

3-16-2006

## Minutes, Arts & Sciences Executive Committee Meeting, Thursday, March 16, 2006

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, Thursday, March 16, 2006" (2006). *Executive Committee Minutes*. Paper 104.  
[http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as\\_ec/104](http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ec/104)

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).

**Meeting Minutes**  
**Executive Committee of the Arts and Sciences**  
**March 16, 2006**

**Members attending:** P. Lancaster, R. Casey, Mark Anderson, Pedro Bernal, Tom Cook, Nancy Decker, Patricia Lancaster, Dorothy Mays, Catlin McConnell, Rick Bommeljé

**Guest:** Jim Eck

- I. Call to Order:** T. Cook called the meeting to order at 12:36 pm.
- II. Approval of Minutes:** The minutes of the meeting of February 16, 2006 were approved
- III. New Business:**

T. Cook stated that the primary item on the agenda was identifying the structure for the process for the search for the Dean of the Faculty position. Prior to beginning, T. Cook asked if there were additional items and D. Mays stated that she wanted to update the committee on the status of the F&S Committee faculty salary task force. T. Cook invited D. Mays to proceed.

**F&S Committee:**

D. Mays stated that the F&S Committee now has a document that has been approved by the original task force. D. Mays reviewed the progress that has been made since Fall 2006 which included putting the proposed document on the website and asking for comments from the faculty. It was also suggested in the Fall that colloquia be held to discuss the document. It was further decided by the F&S Committee and the Executive Committee that no formal endorsement from the faculty was required since the document was developed as a recommendation to be forwarded to the Dean of the Faculty's office. During the Fall, it was recommended that three colloquia be held (for assistant, associate and professor ranks).

D. Mays shared that she is uncertain that the appropriate people who are most knowledgeable with the document will be present to lead the colloquia. She asked for advice from the Executive Committee.

R. Casey stated that the salary structure for next year is currently being finalized in accordance with the stair step model. The structure includes \$1,000 increments per year of service in rank at Rollins as base line pay. This will be for all faculty members who are Assistant Professors, all Associate Professors up to the eighth year of service in rank at Rollins, and Full Professors up to the tenth year of service in rank at Rollins. From the tenth year on, there will be \$750 increments per year. The numbers are being validated to determine if this can go into effect next year. Upon confirmation of the amounts, R. Casey will go to the F&S Committee to make a presentation.

D. Mays indicated that having a colloquium at this point may not be necessary. The document is a recommendation on how to avoid salary compression and also that salary is an accurate reflection of rank and years of service.

R. Casey identified that during the Fall he informed the F&S members that once the structure was established and the numbers were validated and approved that he would bring the plan to them. He further shared that the difference between the task force's

document and the Dean's plan is that the dean's plan is based on years of service within the rank, whereas the task force's recommendation is based on years of service.

D. Mays stated that the controversial issue revolves around Associate Professors who have been in rank for over ten years and will not be rewarded at the same level as if they were new in the rank.

T. Cook asked R. Casey what the plans are for communicating with the faculty. R. Casey stated that once the funds have been approved by Finance and the Provost, he would then go to the F&S committee and seek counsel on how this should best be reported to the faculty. R. Casey further pointed out that this model has been worked on for six years.

P. Lancaster suggested that after R. Casey presents the plan to the F&S Committee that a colloquium could be held. R. Casey stated that the controversy of a colloquium is the debate that could take place about what to do with long term Associate Professors.

T. Cook asked if the outcome of a colloquium would impact next year's salary structure and R. Casey pointed out that it would not.

T. Cook stated that since the document is not going to the faculty for a vote, there is no need to have an open discussion on the matter. The larger point is that faculty members be made aware of it. T. Cook recommended that D. Mays make an announcement at the next faculty meeting stating that the document is on the website and for faculty members to contact their representative on the F&S Committee with comments. D. Mays concurred and will report comments to the F&S and the Executive Committee.

### **Process for search for Dean of the Faculty position**

T. Cook stated that 47 faculty members attended the informal discussion on 3/14/06 to discuss the process for the search for the Dean of the College position.

T. Cook indicated that it is important to survey the faculty since approximately one hundred members were not present. T. Cook also pointed out that whatever is taken to the faculty will be voted up or down. Having the results of the survey will serve as the catalyst for discussion on the issue.

T. Cook stated that there are two, possibly three, alternatives that faculty members will be asked to express their preferences on. T. Cook also shared that it would be beneficial to have a rank ordering of the preferences.

T. Cook recognized Jim Eck who will assist with developing the survey. T. Cook strongly recommended that the survey be developed today or tomorrow, distributed and that the results be requested by Tuesday so that this item can be on the agenda of next faculty meeting.

M. Anderson stated the recent AAC survey on curriculum reform consisted of one question and that there was a 50% return rate.

P. Lancaster asked if a Likert analysis would be appropriate. T. Cook stated that the alternatives needed to be succinctly stated.

There was discussion about options that came from the open discussion. P. Lancaster stated that there were two primary options that surfaced from the meeting: 1. a national search with a one year interim dean appointment – while the search is being conducted; and, 2. a term appointment of 2 or 3 years.

R. Casey stated that there is a question that emerged in the conversation about the examination of the structure of the job itself. N. Decker raised the issue of diversity and

queried as to whether this should be formulated as a survey question. T. Cook pointed out that there was little discussion in the open conversation about diversity per se.

T. Cook asked if two options are enough. There was discussion on the options of a national search with an interim appointment for one year and a 2 or 3 year term appointment following an internal search.

M. Anderson asked if there should be a third question relating to the structure of the position. R. Casey stated that 2 structural issues are: 1. getting clearer on delineating the roles of the Deans and Provost; and 2. within the Arts & Sciences, the Deans of Faculty, Students and Admission reporting to a Provost. It was noted that the Rollins structure is unique to most of our peer institutions.

P. Bernal stated that the structure issue is separate from the process for the Dean of the Faculty search.

T. Cook recapped that there will be two options and asked how many dimensions should be listed for each of the options. J. Eck stated that a Likert Scale can be used for each of the two options. He distributed sample question formats.

R. Casey expressed concern that if the decision is to have the national search with a one year interim, what if the Associate Dean is not interested as a one-year interim appointee.

T. Cook indicated that there appeared to be unanimity of opinion at the open discussion that the interim could not be a candidate for the national search.

P. Lancaster stated that the interim appointment can be reasonably be filled by one who understands the dynamics of the office.

T. Cook asked if Executive Committee members are comfortable with him formulating the two questions for the survey and there was agreement.

P. Lancaster suggested that the two questions be stated with no detailed explanation.

T. Cook indicated that after gathering the survey information, a motion will be formulated for the faculty meeting.

P. Lancaster asked if there should be a comment box and it was concurred that there would be.

J. Eck asked if the Likert Scale is preferred and it was agreed that a 4-point scale would be included for each option

C. McConnell inquired if, in the option of the 2 or 3 year appointment, there would be a national search after the time period and it was concurred. T. Cook pointed out that, at this stage, if there was a national search after this period that the incumbent would not be prohibited from being a candidate.

P. Lancaster pointed out that the term appointment buys time to figure out what you want to do.

T. Cook summarized that there will be two options with four possibilities in each and the survey results will hopefully enable a motion to be formulated for the Faculty to vote on at the next meeting.

#### **IV. Announcements**

P. Lancaster reminded the Executive Committee about the colloquium on Friday, March 17, 2006 to discuss the Rollins Experience.

C. McConnell announced that SGA elections will be held on March 27-29, 2006.

T. Cook inquired about the process for committee elections next year. Initial work will be done to develop a slate for the April faculty meeting.

**V.** The next Executive Meeting will be held on March 30, 2006 at 12:30 pm in the Faculty Club.

**VI.** T. Cook adjourned the meeting at 1:47 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Rick Bommelje  
Vice-President/Treasurer