

2-24-2011

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Faculty Meeting, Thursday, Feb. 24, 2011

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, Feb. 24, 2011" (2011). *College of Arts and Sciences Faculty Minutes*. Paper 20.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_fac/20

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.

**Approved Minutes
A&S Faculty Meeting**

February 24, 2011

Attendance: Joshua Almond, Anna Alon, Ilan Alon, Mark Anderson, Pedro Bernal, Bill Boles, Rick Bommelje, Dexter Boniface, Wendy Brandon, Sharon Carnahan, Jennifer Cavanaugh, David Charles, Martha Cheng, Daniel Chong, Edward Cohen, Daniel Crozier, Denise Cummings, Mario D'Amato, Alice Davidson, Joan Davison, Susan Easton, Hoyt Edge, Marc Fetscherin, Rick Foglesong, Christopher Fuse, Laurel Goj, Ted Gournelos, Yudit Greenberg, Eileen Gregory, Mike Gunter, Dana Hargrove, Fiona Harper, Paul Harris, Karen Hater, Alicia Homrich, John Houston, Gordie Howell, Jill Jones, Sarah Kistler, Steve Klemann, Carol Lauer, Barry Levis, Lee Lines, Jana Mathews, Dorothy Mays, Margaret McLaren, Matilde Mesavage, Jonathan Miller, Susan Montgomery, Bob Moore, Thom Moore, Ryan Musgrave Bonomo, Steve Neilson, David Noe, Kathryn Norsworthy, Socky O'Sullivan, Thomas Ouellette, Derrick Paladino, Twila Papay, Kenneth Pestka, Jennifer Queen, Roger Ray, Paul Reich, David Richard, Dawn Roe, Don Rogers, Sigmund Rothschild, Scott Rubarth, Emily Russell, Samuel Sanabria, Marc Sardy, Rachel Simmons, Joe Siry, Eric Smaw, Bob Smither, Cynthia Snyder, Bruce Stephenson, Claire Strom, Kathryn Sutherland, Bill Svitavsky, Zeynep Teymuroglu, Lisa Tillmann, Robert Vander Poppen, Martina Vidovic, Susan Walsh, Jonathan Walz, Tonia Warnecke, Debra Wellman, Yusheng Yao, Wenxian Zhang

Guests: Pat Powers, Sharon Agee, Micki Meyer

- I. Call to order—the meeting comes to order at 12:35PM.
- II. Approval of Minutes—The minutes of the January 2011 meeting are approved
- III. Committee Reports
 - A. AAC- Levis announces AAC is bringing a Maymester proposal to today's meeting as well as a future proposal regarding graduation requirements. Levis states at this point AAC rejected a new INB major but INB intends to draft another proposal.
 - B. SLC – Boles states Student Life will meet to discuss the Code of Conduct and the alcohol policy as well as alternative programming on campus.
 - C. F&S – Easton announces a faculty meeting with Bitikofer on March 17 to discuss space and facilities.
 - D. PSC – Strom emphasizes the importance of faculty feedback to administrators and states that a 30% response rate for the feedback is unacceptable. She encourages faculty members to complete the surveys. Strom also announces PSC completed its grant decisions and reminds faculty that limited funds are available which make it impossible to fund all requests.

IV. New Business

- A. PSC - Bylaw change affecting the timetable for faculty evaluations and the structure (but not substance) of our bylaws regarding faculty evaluations – Foglesong announces the changes are structural and substantive and therefore EC hopes to bring the bylaw change as a consent agenda. He asks whether anyone opposes the consent agenda and Brandon states she does. (See Attachment 1). Strom responds the rationale for the consent agenda is that the changes primarily consist of date changes and rearranging the text so that it reads more smoothly and so that the full process for each type of review is explained. Strom notes the current bylaws require the reader to flip back to previous sections to understand the process. Strom acknowledges that Brandon identified two substantive changes, but explains these now are struck from the text. Brandon objects that the faculty needs to look carefully at the language of each change to be certain it is not substantive; Brandon specifically cites substantive changes in the fourth and fifth paragraphs dealing with the PTR in which the text states supporting documents are sent to the Dean. Brandon contends the PTR is to be developmental; the role of the Dean is to discuss with the faculty member the CEC letter and ideas for ongoing professional development in teaching and scholarship. Brandon says to require supporting documentation shifts the PTR from a development process and makes it an evaluative review. Strom reiterates the language was mistakenly copied and has been removed. Brandon emphasizes the supporting documentation only goes to the CEC. Foglesong suggests if there are issues of concern regarding the consent agenda then perhaps faculty members can identify these passages and bring the issues to the next PSC meeting. Levis argues that the faculty received the bylaw changes two weeks ago and the faculty needs to assume responsibility and read the material when it is distributed and before the meeting. Levis suggests this is simple courtesy and fairness to committees that work hard and long to bring resolutions. Harris states he agrees with Levis but given the significance of the bylaws moves to table the consent agenda until the March meeting. S replies that tabling to March will mean delaying the substantive changes until at least April because the structural changes are incorporated into the substantive changes to April. Carnahan seconds Harris' motion to table. The motion is defeated with 40 yes votes and 45 no votes. Queen seeks clarification that Brandon's changes were accepted and then calls the question. The motion to adopt the bylaw changes passes 58-17. Strom encourages faculty members who identify issues with the new bylaw changes to bring these concerns to the committee.
- B. AAC: Proposal from Academic Affairs regarding general education courses, transfer credit, and Maymester - Levis explains the primary purpose of Maymester is to provide additional opportunities for students to complete general education credits at Rollins. He notes the proposal also requires half of all credits for the degree be earned at Rollins, which is a slight change from 64 to 70, but an important symbolic change. (See Attachment 2.) Levis notes the proposal creates

the structure under which Maymester is incorporated as a permanent part of the curriculum. Levis highlights the proposal lengthens Maymester to 4 weeks so the calendar can accommodate science courses. He explains two science courses (O and P only) are proposed for Maymester and two science courses with labs (O and P with the N) are proposed for summer school through Holt. Levis concludes that AAC perceives the proposal as both a way to meet student need for general education courses, particularly the sciences and to encourage students to complete their general education curriculum at Rollins. Simmons responds the current three week courses work well for her classes. She asks if the science courses need additional time for labs and if these courses are being offered through Holt then why is it necessary to lengthen Maymester. Levis emphasizes non-lab science courses will be offered in Maymester, but the feeling in the sciences as well as in some other disciplines is that it is impossible for students to master certain types of material within the three week time frame; in particular students need time for reading. O'Sullivan asks about the opportunity to petition to take a second course, what acceptable reasons might exist for granting the petition, and whether it is feasible to complete two courses in four weeks. Levis acknowledges O'Sullivan's concerns and responds the committee believes granting of these petitions should not be the rule, and students must demonstrate solid reasons, typical associated with financial hardship. Anderson responds the idea of taking two courses in six weeks is embarrassing. He suggests something must be wrong with our courses, that our courses must be jokes, if students can complete two courses in three or four weeks. Harris states it is not apparent the number of contact hours; he asks how courses will be scheduled. Levis explains the original pilot also lacked this specification, and these details are not included in the proposal, but rather left to individual faculty members to decide how to fulfill the necessary 35 contact hours. B. Moore responds he discussed the issue of two Maymester courses with other faculty members and the math seems impossible if the course fulfills both the necessary contact hours and demands appropriate homework. Almond states that not only science classes, but also sculpture cannot fit into this model. Carnahan states winter term ended because people violated the purpose and abused the structure; she notes some faculty met their 35 contact hours in three days and then did not teach the rest of the session. She hopes this is controlled. Carnahan also asks that Maymester be used to combine two weeks class time with two weeks of field trips. Levis responds the field trip option already is included. Tillmann moves to change the resolution to "drop the phrase, 'although students may petition the Academic Appeals Committee for a waiver to take a second course.'" The new resolution then reads: "That the College of Arts and Sciences establish a four-week semester to be called Maymester. The four-week session will normally offer only courses fulfilling general education requirements. Faculty

members may petition the AAC to include courses other than those fulfilling general education requirements based on institutional needs. The six-week sessions through the Hamilton Holt School will offer courses not appropriate for the four-week semester such as language and laboratory science courses. Students may take only one course in the four-week semester.” The motion is seconded and Gregory calls the question. Siry seconds, and the amendment passes. Gregory then asks why the six week session must be scheduled through Holt. Levis explains the Holt summer school already exists and this is an effort to try to simplify registration. Gregory inquires whether these courses are open to Holt and day students and expresses concern about sufficient slots for A&S students in the lab courses. Levis answers that Lusk has the opposite concern, that is, the courses will under enroll. The question is called. Foglesong reminds the faculty that there is one motion with two resolution clauses. The motion on credit hours and Maymester passes.

- C. Provost Discussion – Foglesong suggests the meeting dissolve into a quasi-Committee of the Whole so we are free to talk about the topic. Levis moves, the motion is seconded and defeated. Cohen then asks for the floor and thanks the faculty for its support of and confidence in the search committee. He reminds the faculty of the meeting on March 4 and asks the faculty to submit the survey on candidate acceptability. Edge asks whether the survey counts as the A&S vote. Cohen responds the survey results will be passed to the president as a recommendation who then will bring his choice to the community. Foglesong asks what the quorum will be for the meeting because it is a meeting of the whole community. Cohen qualifies it is a colloquium, not a meeting, so there is no quorum. Levis states there is a problem if the colloquium lacks a significant faculty attendance. Levis explains that in the past the faculty took an actual vote and knew the faculty’s position candidates. Levis asks whether the results of the survey, the numbers who found candidates acceptable, will be made available. Levis concludes in the absence of a vote it seems a problem if the faculty do not know the numbers. Cohen explains the intention of the survey is to rate the candidates, not to vote. Foglesong responds this topic and the handling of the faculty opinion on the candidates have occupied EC for the past two weeks. He notes the bylaws are not entirely clear but the fact is the All College bylaws provide the All College Faculty with role of approving the candidate, but the A&S bylaws permit a meeting for the faculty to vote on the position. Foglesong notes he believes the A&S faculty role is independent and the A&S faculty meets before the decision by the President. Foglesong explains EC also believes the A&S faculty has a robust role, but Duncan perceives the role of the faculty as minimalist and confined to the search. I Alon questions the faculty can vote the choice up or down. O’Sullivan states the A&S faculty seems to have a

diminishing role for the past 36 years, a process that accelerated under the current administration. He elaborates that Duncan never shows much interest in our point of view or cares about what we have to say. O'Sullivan therefore urges the faculty to submit the survey on presidential feedback. He also argues it is time to take seriously the financial situation, even though the president seems to deny the issue. McLaren states she welcomes discussion of the candidates by the A&S faculty but her intention in not supporting the discussion at today's meeting was not to disadvantage the last candidate. Foglesong responds the fact the last candidate leaves the day before spring break is a problem and that is why EC believed it made the best decision given a bad situation in suggesting the A&S faculty at least discuss the first three candidates at today's meeting. Foglesong says the EC assumed an A&S meeting on Thursday night or Friday morning meeting could be a problem especially for faculty members who are married or have young children. Miller reminds the faculty of the situation last spring with summer recess; he states the faculty voted at the colloquium because there was no other reasonable time, but notes we are not now in that situation. Siry agrees that the faculty should vote on acceptability, but hopes faculty members attend both meetings. Smither asks whether the president can do what he wants regardless of the vote, and Foglesong responds he believes the president can do what he wants. Foglesong explains he did commit to the president to try to persuade the faculty to rate rather than rank the candidates. He notes the benefit is that if a first choice candidate declines the position then the second choice candidate is not aware of being second choice. A. Ilon asks whether the faculty really has the power to vote a candidate up or down given the lack of responsiveness to the faculty vote on membership on the Board. Vander Poppen questions whether the survey can be construed as a vote given the bylaw. Davison states it is important to note the A&S bylaws were passed first, then the All College Faculty federated, and subsequently the All College bylaws were written. She emphasizes there was never any effort to remove the relevant A&S passage on an A&S vote, and the precedent has been the A&S faculty submits its choices prior to the president's decisions. Davison also suggests the A&S separate meeting is particularly important in this case with an inside candidate. Foglesong asks the faculty whether they wish to meet on Thursday or Friday, and the faculty indicates it wishes to meet on Thursday at 6pm to discuss the candidates for provost. Foglesong agrees to schedule the meeting, again encourages all members to try and attend both the meeting on Thursday and the search committee meeting on Friday.

V. Adjournment at 1:37pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Joan Davison

VP/Secretary

ATTACHMENT 1

NOTE: Most of what is in the below document is exactly what is in the current bylaws. Only the structure and dates have been altered.

Structural Changes: The two evaluations that do not involve FEC are placed first. Then the CEC and FEC are explained; then each evaluation that goes to FEC is outlined, with each step in each section. Before this restructuring, someone going up for mid-course often had to refer back to the tenure part of the document. Although the changes make the document longer, PSC believes they makes it clearer. Any information that is actually deleted or added, rather than moved, is highlighted and explained.

Dates: Additionally, with the help of the current FEC, PSC has devised more streamlined dates for each process. These dates are inserted in the text and in the form of tables and are highlighted in both places.

C. PROCEDURES FOR ANNUAL REVIEW OF UNTENURED FACULTY

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 by 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 statement plays 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 concurrence 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

	Annual	Post-tenure
Notification by Dean's office of eligibility	N/A	April 15
CEC formed by:	December 1	December 1
Candidate materials submitted to CEC and (post-tenure only) the Dean	January 1	January 1
CEC's letter to Dean and candidate by:	February 15	April 15
Dean's letter to candidate and CEC by:	N/A	August 15

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. [inserted language replaces current language about assembling paper files]

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. [fits in with changed time guidelines]

c. Review by the 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. [inserted phrase replaces current language about circulating manual files]

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. [altered language to match that later in document—added time constraint of one week]

Section 2. Faculty Evaluation Committee Structure and Evaluation

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. [change made and approved by faculty several years ago and is current practice. Bylaws not updated]

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 or 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 or, **in the absence of approved criteria, specifications of how College criteria for tenure and promotion are defined, measured, and applied.** ~~[deleted as all departments now have criteria]~~ 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 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 FEC. At the invitation of the FEC, other persons, who the bylaws state may be consulted, may attend meetings of the FEC to which they are invited. This bylaw supersedes all other by laws or faculty handbook rules, which may be contrary. **[added last fall by faculty]**

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 candidate, 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, along with the candidate's file, the Candidate Evaluation Committee's report and recommendation, the Dean's report and recommendation, and the candidate's response(s) to any of the reports and recommendations** ~~[deleted according to current practice]~~ 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, samples of exams and other assignments, samples of written work, and any other 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**.**[language altered to fit current practice and timetable]**

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.**[language added to make chronological process clear within document]**

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. **[language added to address current practice and new timeline]**

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 4. 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 [change for current practice and new timetable]** 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). **The candidate must submit these materials to the department chair by June 15. The Dean also notifies the department chair of the candidate's intention to undergo review. [deleted-- no longer relevant—at other places in document]**

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, and
- 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 FEC by July

1. [per current method of doing evaluations]

As the evaluation process proceeds, the candidate receives copies of all reports and recommendations submitted by the Candidate Evaluation Committee, the Faculty Evaluation committee, the Dean of the Faculty, and the Provost. Any responses will become part of the material which the Provost will use for his or her recommendation and report. Should the candidate wish to respond to any of these reports and recommendations, he or she may do so in writing to all of the appropriate entities in the process. [deleted—incorporated elsewhere]

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 send 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, 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. **For all other promotion decisions, the recommendation is made at the May Board meeting.** **[deleted--moved with reorganization]**The decision of the Board is communicated to the candidate in writing **five business days after the meeting.** **[brought into step with current practice]** 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 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**

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 **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. [brought into accordance with current practice]** 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.

Section 6. Timeline

	Mid-Course Evaluation	Tenure & Promotion	Promotion to Professor
Dean notifies Candidate re: eligibility	April 15	April 15	April 15
Candidate notifies Dean re: intention CEC formed	May 15	May 15	May 15
CEC chair notifies Dean, candidate, and FEC of CEC make up	June 1	June 1	June 1
Candidate electronically submits materials to CEC members, Dean, and FEC members	December 15	July 1	July 1
CEC submits letter to candidate, Dean, and FEC Chair	February 15	October 1	November 1
Dean submits letter to candidate, CEC Chair, and FEC Chair	At least one week before Candidate's FEC meeting	At least one week before Candidate's FEC meeting	At least one week before Candidate's FEC meeting
FEC submits letter to candidate, CEC Chair, and Dean	May 15	December 15	April 1
FEC submits letter to Provost	N/A	December 15	April 1

ATTACHMENT 2

General Education Courses, Transfer Credit, and Maymester

Rationale

In the last several years the number of credits students have earned outside of Rollins College has increased exponentially. New students bring in many credits through dual-enrolled high school courses, IB, AP and others. Once students matriculate, many will take courses from other institutions during the summer, especially to fulfill general education requirements. While students give a variety of reasons for taking these external courses, many will admit that they take them elsewhere because they believe the courses will be easier. The Academic Affairs Committee has studied this problem over the past several years and has concluded that this trend is damaging in several ways. In the first place, students likely take courses to fulfill their general education requirements that do not come up to our standards of quality and rigor. Moreover, the college loses revenue when these students graduate early. Another trend is the increasing number of students who graduate in 3½ years. The following proposals are designed to address these issues. The first modification would require graduating students to complete half of their total credits at Rollins College. The establishment of Maymester will facilitate this process by offering general education courses in the summer at Rollins. Since not all general education courses such as language and laboratory science are suitable for a very short semester, this proposal would also open up the Holt six-week semester for these courses.

Motions

1. Resolved: The residency requirement for students receiving a Rollins degree shall be one-half of the credits required for graduation. These credits must be earned in the College of Arts and Sciences or affiliated Rollins programs.
2. Resolved: That the College of Arts and Sciences establish a four-week semester to be called Maymester. The four-week session will normally offer only courses fulfilling general education requirements. Faculty members may petition the AAC to include courses other than those fulfilling general education requirements based on institutional needs. The six-week sessions through the Hamilton Holt School will offer courses not appropriate for the four-week semester such as language and laboratory science courses. Students may take only one course in the four-week semester, although students may petition the Academic Appeals Committee for a waiver to take a second course.