

10-7-2010

## Minutes, Arts and Sciences Executive Committee Meeting, Thursday, October 7, 2010

Arts and Sciences Executive Committee

Follow this and additional works at: [http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as\\_ec](http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ec)

---

### Recommended Citation

Arts and Sciences Executive Committee, "Minutes, Arts and Sciences Executive Committee Meeting, Thursday, October 7, 2010" (2010). *Executive Committee Minutes*. Paper 46.  
[http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as\\_ec/46](http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ec/46)

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).

**Approved Minutes  
Executive Committee  
October 7, 2010**

Members Present: Rick Foglesong, William Boles, Sue Easton, Barry Levis, Claire Strom, Nick Horsmon, Lewis Duncan, Deb Wellman, Joan Davison,

- I. Call to order—the meeting was called to order at 12:34 PM.
- II. Approval of Minutes—the minutes of the September 16, 2010 executive committee meeting were approved.
- III. Reports
  - A. Provost Search – Duncan explains the faculty members elected to the search committee all are senior faculty members so he now will now ask junior faculty members to serve. He has generated a list of potential junior members and hopes to appoint two or three to the committee. He also intends to include a Crummer faculty member and two or three staff members as well as a senior administrator so as to provide continuity with the selection committee. Duncan states the ad is prepared for the search committee to review when it is convened. He notes Witt Kieffer will serve as the search firm to help vet and bring to campus candidates. Alice Miller will visit campus on behalf of Witt Kieffer and bring with her another consultant, Katherine Will, the recently retired president of Gettysburg College who is familiar with small liberal arts colleges. Duncan concludes he is undecided how many people to include from student affairs and whether direct reports to the provost should serve on the committee.
- IV. Old Business – none
- V. New Business
  - A. Amendments for FEC – Strom introduces amendments to the bylaws from PSC on behalf of FEC. (See appendix 1). FEC seeks the revision of Article VIII D 6 to increase the membership of FEC as necessary so each member of FEC serves as liaison for a maximum of three cases. Strom notes these recommendations originated with Newman and FEC last spring. The second amendment clarifies that FEC meetings are closed except to invited participants. The third amendment responds to the problem that some departments have not updated their criteria for tenure and promotion for ten years, and requires departments to review criteria every five years on a regular cycle. Foglesong inquires about the first proposal and asks Wellman if the number of cases this year is atypical. Wellman responds the faculty is getting larger and the last two years are atypical with 21 cases this year and 23 cases two years ago. Foglesong suggests EC needs a projection of future numbers of cases before EC before considering this proposal particularly given that such a

proposal could create uneven situations of review for candidates within a single year and complicates how the faculty would vote for FEC members (that is some FEC members would serve a single year while others serve multiple years). Davison asks whether it is possible to think of other ways in which to deal with the case pressure rather than simply increasing the size of FEC. She recognizes there might be a legal issue but wonders if there could be a second committee, perhaps of tenured, but not necessarily full, professors who conduct the mid-course reviews. Wellman responds the mid-course is the most important review because deficiencies must be very well laid out. Strom notes PSC thought it might be reasonable for each FEC member to handle more than 3 cases a year, but FEC believes more than 3 cases a year is burdensome. Wellman says FEC's argument is that everyone on the committee participates in the case review and writing of the letter. Levis states he believes serious concerns regarding the amendment have been expressed and these concerns should be considered. Strom answers she can take the bylaw change back to the committee with the concerns and questions. Strom adds there also exists the practical issue that it is hard to find people to serve on committees and if the membership on FEC increases, then the task of staffing the committee will become more difficult. Wellman notes increasing the size of the committee also will require more releases when she is looking for ways to cut releases. Foglesong reminds EC that members of FEC receive one release per year. Duncan states faculty members in part have a 3-3 load because service and research are expected; in the case of FEC the members then receive a release because it is recognized FEC is more time consuming than some other service assignments. Levis states the chairs of some standing committees handle substantial work without a release. Strom again suggests taking the amendment back to FEC and to ask FEC to explain how the work they are required to do on the committee exceeds the time required to teach a course. Foglesong asks for FEC also to address the problem of implementation of the bylaw given the different term lengths of members based upon the variation of cases across years. Davison moves, and Strom seconds "to table the motion and ask FEC to respond to the identified questions and concerns including: number of cases, time demand of case load, procedural problem of elections and procedural problem of potentially uneven committees." The motion unanimously passes. Strom explains the next amendment deals with confidentiality, and that FEC, in response to the transparency agenda, only wants people at its meeting whom they invite. Foglesong clarifies that he believes the transparency agenda already allows for this exception. Davison moves and Easton seconds, "to send the bylaw change dealing with the confidentiality of FEC to the faculty for a vote." The motion unanimously passes. Strom introduces the last amendment and reports this change responds to a concern brought to PSC by the Dean and Newman. They seek clout so departments update their criteria. Davison notes the bylaws already require a review every five years and it seems inappropriate to clutter the bylaws with legislative actions or procedures. Easton concurs. Levis notes the Dean already has the power to withhold new lines if departments fail to

review criteria. Wellman responds the Dean wants faculty support. Davison reiterates the bylaws already contain a provision for regular review and the Dean should use the existing power rather than expecting further enforcement by the faculty. Davison moves and Easton seconds “to send the bylaw change back to FEC for an explanation as to why the procedure should be in the bylaws instead of in the handbook, and as to why such a procedure is necessary, rather than the Dean using existing clout to withhold lines.” The motion unanimously passes.

B. Faculty Feedback to Administrators - (See Appendix 2.) Strom announces PSC will begin the process of feedback with Duncan and Hater.

C. Valedictorian Selection- Levis introduces a proposal from AAC to change the method by which the valedictorian is selected. (See Appendix 3.) The consideration for a change began due to students’ concerns that last year’s valedictorian transferred a significant number of hours. Levis explains the new selection proposal follows the Holt model whereby selection is based not only on grades, but also service to the college and community. The changed process invites students on target to graduate summa cum laude to apply to be valedictorian. They will submit three letters of recommendation, and AAC with the Dean of Student affairs and Director of Community Engagement will select the valedictorian. Levis notes the term valedictorian was debated but ultimately accepted as opposed to distinguished graduate. AAC believes distinguished graduate insufficiently recognizes the academic achievement. Duncan notes he is pleased that public speaking also is emphasized. Duncan reminds EC that the mission is about global citizenship and responsible leadership, not necessarily service. Davison asks Horsmon if SGA supports the proposal and he responds yes. Levis answers Duncan that service is broadly understood to include student research, but at the same time refers only to service while at Rollins. Foglesong expresses worry that the selection could become too subjective and too personal; he says liberal faculty members might favor politically correct services. He further notes that Rollins already recognizes service at graduation with other awards. Duncan comments that the request to reconsider the valedictorian selection was not about service, but whether we have the correct criteria, and whether the valedictorian should complete a minimum number of hours at Rollins. Levis answers most of our peer and aspirant institutions do not list a minimum number of credit for the valedictorian. Foglesong says the notion of considering students with GPAs over 3.9 is a method to break ties for people with high GPAs where some students feel concern that other students take difficult general education courses at Valencia or transfer in a large number of courses which then are not factored into the GPA. Davison expresses concern regarding the role of the Director of Community Engagement in the selection. She states this office probably preferences certain types of service. Additionally Davison contends the selection of the valedictorian, like the approval of the graduates, should be a faculty task. She worries that the process will become too personal if a few

students on AAC participate in the process. Duncan suggests sending the change in selection procedure back to AAC for consideration of the concerns, especially the role of students, the Director of Community Engagement and the Dean of Student Affairs in the selection process. He states that perhaps the faculty representatives of AAC should select the valedictorian. Horsmon asks about the time of implementation for the change. Levis answers AAC hopes to implement the change this year. Wellman says the student handbook does not give directions on the selection of the valedictorian so the change is not an issue in that respect. Boles wonders if students will want to apply to be valedictorian. He also asks if the desire to change the selection process is really about the popularity of the recent valedictorian. Davison moves and Strom seconds “to return the issue to AAC for consideration of the role of students, the Director of Community Engagement and the Dean of Student Affairs in the selection process and the specification of the broad understanding of service relative to the mission.” EC votes to pass the motion; Levis opposes.

D. Budget Issues- Easton notes that F&S is looking at the financial impact of course releases rather than a 3-2, and asks Levis about AAC’s work on a 3-2 proposal. Levis responds Simmons chairs this subcommittee which looks at curricular review and other work. Easton reiterates F&S’s commitment to facilitate communication of budget issues with campus constituents and inquires about approaches for soliciting staff and faculty members questions prior to discussions on the budget. She distributes a chart which F&S believes is important that highlights the gap between acceptances and enrollment. Davison suggests part of the growing gap is attributable to the adoption of the common app. Duncan states he asked Erdmann to consider the ratio of early acceptances to enrollment. Duncan also notes the challenge next year of replacing 525 graduating seniors. Duncan explains he believes the faculty is critical when accepted students visit campus. Duncan says upcoming presentations regarding the issue will be made to the trustees including an interactive presentation with various assumptions. Foglesong responds he believes the faculty would find that presentation interesting.

VI. Adjournment—The meeting adjourns at 1:52pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Joan Davison  
Vice President/Secretary

**Appendix 1**

## **PSC Proposal for Bylaw Changes**

### Article VIII D 6

#### **Section 6. Faculty Evaluation Committee Structure and Evaluation**

The Faculty Evaluation Committee consists of five tenured faculty members each with the rank of Professor serving staggered terms of three years, and one alternate (serving a term of one year), to serve when a regular member is excused from an evaluation. These faculty members are appointed by the Executive Committee, with some consideration given to academic diversity, and ratified by the faculty. Members of the Faculty Evaluation Committee receive one course-released time every year they serve on the committee.

When the number of candidates that the Faculty Evaluation Committee must consider for tenure, promotion, or mid-course evaluation exceeds three times the number of members of the committee, whenever possible the size of the FEC will be increased to ensure that the number of candidates being considered is less than or equal to three times the number of members. Additional members of the FEC will be selected and ratified in the normal manner, preferably at the same time as the other members, will be fully qualified under the guidelines of this section, and will be full members of the FEC for the year of service.

Access to Information. The Faculty Evaluation Committee 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 Faculty Evaluation Committee to introduce additional information that might not have been included by the Candidate Evaluation Committee or the appropriate Dean. The Faculty Evaluation Committee 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.

Review by the Faculty Evaluation Committee. The Faculty Evaluation Committee 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 Department Evaluation Committee, 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, 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 Committee has obtained in the exercise of its duties. The Committee may also consult with the Candidate Evaluation Committee, the appropriate Dean, or any other member of the community.

Meetings of the Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) must be confidential, regardless of subject matter under consideration, and may be attended only by the duly appointed members of the FEC. Provided, however, candidates for tenure, promotion, and mid

course reviews shall attend meetings in which said candidates are scheduled for FEC interviews or at such other times at the request of the candidate or FEC. Other persons, may at the invitation of the FEC and who are otherwise permitted to be consulted by the FEC in these by laws, may attend meetings of the FEC to which they are invited, including, but not limited to the Chair of the Candidate Evaluation Committee (CEC), administrators of the college and outside consultants. This by law supersedes all other by laws or faculty handbook rules which may be contrary.

The Faculty Evaluation Committee cannot challenge substantive requirements of a department for tenure or promotion that has approved criteria. The Faculty Evaluation Committee will require the evaluation from the Candidate Evaluation Committee to adhere to its approved criteria, both procedural and substantive.

## VIII B 2

### **Section 2. Departmental Criteria**

Each department, with the concurrence of the Faculty Evaluation Committee, shall determine how the above criteria shall be defined and applied for faculty evaluations in particular academic disciplines, providing to the FEC explicit standards for teaching, scholarship, and service for tenure and promotion to Associate Professor and Professor, including standards specific to the discipline. The department shall provide a rationale in support of their standards. **The respective Chairs of all of the departments of the College of Arts and Sciences have executed a document dated August, 2009 in which they have acknowledged the next immediate academic year in which their respective department is required to review and submit its Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to the Dean of the Faculty and the FEC. The dates provided in that document must govern. Thereafter the department Chairs of each respective department of the College of Arts and Sciences must review and submit its criteria for Tenure and Promotion every five years, or prior to that time at the discretion of the departments.** The department must reevaluate and resubmit these criteria to the FEC every five years, or earlier if the criteria have been revised. Any department with a candidate for tenure will use the set of criteria in effect at the time of the candidate's hiring, unless the candidate chooses to use the most recent criteria at the time they take effect. In all other cases, the set of criteria in effect three years prior to the candidate's evaluation will be used, unless the candidate chooses to use the most recent criteria at the time they take effect.

## **Appendix 2**

### **Guiding Principles for Faculty Feedback to Administrators**

#### **Purpose**

To develop a system that provides for a regular and candid flow of information between the faculty and administrators concerning the perception of each administrator's performance in the aspects of the position that affect the faculty. This system is primarily intended to provide constructive feedback that the administrators can reflect upon and respond to, with the ultimate goal of improving the effectiveness of the administration and their relationship with the faculty.

### **Goals**

The goal of the system is to provide a method for administrators to receive feedback directly from the faculty at large and for the faculty to have some method to inform administrators of their opinions on administrative performance on matters directly relating to their interaction with the faculty. These matters may include such things as the educational process and program; student life issues; issues pertaining to salaries, promotion and tenure; and issues concerning the interaction between the administration and the faculty. This mechanism will also provide an opportunity for the administrators to identify concerns of the faculty, and then to reflect on and respond to these concerns.

### **Guiding Assumptions**

- 1) The process will be undertaken in a spirit of collegiality, with the intention of assisting in the professional development of the administrator and improving communication between the faculty and administration.
- 2) The mechanism will include feedback from the entire faculty.
- 3) A questionnaire format will be used and the questions will be developed in a spirit of cooperation between the faculty and administrators.
- 4) The administrator will be provided the opportunity to write a brief self-assessment that will accompany the questionnaire.
- 5) The individual and his or her supervisory chain will be provided access to all of the comments submitted by the faculty.
- 6) Research indicates that the maximum benefit from a system such as this occurs only when there is some formal response from the person receiving the feedback. Therefore, it is expected that the administrator will respond to the faculty, either orally or in writing, after reviewing the comments.
- 7) The feedback mechanism will be a biennial event that will not necessarily be linked to the period of evaluation.

### **Process**

The process will eventually include all appropriate administrators; however, the initial effort will be to implement a program that includes the President, Provost, Dean of the Faculty, and Dean of Student Affairs. The feedback process will occur on a continuing two-year cycle beginning with the Dean of the Faculty and Dean of Student Affairs during the 2010-11 academic year.

The method for feedback will be a survey conducted on-line anonymously and all faculty will be asked to participate. The questions should be phrased in such a way as to



encourage both specific and general comments. There will be a two-week window in which faculty will be able to respond.

Once all faculty have had an opportunity to respond, the collected responses will be provided to the administrator and his or her supervisory chain. The administrator will then be expected to respond to the feedback within a reasonable time frame.

The Professional Standards Committee will review this policy two-years after the process begins and will report to the faculty on the effectiveness of the process and any proposed changes.

## **APPENDIX 3**

### **Proposal for New Selection Process for the College of Arts and Sciences Valedictorian**

Each year the Arts and Sciences faculty will select a valedictorian who will be recognized at graduation and give the commencement address. Selection of the students will be based on a combination of GPA and service to the college and the community. The student selected will embody the ideals of the Rollins College mission statement: he or she will exhibit the qualities of a global citizen and responsible leader as well as maintaining the highest level of academic achievement.

#### **Selection Process:**

The Office of Student Records will provide a list of the students eligible to graduate *Summa Cum Laude* at the end of the fall semester before they will graduate to the Dean of Student Affairs. The Dean will then invite each student to submit an application to be considered for the position of Valedictorian. The student will complete a form in which he or she will explain his academic achievements, his/her contributions to the Rollins College and his/her involvement to the local or world community. The student will also obtain two letters of recommendation from faculty and one letter from an individual familiar with the student's service. All referees should be asked to comment on the student's ability to make a public address.

The selection committee will consist of the members of the Academic Affairs Committee, the Dean of Student Affairs, and the director of the Office of Community Engagement. The committee will initially devise a rubric for the selection process. The committee will then review the students who completed the application process, measuring them against the rubric. In addition to academic achievement and service, the committee should also weigh the individual's ability to make a public address. The committee at its discretion may be asked either all of the applicants or selected finalists for a personal interview. Once the committee has made its selection, they will notify the successful student who will begin the process of composing the commencement address.





