

10-31-2013

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Faculty Meeting, Thursday, October 31, 2013

Arts & Sciences Faculty
Rollins College

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

 Part of the [Educational Administration and Supervision Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Arts & Sciences Faculty, "Minutes, Arts & Sciences Faculty Meeting, Thursday, October 31, 2013" (2013). *College of Arts and Sciences Faculty Minutes*. Paper 92.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_fac/92

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



A&S FACULTY MEETING

OCTOBER 31, 2013

Agenda

- I. Call to Order**
- II. Approval of Minutes from 9/26/13 meeting**
- III. Announcements**
- IV. Reports**
Delivered electronically, pre-meeting
(see Attachment #5, below)
- V. Old Business**
Blended Learning Proposal (AAC) (Robert Vander Poppen)
(see Attachments #1 & #2, below)
- VI. New Business**
Amendment to Article VIII of A&S by-laws (FEC) (Robert Sherry)
(see Attachments #3 & #4, below)

PE competency (AAC/Athletics) (attached) (Richard Morris)
- VII. Adjournment**



A&S FACULTY MEETING

OCTOBER 31, 2013

Minutes

UNAPPROVED

In attendance

Almond, Josh; Alon, Anna; Alon, Ilan; Anderson, Mark S; Barnes, Missy; Bernal, Pedro J; Boles, Bill; Boniface, Dexter; Brandon, Wendy W; Bresnahan, Carol; Cavanaugh, Jennifer; Chambliss, Julian; Charles, David; Cheng, Martha; Chong, Dan; Cohen, Ed; Cook, Gloria F; Crozier, Daniel G; Cummings, Denise K; Davison, Donald L; Davison, Joan D; Decker, Nancy M; Dennis, Kimberly L; Edge, Hoyt L; Fetscherin, Marc; Foglesong, Richard E; Fokidis, Bobby; Foster, Julia K; French, Todd E; Fuse, Christopher R; Gregory, Eileen; Griffin, Kevin E; Habgood, Laurel G; Hargrove, Dana; Harper, Fiona M; Harwell, Jonathan H; Homrich, Alicia M; Jones, Jill; Kenyon, Erik; Kistler, Ashley; Klemann, Steve; Kodzi, Emmanuel; Kozel, Philip M; Lewin, Richard; Libby, Susan H; Lines, Lee; Luchner, Andrew F; Mathews, Jana E; Mays, Dorothy A; McClure, Amy I; Mesavage, Matilde; Miller, Jonathan; Mobley, Jen-Scott; Montgomery, Susan E; Moore, Robert; Moore, Thomas R; Murdaugh, Anne E; Musgrave, Ryan; Newcomb, Rachel C; Nichter, Matthew; Norsworthy, Kathryn; Ouellette, Thomas; Queen, Jennifer; Reich, Paul D; Riley, Kasandra; Roe, Dawn D; Russell, Emily S; Ryan, Mackenzie M; Sanabria, Samuel; Seitzer, Jennifer; Sherry, Robert; Smaw, Eric D; Smither, Bob; Snyder, Cynthia E; Stephenson, Bruce; Stephenson, Paul; Strom, Claire M; Sutherland, Katie; Teymuroglu, Zeynep; Tillmann, Lisa; Vander Poppen, Robert E; Vitray, Rick; Walsh, Susan J; Walz, Jonathan R; Yao, Yusheng; Zhang, Wenxian; Zivot Eric

Call to Order

President Carol Lauer called the meeting to order at 12:33PM. Quorum was achieved (87 signatures, total).

Approval of Minutes

Rick Vitray motioned to accept the minutes from the last A&S faculty meeting on September 26, 2013. The motion was seconded by Robert Sherry; the minutes were approved.

REPORTS

President of A&S (Carol Lauer)

Carol Lauer announced that in order to maximize the time available for discussion, she requested (and had received) electronically submitted reports from the respective chairs of the standing committees. Lauer explained that these are in lieu of verbal reports and that the faculty may review these as attachments to these minutes.

Lauer remarked that “this had been a difficult month at Rollins” with the unexpected passing of David Erdmann (1944-2013) who served as Dean of Admission and Enrollment at Rollins for 29 years, and the tragic death of Human Resources Assistant Yessenia Suarez and her two young children, aged 8 and 9. Lauer asked for a moment of silence.

In a related announcement, Lauer asked the faculty to be especially receptive to requests from the Admissions office as they recover from Erdmann's death; specifically, requests to meet with and host classroom visits from prospective students.

OLD BUSINESS

Blended Learning Proposal (Robert Vander Poppen)

[see attachment below]

Robert Sherry asked to re-open the discussion; Rick Vitray seconded. Claire Strom and Robert Vander Poppen offered introductory remarks and addressed concerns raised at and since the last A&S faculty meeting: Strom, AAC Chair, acknowledged that the initial discussion regarding Blended Learning (BL) had caused "considerable [faculty] anxiety" and Strom framed her remarks by stating that the decision to fashion a BL policy was "defensive"; her concern is that the College would craft a set of guidelines "without sufficient faculty oversight" if the faculty did not act. Vander Poppen echoed Strom's view, characterizing the adoption of the proposal as "proactive." Vander Poppen said that he was drawn to the "intentionality" and timeliness of the proposal and that, if approved, the policy and certification of professors would be "closely monitored." Vander Poppen stressed that only courses that contained 25-49% of outside-of-the-classroom time would be affected and Strom pointed out that "very few" courses currently offered would fit the definition of BL laid out in the policy. Further, Vander Poppen clarified that the policy pertained to the replacement of traditional class-time; that community engagement components, tutorials, independent studies, and internships would *not* fall under the BL rubric.

Calling English a "blended major," Bill Boles asked if the Holt program would adopt the same guidelines for BL; Strom reported that Dean Richard (Holt) said that Holt's BL courses would "fall happily" within the guidelines as proposed.

Pat Schoknecht, Information Technology's Chief Information Officer, expressed concern about plans to include the BL designation in the course catalog alongside GenEd and other designations. Schoknecht offered that the definition of BL in the proposed Rollins guidelines was at odds with the "generally accepted definition in higher ed[ucation]." Further, the more widely accepted definition, regarding the replacement of traditional classroom hours with "digital electronic time," is more in line with the Holt School's current working definition of BL, Schoknecht pointed out.

Eileen Gregory reported that she is certified to teach BL courses, is currently offering a BL course "in A&S and its equivalent in the Holt program," and reported that her course does not rely on an electronic component and that it conforms to the guidelines in the proposal currently being discussed and is "working just fine."

Rick Vitray expressed confusion about the BL designation and relief that he now understood that the new application process would not apply to him. Vitray asked about the percentages outlined in the proposal, specifically about the 25%-49% window. He asked for confirmation that a course with 24% BL, as defined in the proposal, would not trigger the need for BL certification. He asked about "lift[ing] the floor" above 24%

Eric Zivot also asked about percentages: "what would a course with more than 50% BL be—uber-BL?" Strom responded that 50% is the upper cap—that no course at Rollins likely will exceed that.

Kim Dennis next asked, “Can we be explicit about the 50%” upper cap?” Vander Poppen pointed out that it is, in fact, explicitly outlined in a subsequent paragraph in the proposal.

Jill Jones followed up regarding percentages, characterizing her remarks as “not a friendly amendment” but rather an expression of concern that the upper cap at 49% “seems high” to her. She said that she’d be much more comfortable with a 20%-40% window. Vander Poppen said that he plans to closely monitor data regarding outcomes over three years and to report back to the faculty.

Nancy Decker was recognized and “plead[ed] for retaining” the 49% cap. Decker offered the example of a course in Arabic presently offered in the Modern Languages Department. Taught by a Berkeley professor via teleconference, Decker said that Rollins cannot provide on campus a “sustainable model” that replicates student opportunities to work alongside a qualified professor and a native speaking Teaching Assistant. She said that given the small numbers of students likely to enroll in course like the Arabic one, Rollins needs to think creatively about ways to offer them.

Vander Poppen countered that the Arabic course, as defined by Decker, “would not fall under the BL name” in the proposal being discussed.

Schonknecht repeated her call for clarification of the definition of BL.

Strom outlined her concerns about *not* passing the proposal. She reminded the faculty that the proposal outlined a three-year pilot program only. Strom advised the faculty to “hold their noses and jump [as into the deep end of a swimming pool; take the plunge]”. “I don’t know if this is perfect,” Strom continued, but she urged the faculty to support the proposal.

Julian Chambliss asked to make two points: the first outlining his “general concern over time” about asynchronized versus synchronized learning; the second about the need for “tech to enhance the classroom experience.” Chambliss recognized that the definition of and policies surrounding BL “are evolving,” and added “it’s important to recognize that 90%” of the Rollins faculty will need neither to re-tool course offerings nor to fill out a form seeking BL certification—it won’t apply.”

Next, Rachel Newcomb and then Provost Carol Bresnahan stood to echo Schoknecht’s concern that a Rollins-specific definition of BL not in line with a generally accepted description would create confusion for prospective and transfer students, among others. Bresnahan “thank[ed] the faculty for taking up this discussion,” but cautioned against adopting a definition of BL not generally “understood by the academy” and outside even the Wikipedia definition.

Vander Poppen countered that “there is something to be said for being nonconformists” and that he supported a more “inclusive” definition of BL; he argued that the descriptor in the proposal might serve “to set our pedagogy apart” from other programs and institutions. Vander Poppen said that a primary motivation for the proposal was “to give students more information” about specific course requirements, and repeated that it was “important to add” that, if approved, the proposal would be “re-assessed in three years by the faculty,” in AY 2016-2017.

Julian Chambliss called the question, and Dexter Boniface seconded the motion. Jennifer Queen requested that the vote be executed via paper ballots. These were distributed and tallied. The proposal passed with 56 yes votes, 23 no votes, and 2 abstentions.

NEW BUSINESS

Amendment to Article VIII of A&S by-laws (FEC) (attached)(Robert Sherry)

Carol Lauer introduced Robert Sherry and framed the discussion, saying she supported the newly revised policy, recognizing “advantages and disadvantages” therein, and characterizing the policy as “better than what we have now.”

Robert Sherry moved to accept the bylaws as written. Hoyt Edge seconded the motion.

Acknowledging that “one part of this is more controversial” than the other, Lauer asked the floor if there were objections to dividing the faculty’s discussion into two discrete parts, considering Parts 1-4 first before moving on to Part 5. There were no objections.

Sherry began by calling the proposed bylaw change an “altruistic proposal.” He said that it was crafted by senior faculty who serve on the Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) and are veterans of the current system for tenure and promotion. Sherry reported that the proposal grew out of discussions about the process for tenure and promotion, concerns from junior faculty about the efficacy and confidentiality of the current process, and a review of the policies of the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), the Associated Colleges of the South (ACS) and Rollins itself. Sherry characterized the three sets of guidelines as “vague.”

Further, Sherry said the intent of the proposed policy changes was to codify and make consistent the tenure and promotion process “from one academic department to another.” He hoped, he said, to streamline the process and to alleviate concerns about conflict of interest and quid pro quo. Sherry stressed that he gathered input and feedback from many constituencies.

Sherry said that a key component of the proposed policy provided for “veto power” by the Dean of Faculty (DOF) regarding the make-up of Candidate Evaluation Committees (CECs). He said that while department Chairs would still lead the process of assembling committees (unless the Chair herself was the candidate), the DOF could “step in” when the make-up of a particular CEC was complicated by personnel or other matters.

Sherry opened up the floor for discussion. Jonathan Miller characterized the job of Library Director as a “strange hybrid position,” in some ways similar to a department chair but reporting to the Provost rather than the Dean of the Faculty. He pointed out that in similar instances the phrase “chairs or directors” appeared in the bylaws, rather than simply “chairs.” Sherry called Miller’s suggestion “friendly and right” and said he would modify the proposal accordingly.

Next David Charles noted that he found the request to restrict his comments to the introductory paragraph of the proposal “challenging” and that he preferred to offer a “holistic” response “about the process in general.” Regarding the process whereby the proposal was crafted by senior faculty members, Charles questioned not including the voices of assistant and associate professors. He further objected to the proposed “replication” of the CEC to resemble the makeup of the FEC, shutting out all junior faculty and some department chairs.

Hoyt Edge spoke next, saying it was “not clear if [David Charles’s] objection” applies only to cases of promotion to full professor. Charles interjected, “well, that’s the pressure point, right?” Edge countered that his understanding was that all faculty would have an equal voice in the process but that the proposed changes would protect vulnerable junior colleagues.

Claire Strom then expressed concern over “scholarship situations” in which colleagues, ill-equipped to assess discipline-specific scholarship, would be called upon to make such evaluations. Strom said that this was especially problematic at Rollins where many departmental criteria for tenure and promotion do not require letters of support from outside evaluators.

Ilan Ilon added his concern about the proposal’s call for an “expansion of the DOF’s role” in creating the CEC. He praised Bob Smither’s performance as dean, but said that “the wrong person” in that role could be “dangerous.”

Fiona Harper next commented on the dearth of full professors at Rollins who can appropriately place junior faculty’s scholarship in the proper context, noting that “this is especially a problem in the sciences.”

Susan Libby added that, “Art had no full professor for a really long time” but managed to appropriately vet junior colleagues under the current process. Libby said that if the current tenure and promotion process was replaced by the one outlined in the proposal, promotion to full professor would have been very problematic in her department.

Emily Russell pointed out that while it might be “seductive” to be drawn to a “one-size fits all wisdom” regarding tenure and promotion, junior faculty, “more recently out of grad school,” might be more well-versed regarding best practices and the latest scholarship. Russell said that “more voices are good,” and that the current system was “not on the face of it an ineffective way” of evaluating colleagues.

Eileen Gregory asked the faculty to step back and consider the question, “What does it mean to be a faculty member at Rollins; and, specifically, what does it mean to be a full professor here?” She said she always posed this question to candidates when she served on the FEC and that she had found “great disagreement across campus” among the answers to her question. Gregory suggested that rather than changing policy, she’d like to see the faculty conduct “a dialogue around these issues.”

Eileen Gregory then made a motion to table discussion of this part of the proposal. Ilan Alon seconded. The faculty voted overwhelmingly to table the first part of the motion, with only scattered nays.

Carol Lauer then moved to open discussion of the second part of the proposal, regarding confidentiality in the tenure and promotion processes. Eileen Gregory seconded.

Jonathan Miller spoke first, reporting that upon his arrival at Rollins he was “appalled by the lack of security” around the dissemination of tenure and promotion materials. “There are systems in place not currently used” that could easily make the system more secure, Miller said.

Josh Almond asked if the proposal's provision requiring confidentiality "applied to the candidate him- or her-self"? Sherry said that he "the committee [FEC] was not thinking" that the entreaty regarding confidentiality would include the candidate.

Kathryn Norsworthy asked for a clarification of the wording in the proposal. Norsworthy asked if the candidate was a "participant." Sherry made a distinction between candidates going through the process and committee members participating in it.

Jennifer Queen said that the practice in the Psychology Department was for the CEC chair to "sit down informally" with the candidate after the CEC meeting but before a formal letter was composed. She asked if this interaction would be allowed under the proposed confidentiality clause of the motion. Sherry said that the practice could continue under the new proposal.

Marc Fetcherin asked if the guidelines regarding confidentiality would apply to FEC members as well as CEC members. Rick Vitray responded that an "internal policy" governing confidentiality already was in place for the FEC. He said that he considered "as friendly" the suggestion that the proposal be changed to read "FEC and CEC members" rather than "CEC members."

Nearing the end of the allotted meeting time, Carol Lauer asked to "postpone or table until our next meeting" the discussion of the proposed bylaw changes. Lee Lines seconded. The vote to postpone the discussion was approved overwhelmingly.

ADJOURNMENT

Carol Lauer adjourned the meeting at 1:47PM.

5 Attachments, below

BLENDED LEARNING GROUP PROPOSAL FOR AAC AND THE A&S FACULTY

Blended Learning is the replacement of a portion of in-class face--to--face-instruction with learning beyond the classroom, often, but not always, through the application of technology to enhance student learning outcomes.

The Blended Learning Group proposes that the faculty of A&S adopt the following procedures for approving and assessing the efficacy of Blended Learning courses as part of a pilot program.

Course Proposals and Faculty Certification

Courses with Blended Learning Content should have a unique catalog designation to make students aware of their special nature. (BL, or some other code)

- Faculty should be allowed to blend up to 24 % of the contact hours for a class without a catalog designation as an opportunity to experiment with new didactic techniques.
- Faculty engaging in Blended Learning will undergo a certification program coordinated by Instructional Technology and based on a modified form of the seminar currently employed by the Holt School prior to being eligible to apply for Blended Learning catalog designation. Faculty teaching A&S Blended Courses should be compensated for obtaining certification, but should not receive additional compensation for teaching Blended courses.
- Faculty must request catalog designations as Blended if 25-49 % of the contact hours are achieved through Blended content as defined above. (See attached form).
 - Application should be based on extant AAC approval mechanisms - AAC Subcommittee with Instructional Technology advisor will review applications.
 - Faculty member shall explain pedagogical reason for the desired blended format tied to enhanced LEAP Learning Outcome
 - Faculty member shall include the portion of the syllabus that describes the nature of the non-traditional content.
 - Faculty member shall list technology needs for course.
 - Faculty member shall include methods and plans for assessing effectiveness of non-traditional methods in achieving learning outcomes.
 - Like Alphabet Soup GenEds – Designation goes with instructor not course in general.
- Office of Student Records shall maintain and post guide containing course description, and description of Blended content as part of schedule.

Limitations

- A&S Blended courses may not exceed 49% of contact hours achieved through Blended Content (exclusive of labs).
- Faculty load and compensation should be allocated according to the standards of traditional courses.
- A&S course caps should not change between Blended and traditional courses.
- RCC Courses may not employ asynchronous technology-enhanced Blended Content. Other types of face-to-face Blended Content are acceptable up to the 24% threshold. All

- RCC courses with more than 5% blended content require catalogue designation.
- During pilot phase, designation only available for courses offered previously in traditional format to facilitate direct comparison of in assessment.
 - Proposed procedures in place for AY 14-15, AY 15-16, AY 16-17, with assessment during Summer 16.
 - Program must be reauthorized by faculty to continue beyond AY 16-^o©-17.
 - AAC authorization required to move any A&S major beyond 24% of courses on major map to blended format.
 - Full faculty authorization required to move any A&S major beyond 49% of courses on major map to blended format.

Courses and credit-earning opportunities that do not appear with regularly scheduled contact hours on the class schedule maintained by student records (such as music performance classes, independent studies, and internships) shall continue to be approved according to current practices.

This proposal explicitly does not consider the use of technology-enhanced cross-campus collaboration, which the task force believes should be addressed as a separate issue. As is current policy, other forms of instructional innovation that fall out of a regular class format can be approved by AAC on a case-by-case basis.

The task force recognizes that some departments cross-list their courses with other divisions of the institution that have different Blended Learning guidelines and approval procedures. Which guidelines would apply to such courses would be left to be worked out between those departments and the Deans of the respective schools for the life of the proposed pilot program.

APPLICATION FOR BLENDED LEARNING DESIGNATION

Courses employing between 25 and 49 % of contact hours in a Blended Format (as defined below) require a special catalog designation. Only faculty who have completed Rollins College Blended Learning Certification are eligible to request such a designation.

Blended Learning is the replacement of a portion of in-class face-to-face-instruction with learning beyond the classroom, often, but not always, through the application of technology to enhance student learning outcomes.

Faculty Member:

Department:

Course #:

Course Title:

Year and Semester of Course Offering:

How many times have you previously taught a course with a BL Designation at Rollins?

How many times have you previously taught this course in a traditional format?

Have you completed A&S BL Certification? Date?

Justification:

Explain the reasons for moving the course to a Blended format by articulating how non-traditional activities enhance student achievement of LEAP learning outcomes.

Blended Content:

Describe the types of techniques, activities, and experiences that will constitute the Blended portion of the class.

Syllabus Language:

Include the section of your syllabus that describes and explains the didactic reasons for the non-traditional course content to the students.

Assessment:

Describe the mechanisms by which you will assess the effectiveness of the non-traditional pedagogy on student achievement of learning outcomes.

Technology:

List the technology or technologies that will be employed in the course. Pre-populated list of check boxes (generated by IT) and a comments section for additional options.

Background:

Describe your experience teaching Blended, Hybrid, or Online Courses as well as your familiarity with the technologies listed in the box above. List any other relevant information regarding your qualifications to teach a blended learning class.

Signatures and Approvals:

Instructor _____

Department Chair _____

Interdisciplinary Program Coordinator _____

AAC Subcommittee _____

Dean of A&S _____

FEC PROPOSED BYLAWS CHANGE—NEW VERSION

Section 1.

Candidate Evaluation Committee (CEC) Structure and Evaluation

a. Composition

While the composition and structure of a Candidate Evaluation Committee (CEC) varies among departments, normally the *minimum* membership is three individuals and the Department Chair or a senior departmental faculty member serves as the CEC Chair.

The Department Chair, wherein the candidate holds appointment, in consultation with departmental members, shall select a Candidate Evaluation Committee (CEC) in conformity the requirements set forth below (§§1-5), on or before May 15 prior to the academic year in which the candidate's evaluation takes place. In selecting a candidate's CEC, the Department Chair may wish to consult with the Dean of Arts and Sciences, since the Dean retains authority to *disapprove* the CEC's composition.

1. Voting Membership For Tenure and Promotion Evaluations:

A candidate's *voting* CEC shall normally consist of the Department Chair (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 qualified tenured members who wish to serve. Only tenured associate professors and full professors may vote on the promotion of assistant professors. Only full professors are eligible to vote on the promotions of associate professors. If the chair is untenured or does not hold the rank for which the candidate is making application, the *voting* CEC, in consultation with the Dean, shall select an appropriate CEC and CEC Chair.

2. Special Circumstances:

Where three qualified (per § 1 above) tenured members of the department are unavailable, the Dean of Arts and Sciences, in consultation with the Department Chair, candidate and the department, shall select tenured faculty members from outside the department (or in very rare instances from outside the College), to serve as *voting* or *non-voting* CEC members.

3. Non-Voting CEC Membership:

Departments are encouraged to include other tenured and tenure-track faculty as *non-voting* CEC members in the evaluative process, so that those faculty members may confidentially review material submitted, provide input and information, and gain knowledge about Rollins evaluative standards, policies, and practices. To ensure confidentiality, *non-voting* CEC members shall not be present for the actual vote-casting or for discussions about vote-casting.

4. FEC Liaison:

A member of the Faculty Evaluation Committee (the FEC Liaison) serves on each tenure or promotion committee as *non-voting* member. The FEC liaison's primary functions are

to provide procedural information and support to the CEC/candidate, promote compliance with departmental criteria, and ensure institutional uniformity.

5. Confidentiality:

A breach of confidence by a participant in an appointment and promotion matter is considered to be a serious violation of professional ethics. In this regard, the entirety of a candidate's tenure and promotion proceeding (exclusive of non-confidential documents from the candidate's file) shall be held in strict confidence by all participants. CEC participants shall not discuss the opinions expressed by the Rollins administration, faculty, or by internal or external referees with the candidate or with other external parties until the candidate's formal evaluation letter is dispersed by the CEC. Post the candidate's CEC meeting, the Department Chair or his/her designee (including but not limited to the CEC Chair) shall convey any and all appropriate information to the candidate in a timely fashion.

The CEC Chair shall send notice of the CEC's composition to the FEC, Dean, and candidate by June 1.

FEC PROPOSED BYLAWS CHANGE

Proposed in red

Current in black

Section 1.

Candidate Evaluation Committee (CEC) Structure and Evaluation

a. Composition

While the composition and structure of a Candidate Evaluation Committee (CEC) varies among departments, normally the *minimum* membership is three individuals and the Department Chair or a senior departmental faculty member serves as the CEC Chair.

The Department Chair wherein the candidate holds appointment in consultation with departmental members, shall select a Candidate Evaluation Committee (CEC) in conformity the requirements set forth below (§§1-5), on or before May 15 prior to the academic year in which the candidate's evaluation takes place. In selecting a candidate's CEC, the Department Chair may wish to consult with the Dean of Arts and Sciences, since the Dean retains authority to *disapprove* the CEC's 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. If the department Chair is the candidate being evaluated, another member of the department shall be selected as CEC chair.

1. Voting Membership For Tenure and Promotion Evaluations:

A candidate's *voting* CEC shall normally consist of the Department Chair (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 qualified tenured members who wish to serve. Only tenured associate professors and full professors may vote on the promotion of assistant professors. Only full professors are eligible to vote on the promotions of associate professors. If the chair is untenured or does not hold the rank for which the candidate is making application, the *voting* CEC, in consultation with the Dean, shall select an appropriate CEC and CEC Chair.

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. If the department Chair is the candidate being evaluated, another member of the department shall be selected as CEC chair.

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.

2. Special Circumstances:

Where three qualified (per § 1 above) tenured members of the department are unavailable, the Dean of Arts and Sciences, in consultation with the Department Chair, candidate and the department, shall select tenured faculty members from outside the department (or in very rare instances from outside the College), to serve as *voting* or *non-voting* CEC members.

If two additional tenured members of the department are unavailable, nontenured 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.

3. Non-Voting CEC Membership:

Departments are encouraged to include other tenured and tenure-track faculty as *non-voting* CEC members in the evaluative process, so that those faculty members may confidentially review material submitted, provide input and information, and gain knowledge about Rollins evaluative standards, policies, and practices. To ensure confidentiality, *non-voting* CEC members shall not be present for the actual vote-casting or for discussions about vote-casting.

4. FEC Liaison:

A member of the Faculty Evaluation Committee (the FEC Liaison) serves on each tenure or promotion committee as *non-voting* member. The FEC liaison's primary functions are to provide procedural information and support to the CEC/candidate, promote compliance with departmental criteria, and ensure institutional uniformity.

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.

5. Confidentiality:

A breach of confidence by a participant in an appointment and promotion matter is considered to be a serious violation of professional ethics. In this regard, the entirety of a candidate's tenure and promotion proceeding (exclusive of non-confidential documents from the candidate's file) shall be held in strict confidence by all participants. CEC participants shall not discuss the opinions expressed by the Rollins administration, faculty, or by internal or external referees with the candidate or with other external parties until the candidate's formal evaluation letter is dispersed by the CEC. Post the candidate's CEC meeting, the Department Chair or his/her designee (including but not limited to the CEC Chair) shall convey any and all appropriate information to the candidate in a timely fashion.

The CEC Chair shall send notice of the CEC's composition to the FEC, Dean, and candidate by June 1.

The chair of the CEC will notify the FEC, the Dean, and the candidate of the members of the CEC by June 1.

COMMITTEE REPORTS (SUBMITTED ELECTRONICALLY)

Academic Affairs Committee Report

Claire Strom, Chair

AAC continues to work very hard, meeting weekly. All of the below items were passed unanimously by the committee.

- New partner in Shanghai
- Revisions to programs in CMC, INB, History, Art History, Asian Studies, Environmental Studies, Pre-Engineering
- New policy that no class may be counted for more than two programmatic requirements
- Approval of catalog copy for rFLA

Student Life Committee Report

Yusheng Yao, Chair

- SLC held an additional meeting on Oct. 1 mainly to resolve the urgent issues regarding Scholarship for High Impact Practices (SHIP). 1. We have formed a subcommittee (2 faculty members, 2 SGA representatives and one staff member) to evaluate SHIP applications. 2. We have formulated rules and procedures to monitor post-Ship grant professed reports, to avoid possible favoritism, and to resolve controversial cases. 3. We have discussed possible ways for SHIP's fund-raising.
- We discussed enforcement of non-smoking policy on campus and decided: 1. to encourage a Sandspur article to be written about this to enhance awareness; 2. to remind Maria Martinez to email everyone reminding them of the non-smoking policy; 3. to revisit this issue in 3 months.

Professional Standard Committee Report

Julian Chambliss, Chair

The Professional Standard Committee finished the evaluation of sabbatical grant requests and continued its discussion of the Course Instructor Evaluations (CIEs) in October. The PSC believes there is consensus around further review of the CIE. To that end, the PSC is examining the best way to proceed. Based on the PSC's conversation with Paul Harris, the committee believes more data from students and faculty about the current CIE is crucial. To achieve this, the PSC has asked James Zimmerman to explore the feasibility of student focus groups. The PSC is currently defining the questions for the student focus groups. In addition, the PSC is examining the possibility of collecting new faculty feedback about the CIE.

Finance and Service Committee Report

Hoyt Edge, Chair

The two percent salary stipends were included in the November pay checks. The Planning and Budget Committee will be examining possible ways to reduce our expenditures \$2 million for this year in an attempt to convert the stipends into base pay. We will be able to give a report later in the year as to whether this will become possible or not.

We continue to work on the issues of the effects of any possible compression and gender inequity. Edge met with Provost Bresnahan, Matt Hawks, and Udeth Lugo to discuss ways in which these issues might be addressed and in what ways the results could be communicated effectively to the faculty. It was emphasized that the more information provided to the faculty, the better it would be. Edge proposed that at least the number of faculty salaries that had been queried in terms of compression and gender inequity be released, as well as the actual number of salaries adjusted in these two categories.

Subsequently, this issue was addressed in the Executive Council. It was recommend both that the faculty receive more in-depth information about the complexity of compression issues and that the administration seek to ascertain the methods used at other institutions to manage compression.