

10-22-2009

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Faculty Meeting, Thursday, Oct. 22, 2009

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, Oct. 22, 2009" (2009). *College of Arts and Sciences Faculty Minutes*. Paper 25.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_fac/25

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
Arts and Sciences Faculty Meeting
Thursday, October 22, 2009
12:30 – 1:45pm
Galloway Room

Members present: Barry Allen, Joshua Almond, Anna Alon, Gabriel Barreneche, Pedro Bernal, Erich Blossey, Bill Boles, Rick Bommelje, Sharon Carnahan, Daniel Chong, Ed Cohen, Gloria Cook, Tom Cook, Daniel Crozier, Denise Cummings, Mario D'Amato, Alice Davidson, Creston Davis, Don Davison, Joan Davison, Nancy Decker, Kimberly Dennis, Lewis Duncan, Hoyt Edge, Larry Eng-Wilmot, Marc Fetscherin, Richard Foglesong, Christopher Fuse, Laurel Goj, Kevin Gray, Yudit Greenberg, Mike Gunter, Fiona Harper, Paul Harris, Scott Hewit, John Houston, Gordie Howell, Richard James, Peg Jarnigan, Laurie Joyner, Sarah Kistler, Madeline Kovarik, Philip Kozel, Harry Kypraios, Tom Lairson, Carol Lauer, Barry Levis, Richard Lewin, Lee Lines, Julia Maskivker, Dorothy Mays, Edna McClellan, Margaret McLaren, Jonathan Miller, Bob Moore, Thom Moore, Steve Neilson, Socky O'Sullivan, Rhonda Ovist, Twila Papay, Paul Reich, Charlie Rock, Dawn Roe, Ed Royce, Scott Rubarth, Suzanne Salinger, Judy Schmalstig, Rachel Simmons, Joseph Siry, Jim Small, Cynthia Snyder, Steven St.John, Bruce Stephenson, Paul Stephenson, Darren Stoub, Kathryn Sutherland, Bill Svitavsky, Mary Throumoulos, Lisa Tillmann, Patricia Tome, Giorgio Turri, Larry Van Sickle, Rick Vitray, Anca Voicu, Tonia Warnecke, Debra Wellman, Jay Yellen, Wenxian Zhang

Guest: Sharon Agee

- I. Call to Order - The meeting was called to order at 12:45 PM
- II. Approval of Minutes - The minutes of the September 24, 2009 meeting of the faculty were approved.
- III. Executive Committee Report: Foglesong explains the work of EC focused on the DoSA search and issue. EC constituted itself as the study committee and will address this issue later in the meeting. EC also received a Merit Pay report from the Merit Pay Assessment Committee with various recommendations and the report is found in the minutes of EC. AAC has worked on course approvals and in particular topic courses' transition to regular courses because topics course are limited to two offerings. AAC also turned to the Blended Learning issue and began the initial address of the question. AAC has a by-law change to bring to EC and then to the faculty. The bylaw codifies the existing practice of AAC's responsibility for the Holt curriculum. AAC also will review a proposal for a master's degree program in Civic Urbanism. Foglesong continues PSC is involved in questions about evaluation of the Provost with Duncan and is discussing how to participate in the Provost's evaluation. F&S focused on faculty presence on and participation with Board of Trustees. Separately Jon Fuller asked about faculty participation on the Board and Fuller subsequently did speak with the Board about whether formal or informal participation is desirable. Foglesong states the Transparency protocol continues and EC meetings are open and

visitors are invited. Foglesong notes unfortunately the progress on governance's use of blackboard is slow. Likewise Groupwise continues to be an issue which he hopes "soon sleeps with the fish." UCC (United Communications Committee) soon will survey about faculty preferences for a new e-mail platform. Foglesong then invites Casey to speak. Casey addresses the question of College policy on swine flu, H1N1. He says concern particularly is prompted by students request to SGA for clarity on attendance policies given swine flu. McLaren asks for a colloquium on swine flu attendance issue. Ovist states she is unwilling to eliminate her policy because students perceive this as three days off, and therefore she takes attendance and makes decisions on a case by case basis. Tillmann asks Casey about an appropriate cap on absences, and Casey encourages professional judgment. Foglesong states he now needs to move forward with the agenda which came through the governance system.

- IV. Old Business - Foglesong introduces the tabled motion from the last meeting which Lairson previously brought: "Merit Pay Assessment should be done by a new committee appointed by EC with a member from each of MPAC and FSC and three additional people from outside the process so we have a broader discussion, analysis, and assessment of what happened." Lairson states he now wishes to set aside the old motion and introduce a new motion. Lairson's motion to set aside the old motion passes. Lairson then introduces his new motion: "To create a 5-member committee consisting of one person from the original Faculty Salary Council, one member from the Merit Pay Appeals Committee, and three members selected to give balance to the committee in terms of gender and rank. The committee's meetings should be open. The charge of the committee is to assess the process used to award merit pay in 2009, including the criteria applied and the method of evaluation, and to make recommendations to the faculty, thorough EC and PSC, for making our system for awarding strategic compensation more effective, efficient and fair. The committee will begin work as soon as possible and complete their assessment by mid-February 2010. The committee members will be appointed by the EC and approved by vote of the faculty. They will report simultaneously to PSC and EC. In the course of their deliberations they will host at least one faculty colloquium." Lairson explains it is not a good idea to have the same committee which distributes merit pay to then evaluate the distribution. Yet he also believes some people with knowledge of the previous work on strategic pay should be on the committee – specifically members both from FSC and from MPAC. Carnahan states she currently is on FSC and asks how her role on that committee relates. She states she already is working on the merit pay issue. Lairson answers his proposal is to pre-empt that committee's work with regard to review of merit pay due to the fact division chairs come from a particular stratum of the faculty. Vitray asks how the new committee will be elected. Foglesong says EC will select and faculty will elect. Joyner responds the current FSC meets most of the terms with regard to representation and ranks. There are representatives from the former FSC and from MPAC. There are chairs, full professors, and associate professors. There is gender balance. Joyner also notes that most of the members of this year's FSC are new so the same committee which awarded merit pay is not assessing its awards; "the committee awards merit and reviews the process, but the people on the committee who are evaluating last year's process primarily are new to

the committee.” Kypraios emphasizes the need for broad divisional representation on the committee and expresses worry the current proposal could make the divisional representation narrower than FSC’s membership. Lairson responds he is concerned about the non-participation of assistant professors. Blossy states “FSC reviewing the process is like the fox guarding the hen house with FSC both awarding merit and setting the criteria.” Lauer states there is a problem with the FSC as it now exists because two members are from English. Valiante suggests we do not trust people to make decisions in the best interest of the faculty and instead assume they independently act to further own interest. He encourages trusts. Schmalstig states she is unclear who does make the decision about merit pay. Joyner says perhaps could have disagreements from members of FSC with her recommendations, but decisions are jointly made. Lines asserts he hopes to see untenured on the committee and hopes they provide their perspective. Vitray emphasizes the importance of a broadly based divisional committee because of divisional differences. Cohen asks Lairson for clarification on who can participate from FSC on the newly proposed committee – is the FSC representative to be from last year’s or the current FSC? Lairson states he sees his proposal as pro-merit pay and prefers last year’s FSC representation. Rubarth agrees it is a good point about the need for a divisional representative and perhaps need a friendly amendment to add divisional representation. Harris suggests a change in the motion with four additional people on the committee, each representing a division. Harris introduces an amendment so the motion now reads: “To create a 6-member committee consisting of one person from the original Faculty Salary Council, one member from the Merit Pay Appeals Committee, and four members selected to give balance to the committee in terms of division, gender and rank. The committee’s meetings should be open. The charge of the committee is to assess the process used to award merit pay in 2009, including the criteria applied and the method of evaluation, and to make recommendations to the faculty, thorough EC and PSC, for making our system for awarding strategic compensation more effective, efficient and fair. The committee will begin work as soon as possible and complete their assessment by mid-February 2010. The committee members will be appointed by the EC and approved by vote of the faculty. They will report simultaneously to PSC and EC. In the course of their deliberations they will host at least one faculty colloquium.” The amendment passes. Carnahan says now she is on FSC and working hard on issues and believes a mistake was made as she did not know the plan was for the committee to do both jobs; she believes the two jobs must be divorced. The question is called, and the motion passes.

- V. New Business – Foglesong explains the options as EC perceives them regarding the Dean of Student Affairs search and the committee to investigate relationships and restructuring of that office. Foglesong states as he indicated in his e-mail EC anticipates that discussion by a committee of the whole might facilitate our work. Foglesong explains the EC decided 6-1 to present three options to the faculty. EC also endorsed one option, option A. These options are:
- A. Appoint Karen Hater as Dean of Student Affairs (not interim) and create a committee to study the structural relationship of the DoSA office to the rest of the institution.” (EC recommends, 5-2 vote)

B. Appoint Karen Hater as a two-year interim dean and appoint a committee to study the structural relationship of the DoSA office to the rest of the institution.

C. Undertake a national search to fill the DoSA position and appoint a committee to study the structural relationship of the DoSA office to the rest of the institution.

Tillmann moves a committee of whole so as to not obstruct discussion. This passes.

Returning from the committee of whole Wellman say Hater as dean might enhance consideration of changes given her knowledge. Vitray says the issue requires more focus and direction. Foglesong asks for someone to move item A and it is moved and seconded. McLaren asks the motion to be set aside until the next meeting. Harris calls the question and is seconded. Item A passes 37 yes and 23 against.

VI. Adjournment - The meeting was adjourned at 1:51 pm.