

9-25-2007

## Minutes, Arts & Sciences Executive Committee Meeting, Tuesday, September 25, 2007

Arts & Sciences Executive Committee

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

---

### Recommended Citation

Arts & Sciences Executive Committee, "Minutes, Arts & Sciences Executive Committee Meeting, Tuesday, September 25, 2007" (2007). *Executive Committee Minutes*. Paper 92.  
[http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as\\_ec/92](http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ec/92)

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

**Minutes**  
**Executive Committee of the Arts and Sciences Faculty**  
**September 25, 2007**

Members present: Lewis Duncan, Laurie Joyner, Paul Harris, Roger Casey, Don Davison, Barry Levis, Wendy Brandon, Rick Vitray, Stephanie Schuldt, Sharon Carnahan

- I. The minutes of the Executive Committee from September 13, 2007 were approved.
- II. Old Business
  1. Executive Committee interpretation of whether faxes/emails/absentee ballots, etc., should be counted as official votes for business and/or nominations at A & S meetings. – Davison explained that a problem of absentee existed especially with amended legislation. Vitray suggested that such ballots only be valid if legislation had not been amended. Duncan said that such ballots do not take into account the floor debate. In a close vote, these ballots should not result in significant decisions. In a close vote Harris thought the faculty would have difficulty accepting final decisions made by the absentee ballots. Davison said that state legislatures normally would not accept these votes although he thought the faculty would be upset if they were disallowed. Levis moved that since the executive committee is responsible for the interpretation of the Bylaws and since no mention of absentee ballots is mentioned in them, that the executive committee should disallow them. The faculty has the right to overrule the committee if they see fit. The motion passed unanimously.
  2. Strategic Marketing Initiative. Davison suggested a presentation to the faculty by Greg Marshall. Duncan reported that the college had hired an ad agency and was also working on our web presence. A full-page ad about Rollins will appear in *The New York Times* on September 30. The college has a large number of different messages about itself. We need to have some consistency. Davison felt the need to have report made to the faculty. Levis said that in light of faculty concerns the report should be sooner than later. Joyner argued that faculty needed to be very involved in the process.
  3. Search for new Vice-President for Finance. With the impending retirement of George Herbst, Duncan is forming a search committee and seeking faculty participation. The question is how to select the members

of the committee. Davison said that the last search included the chair of Finance and Services and the President of the Faculty. Duncan said that Craig McAllaster as chair and Matt Hawkes will also serve because of the use of an outside search firm. Duncan wants to receive unranked candidates to be presented by search committee. A selection group would then make a choice among the four although all faculty would be involved in the interview process. We need an external search because there are no obvious internal candidates. The search committee does not need to develop a job description since it already exists. Vitray and Davison agreed to serve on the search committee.

#### 4. Academic Affairs Committee

Carnahan provided a Curriculum Review Steering Committee update. The AAC has met once and accepted the proposals from the Executive Committee and will present them at the next Executive Committee meeting. AAC will propose a slate and set of charges. It will include a staff person serving in an ex officio position and as well as a student representation. Davison said that the next Executive Committee meeting will be October 9 when we would have to consider the agenda for the October faculty meeting on October 23. He wondered if there would be at-large positions. Carnahan thought not. Davison wanted to make certain that there was suitable amount of time to get nominations if need be so that the steering committee could be fully constituted on October 23.

### III. New Business

1. IRB (see attachments and Appendices 1 and 2). John Houston has provided a list of those who have volunteered to participate and wondered what next step he should take. Casey said that the IRB needed a Crummer representative. The Executive Committee authorized Houston to commence work. Schuldt asked about student representatives. Levis thought the term “student affairs rep” referred to someone from the student affairs division.
2. Course Instructor Evaluation education process. Brandon, Chair of Professional Standards, presented the results of a discussion on the use of CIE for tenure evaluation. The college needs to have CIE for faculty development purposes and not just tenure review. We need to make it more flexible. Joyner felt that the college should use the CIE to triangulate from multiple sources. We need qualitative as well as quantitative data. Levis argued many faculty think that we place too much emphasis on student evaluations. Vitray said that it seems that traditionally evaluations have played major role in the process. Davison

suggested that the new instrument places greater emphasis on the faculty member's self assessment, the establishment of goals and what actually went on in the course. He felt that departments need to talk about how these instruments will be used in the evaluation process. Carnahan wondered if anyone was aggregating across faculty to obtain norms. Harris reported that Katie Sanchez had this responsibility. Joyner suggested that the college should be able to do comparisons of means for courses, professors, departments, and the college as a whole. Harris said that we use percentages instead of the mean and right now we only focus on those in the lowest 10%. Joyner raised the question of the value Rollins places on teaching, versus research and service. She felt that a person only interested in teaching should be teaching high school. Persons in college-level positions must also be actively engaged in research. Duncan expressed concern about the role of the department in writing advocacy letters for candidates. Levis said that is how departments have been instructed by FEC to present cases. Casey noted the difference of the old narrative teacher evaluation system and the new one where comments are greatly reduced. It is hard to determine the nature of excellence in teaching with the new ones. We need to have a careful transition from the old to the new system. Duncan said that many institutions look at teacher performance in the same course, but we cannot do that so much here. Carnahan suggested that the college should have training for faculty to do classroom visitations. Casey suggested Centre College as a model.

IV. The meeting was adjourned at 1:54.

Respectfully submitting,

Barry Levis  
Secretary

### **Appendix 1**

*Excerpted from the Minutes of the A & S Faculty Meeting, March 29, 2007.*

**IV. by-laws change to establish IRB:** J. Houston: proposal that Executive Committee nominate slate of board members: 6 members + chair (tenured professor), including 2 full-time faculty, member from outside Rollins, and student affairs rep. Staggered 3-year terms. Members would receive training. Guiding principles (in compliance with federal guidelines): informed consent, voluntary participation, anonymity/confidentiality, avoidance of deception about research purposes when possible. Most research proposals will be expedited. Full IRB review occurs when studying vulnerable populations and

when risk to participants is more than minimal. S. Carnahan: IRB review is an educational process for students and faculty.

**Question called. Motion for by-laws change approved:**

"Rollins College has established the Institutional Review Board (IRB), endorsed by the faculty, to protect the rights of human participants and to promote professional research. The goal of the IRB is to enhance the validity of research by helping to ensure that projects involving human participants adhere to established ethical, moral, and legal standards. The IRB also serves to weigh any potential risk to research participants against the benefits that the proposed research may provide. Human research is any activity developed for the purpose of collecting and organizing data from human participants in such a manner as to test hypotheses, address research questions, or contribute to generalizable knowledge."

**Appendix 2**

*Excerpted from John Houston.*

As a result of an e-mail appeal to all full-time faculty, the following faculty members have expressed a willingness to serve on the Rollins IRB:

Sue Easton (Associate Professor, Communication)  
John Houston (Professor, Psychology)  
Yvonne Jones (Assistant Professor, Library)  
Marvin Newman (Professor, Communication)  
Dave Richard (Associate Professor, Psychology)