

3-17-2011

Minutes, Arts and Sciences Executive Committee Meeting, Thursday, March 17, 2011

Arts and Sciences Executive Committee

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

Recommended Citation

Arts and Sciences Executive Committee, "Minutes, Arts and Sciences Executive Committee Meeting, Thursday, March 17, 2011" (2011). *Executive Committee Minutes*. Paper 41.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ec/41

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.

**Approved Minutes
Executive Committee
March 17, 2011**

Members Present: Rick Foglesong, William Boles, Claire Strom, Nick Horsmon, Joan Davison, Laurie Joyner

Guests: Don Davison, Ilan Alon, Cecilia McInnis Bowers, Sharon Agee

- I. Call to order—the meeting was called to order at 12:37 PM.
- II. Approval of Minutes—The Executive Committee approved the minutes of February 3, 2011.
- III. New Business
 - A. Bylaw changes from Professional Standards regarding promotion, tenure, and reappointment evaluations – Strom introduces the substantive changes. (See Attachment 1.) Strom requests the faculty discuss and vote on each change independently. EC concurs. The first change rephrases the sentence to “reappointments occur annually after the initial appointment” to conform to practice. Likewise, the second amendment brings language into conformity with practice, adding the role of FEC for promotions to associate. Strom explains the third proposed amendment generated debate within PSC. The amendment makes the PTR more substantive than in the past, and places emphasis on the use of sabbaticals for ongoing work and development. Strom notes PSC changed the PTR by adding into the bylaws the language from the faculty handbook. This language also specifies PTR should include supporting documents. The fourth change addresses outside letters, which currently are provided at the discretion of the candidate. Strom says PSC is concerned the process is not normalized. Additionally the dates associated with the current process provide very limited time for an outside evaluator to submit a letter. Strom explains the change designates that the chair of the CEC requests the letter. Joyner responds that she believes the process should be consistent at the college wide level, and states that peer and aspirant institutions have processes of outside review. Joyner also argues it is desirable to have standardization of the process across departments. Strom concurs but notes disagreement still exists on this issue within PSC. Strom introduces the fifth amendment as a change from FEC. FEC desires to have a mechanism to increase its membership when more than 18 people are scheduled for midcourse, tenure and promotion. FEC suggests an increase of one committee member for every three people beyond 18 who must be evaluated. Joyner questions whether we are likely to have large groups of candidates in coming years. Foglesong asks that Wellman try to determine the number of candidates in upcoming years. Davison expresses concern regarding consistency of FEC if too many members rotate on the body. Strom states she intends to ask Ouellette to

present this amendment on behalf of FEC. Strom then introduces the sixth amendment which eliminates the appeals committee as redundant with the all faculty appeals committee. Davison questions the elimination of the A&S committee and expresses concern that Crummer faculty then will hear appeals from A&S faculty members regarding promotion and tenure. Strom moves to send the bylaw changes to the faculty, Boles seconds and the resolution passes.

- B. FEC slate – Foglesong reports Ouellette and Lauer’s terms on FEC expire and EC must provide a slate to replace them. (See Attachment 2.) He notes that Rick Vitray requested to complete his term on FEC, and this request was accepted. EC agrees to ask Jennifer Cavanaugh to serve on FEC, and if she declines then ask Cecilia McInnis Bowers.
- C. Internationalization Committee slate – Foglesong explains that the Internationalization Committee, in response to faculty concerns, is seeking to create a slate to have its work sanctified. (See Attachment 3.) Davison asks for clarification of the purpose of the slate, and specifically whether EC is accepting the committee’s nominees, or if EC is taking an election to the faculty. Davison suggests it seems appropriate to take to the faculty a competitive election given the desire of faculty at last year’s colloquium to have better representation on the committee. I. Alon explains the committee did not receive much interest when Edge sought candidates, but the committee tried to present a fair slate. Foglesong suggests Alon and Voicu continue on the committee and EC take to the faculty a set of nominees for election with the possibility of additional nominees from the floor. Foglesong recommends the ballots consist of Decker against Prieto-Calixto, Greenberg against Vander Poppen, and Reich against Rogers. Strom moves EC take to the faculty these ballots with the possibility of floor nominations. Horsmon seconds the motion, and it passes.
- D. Advice to Student Affairs Articulation Committee – Foglesong raises the question of what to do with the report. (See Attachment 4.) Foglesong explains he discussed the issue with Neilson who believes the committee’s work is finished and the issue is moot.
- E. Faculty compensation plan for 2010-11 – Foglesong introduces the proposal from Duncan and asks, “How do we respond?” Foglesong suggests the possibilities of a committee of the whole discussion, a colloquium for the faculty, or a recommendation from the budget committee. Davison states another possibility is that EC recommends Duncan’s proposal as a resolution to the faculty. Boles moves and Davison seconds, “The faculty supports President Duncan’s proposal to give every faculty member a fixed sum payment that becomes part of their base salary in 2011-2012, with the remaining funds in the salary pool for that year placed into escrow for use in a merit allocation in a subsequent year.” The motion carries.
- F. Joe Siry’s resolution – (See Attachment 5.) Foglesong explains Siry wishes to introduce a resolution to support the Hope Community Center in Apopka. Discussion occurs whether such support again takes the faculty into public policy issues. Foglesong argues the decision does not ask government to pass

any laws. Davison notes the issue only asks the Rollins community to recognize the Hope Community Center. There is no appeal to the external community. EC agrees to take the issue to the faculty for a vote.

- G. Proposal for honorary degrees for deceased students – Foglesong explains this issue arose from I. Alon who wishes to honor Mike Kronstadt with a degree, and generally supports honorary degrees for deceased students. Strom suggests there is a need for a general policy which applies to all students. Boles notes the policy might include minimum standards for good academic and social standing. Horsmon concurs. Davison inquires whether students would need to have completed a minimum number of hours, perhaps 70, or 80 or 100. Joyner notes that the dean of faculty office already collected benchmark data on policies at other schools that typically include factors such as the student being in good academic and social standing and having completed a minimum number of hours. Joyner suggests EC contact Toni Holbrook to access this data to inform their efforts in developing such a policy. Joyner concludes that the faculty might develop a policy but the Board of Trustees approves honorary degrees, not the faculty. Strom emphasizes that it is necessary to develop a policy which addresses all students. Boles responds that SLC should be able to complete a policy before the next EC meeting. Strom moves “the Student Life Committee will develop a policy on deceased students and return the policy to EC.” Davison seconds and the motion passes.
- H. Information regarding March 18 Phi Beta Kappa meeting – D Davison explains the Phi Beta Kappa visitation team will meet with the EC faculty members and SGA president to discuss issues of governance, major issues affecting the college, the general relationship between faculty and the administration, and faculty views of administrative leadership.
- I. Agenda for 3/24 faculty meeting – Foglesong suggests EC begins elections at the start of the meeting and continue throughout the duration. Boles suggests ballots be placed upon chairs to eliminate the distribution time. Foglesong and EC agrees upon the agenda for the remainder of new business: AAC issues of prematriculation programs and the N requirement, PSC bylaw changes, the FEC slate, the faculty compensation proposal, and the Hope Community Center resolution.

V. Adjournment—The meeting was adjourned at 1:56pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Joan Davison
Vice President/Secretary

Attachment 1

Bylaw Changes

1. Part A, Section 2, Reappointments

Rephrase sentence from “Reappointments normally occur annually after the third appointment” to read “Reappointments normally occur annually after the **initial** appointment” to make sense.

2. Part B, Section 3, Specific Criteria, Promotion to Associate Professor

Add FEC to following sentence to accord with current practice. “If the CEC, **the FEC**, and the appropriate Dean believe that the individual's contribution to the College, professional growth, and potential warrant promotion, then upon their recommendations and the concurrence of the Provost, the promotion may be granted by the President.”

3. Part D. Post-tenure Evaluations

Change the language for post-tenure evaluation to mirror handbook language. Reiterate idea that sabbatical is for ongoing faculty development. “The faculty member creates a professional assessment statement called the Faculty Development Plan, **which outlines the faculty's goals, such as research, writing, performance, artistic creation, or teaching elsewhere, for her/his sabbatical. This assessment statement, with supporting documents, such as syllabi, student evaluations, and previous scholarly work,** goes to the members of the CEC to review by January 1.”

4. Part E. Procedures for Mid-course, Tenure, and Promotion, Section 1, Candidate Evaluation Committee, b. Collection of Material

Change and standardize process for collecting outside letters if required. . **“The CEC may recruit evaluations of the candidate's scholarship from experts at other institutions. The guidelines for this should be clearly stated in the department's promotion and tenure criteria. All solicited letters from outside evaluators should be forwarded to the FEC and the appropriate Dean with the CEC's letter.”**

Two points are addressed:

1. Currently candidates can request outside evaluations if they wish. This should be a departmental policy—one way or the other.

2. Currently the candidate has to request outside evaluation by June 15. According to current FEC practice, the candidate is responsible for submitting the final evaluation letters in her/his portfolio, due July 1. This does not give outside evaluators sufficient time to review candidate's materials and write letters

5. Part E. Procedures for Mid-course, Tenure, and Promotion, Section 2, Faculty Evaluation Committee, b. Composition

Change composition of FEC to address problem that committee has had the last few years with too many portfolios to review. "When the number of candidates that the FEC must consider for tenure, promotion, or mid-course evaluation exceeds eighteen, the number of members of the committee, whenever possible, will be increased by one for every three additional candidates. Additional members of the FEC will be tenured, full professors, selected and ratified in the manner outlined above. They will serve as full members of the FEC for one year."

6. Part F. Appeals

Deleted appeals committee because parallel structure in All-College Bylaws and that appeals committee exists and is functioning. Having two committees that can both address appeals regarding PTE is confusing and potentially opens the college to litigation. The All-College committee language is below.

ARTICLE VI

FACULTY APPEALS COMMITTEE

Section 1. Membership and Terms of Office

The Faculty Appeals Committee shall consist of three tenured faculty members, one from the Crummer Graduate School who shall be elected by the Crummer faculty, and two from Arts and Sciences, who shall be elected by the Arts and Sciences faculty. Committee members shall serve staggered terms of three years. Three alternates (one from the Crummer faculty and two from the Arts and Sciences faculty) shall be elected for the same terms. Members of the committee may not participate in committee deliberations or actions in cases dealing with their own individual appeals, nor may they participate in committee actions or deliberations in appeal cases in which they participated as members of an evaluation committee. Members of the committee may not participate in committee deliberations or actions in grievance cases in which they are either petitioners or named in the grievance. In such circumstances, the member shall be replaced by a corresponding alternate.

Section 2.1 Duties and Responsibilities in Appeals Cases

The committee hears the appeals of candidates for tenure and/or promotion with regard to the recommendation of the respective evaluation committee or with regard to the recommendation of

the Provost. The Appeals Committee initially reviews all requests for appeal to determine sufficient cause. If the committee so determines, the case is reviewed.

Section 2.2 Recommendations in Appeals Cases

After reviewing the case, the Appeals Committee makes a recommendation to the President either to uphold the original decision or to recommend a new evaluation.

Section 3. Duties and Responsibilities in Grievance Cases

If any faculty member alleges cause for grievance in any matter not covered by the procedures described in these bylaws or in pertinent AAUP policy documents, the faculty member may petition the Faculty Appeals Committee for redress. The petition will set forth in detail the nature of the grievance and will state against whom the grievance is directed. It will contain any factual data that the petitioner deems pertinent to the case. The committee will decide whether the facts merit a detailed investigation; if the faculty member succeeds in establishing a prima facie case, it is incumbent upon those named in the grievance to come forward with evidence in support of their position on the matter. Submission of a petition will not automatically entail investigation or detailed consideration thereof. The committee may seek to bring about a settlement of the issue that is satisfactory to the parties. If in the opinion of the committee such a settlement is not possible or appropriate, the committee will report its findings and recommendations to the petitioner and to the President or the Provost, and the petitioner will, upon request, be provided an opportunity to present the grievance to the administrator.

Attachment 2

From: Thomas Ouellette
Sent: Monday, March 14, 2011 11:59 AM
To: Dr. Richard E. Foglesong
Subject: Re: governance nominations

Thanks, Rick.

I spoke with Kathryn Norsworthy and she IS willing to serve on the FEC next year. Not sure how you want to handle this vis-a-vis Rick Vitray's year. Other candidates we think would be terrific: Lee Lines, Thom Moore, Tom Cook.

For balance: here's who's remaining: Eileen Gregory, Socky O'Sullivan, John Sinclair, and Kathryn. Stepping down: Carol Lauer and me.

Attachment 3

From: Hoyt Edge

Sent: Thursday, February 24, 2011 4:29 PM

To: Dr. Richard E. Foglesong

Subject: slate for International Studies Committee

Rick,

As we discussed, the new formula for membership on the International Studies Committee (allowing for there being no faculty member who is an Associate Provost) is for rotating terms for 4 A&S faculty, a Holt faculty, and a Crummer faculty (as well as Dean-level representatives from these schools). Given that so much of the committee work now concerns approval of Presidential applications, and institutional memory is vital in order to have consistency, we felt that two present members should assume the first rotating positions. The three new ones would have 3 year terms (unless you think that one of them should have a 2 year term, in which case it might be the Holt position since Rollins seems to be in transition vis-à-vis Holt).

We give you our recommended slate; in addition, we offer alternatives for 3 positions. I try to locate the faculty's interest and indicate why the committee was drawn to them. All of these people have indicated an interest in serving on the committee:

Anca Voicu – 1 year – a person born abroad bringing unique perspective, and having lots of experience on the committee

Ilan Alon – 2 years - he represents the China Center and our new initiatives in SE Asia, and also has lots of experience

Nancy Decker – 3 years; the alternate for this position would be Alberto Prieto-Calixto; both of these are concerned with both the languages as well as semester programs (Nancy has been more pro-active in pushing Rollins towards offering new languages that relate to new study abroad programs.

Yudit Greenberg – 3 years; the alternate for this position is Robert Vander Poppen; Yudit has taken students to several countries, and Rob is taking students to Italy over spring break (and he is a newer faculty member)

for Holt: Paul Reich - 2 or 3 years - while he was an undergraduate at Rollins, he was a student in Sydney, and he is a young faculty member, and we think we should have at least one new faculty member on the committee ; the alternate is Don Rogers in International Business who has had a long-term interest in other culture in his teaching.

Please let me know what slate the EC decides to present; I'd like to inform those who are on the slate and those who are not before the names are published.

Thanks,
Hoyt

Attachment 4

In light of the faculty's response to this report at our February meeting, the committee has asked for feedback from EC regarding how they might proceed.



Report of the Student Affairs Articulation Committee

December, 2010

In October 2009, the A&S Faculty adopted a motion to form a Student Affairs Articulation Committee. The charge of the committee was:

...to study the structural relationship of the Dean of Student Affairs Office to the rest of the institution, including the Holt School, the Dean of Faculty office, and the Crummer School. This task will entail answering the following questions: What is the mission of the DoSA Office? How do the mission and operations of the DoSA Office articulate with other College offices? and "Does Rollins have the optimal structure to support the educational mission of the College?" In addressing these questions, the Committee will (1) learn about what the DoSA Office does, (2) examine its articulation with other College offices, (3) conduct extensive conversations with the campus community (students, faculty, and staff) about perceived issues in this regard, and (4) examine alternative models for housing Student Affairs in a college such as ours. With the permission of the Executive Committee, the Committee may expand or contract the scope of its investigation. The Executive Committee seeks feedback from the Committee during the 2009-10 academic year. Therefore, the Committee will offer its findings and recommendations, even if tentative, by April 1, 2010.

The Committee met initially on April 2, 2010, making it clear that we would not meet the deadline set by the faculty. The Committee asked for, and subsequently received an extension until January 2011 and also requested that the membership be broadened. Before the conclusion of the spring term, the Committee defined a research agenda and this work was completed during the summer 2010.

The Committee met monthly through the fall term 2010. We studied the nature of student affairs work here and elsewhere in higher education. We reviewed best practices in the field, and studied organizational structures of over 30 institutions on the College's "Peer Institutions", "Benchmarking Institutions", and Associated College of the South lists. (Summary attached). We also had informal discussions with other faculty and staff.

The Committee makes the following observations and offers one recommendation:

Observation One: The mission of the division is clearly defined and was developed by a committee comprised of administrators, faculty, student affairs staff, and a student representative. The mission statement was ratified as follows by the faculty at its meeting on April 29, 2009:

“The Division of Student Affairs at Rollins College advances the mission of the College of Arts & Sciences by collaborating with the Faculty in creating and maintaining an environment that fosters intellectual, social, and personal learning and growth for our students.

Our vision is to foster and promote a healthy and caring environment that focuses on essential learning outcomes with an emphasis on personal and social responsibility.”

This mission is consistent with best practices in student affairs and reflects the scholarship and research within student affairs and academic affairs to create an integrated student learning centered institution. The division’s goals have largely been articulated and focused on student learning outcomes.

Observation Two: A review of 36 peer and aspirant institutions found only 3 institutions (including Rollins) that do not have the Chief Student Affairs Officer (CSAO) report to the President. Those three institutions have the CSAO report to the Provost. In two of those cases (Rhodes and Bucknell) the CSAO sits on a senior, President’s Leadership Cabinet and is involved in all decision making policies of the institution.

Recommendation: The Committee recommends that the CSAO of Rollins College, currently the Dean of Student Affairs, should report directly to the President. While it might be argued that the title of the position should also be changed to Vice President for Student Affairs, the Committee acknowledges this addresses a larger set of organizational structure issues that is under the purview of the President.

The Committee believes the change in reporting lines brings clarity not just to the position of Dean of Student Affairs but Provost (Vice President of Academic Affairs) as well. We recognize that this change may require a revision to the Student Affairs mission statement to reflect the involvement of other Rollins programs as being under the purview of student affairs.

Respectfully submitted,

The Student Affairs Articulation Committee:

Alice Davidson, Assistant Professor of Psychology, Member Student Life Committee
(10-12)

Larry Eng-Wilmot, Professor of Chemistry
 Lee Lines, Professor of Environmental Studies, Member Student Life Committee from (01-03) Chair Student Life Committee (02-03)
 Steve Neilson, Professor of Theatre, Special Assistant to the President
 Derrick Paladino, Assistant Professor of Counseling, Member Student Life Committee (08-10)
 Jennifer Queen, Associate Professor of Psychology, Member Student Life Committee (05-09)
 Brent Turner, Director of Student Involvement and Leadership and the Cornell Campus Center

Senior Student Officer Comparison on Title and Reporting Line

Associated Colleges of the South

Institution	Reporting	Title
Richmond	President	VP
University of the South	President	Dean
Rhodes	Provost (sits on President's Council)	Dean
Centenary	President	VP
Hendrix	President	VP
Centre	President	VP & Dean
Millsaps	President	VP & Dean
Southwestern	President	VP
Birmingham Southern	President	VP
Trinity	President	VP
Davidson	President	VP & Dean
Furman	President	VP
Washington and Lee	President	VP & Dean
Rollins	Provost	Dean

Peer Institutions

Institution	Reporting	Title
Colorado College	President	VP & Dean
Elon University	President	VP & Dean
Furman University	President	VP
Gettysburg College	President	Dean & VP

Rhodes College	President	Dean
Southwestern University	President	VP
Stetson University	President	VP & Dean
Trinity University	President	VP
University of the South	President	Dean
Villanova University	President	VP
Willamette University	President	Dean

Benchmarking Institutions

Institution	Reporting	Title
Bowdoin College	President	Dean
Bucknell University	Provost (sits on President's Council)	Dean
Carleton College	President	Dean
Colby College	President	Dean
Colgate University	President	VP
Davidson College	President	VP & Dean
Macalester College	President	VP
Middlebury College	President	Dean
Oberlin College	President	Dean
University of Richmond	President	VP
Washington and Lee	President	VP & Dean

Attachment 5

From: Dr. Joe Siry

Sent: Thursday, February 24, 2011 12:01 PM

To: Dr. Joan D. Davison; Debra Wellman

Cc: Mahjabeen Rafiuddin; Margaret McLaren; Rachel Newcomb; Gay Biery-Hamilton; Udeth Lugo

Subject: A resolution I would like considered for the faculty to support

Dear Joan:

As vice president of the faculty I would like you to work with me to promote the following faculty resolution:

Whereas the Hope Community Center in the Apopka Community is celebrating its 40th Anniversary this year 2011, and

Whereas nearly one fourth of the Rollins faculty have engaged in effective support of the Hope Community Center's efforts to alleviate the social, economic, spiritual and multicultural burdens of the disadvantaged population it serves

Be it resolved that the Rollins College Faculty declares April 7 as Hope Community Center Day at Rollins College.

Be it further resolved that the faculty urges the faculty and staff of the College to attend a reception at the lakeside of the Cornell Fine Arts Museum at 4PM Thursday April 7, or join the procession to Bush Auditorium at 6PM, or to attend the evening of performances at Bush Auditorium that same evening.