procedures to do so and she wondered if we should have. D. Wellman suggested that we might want to keep the role in case it's needed for some unforeseen reason.

III. D. Wellman wondered if we need separate course and instructor evaluations for field studies. Perhaps different questions are more appropriate. W. Brandon said she would look at it but mentioned that the problem is the same as if a department had its own evaluations. That is that according to Katy Sanchez, they can't be normed.

4. The meeting was adjourned at 1:45 p.m. Meeting dates for the spring term will be determined by email.

Respectfully submitted by Julie Carrington.