

2-28-2008

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Faculty Meeting, Thursday, Feb. 28, 2008

Arts & Sciences Faculty

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

Recommended Citation

Arts & Sciences Faculty, "Minutes, Arts & Sciences Faculty Meeting, Thursday, Feb. 28, 2008" (2008). *College of Arts and Sciences Faculty Minutes*. Paper 55.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_fac/55

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, February 28, 2008

College of Arts & Sciences: Faculty Meeting Roster Feb. 28, 2008

Barry Allen, Mark Anderson, Gabriel Barreneche, Erich Blossey, Alexander Boguslawski, Bill Boles, Rick Bommelje, Dexter Boniface, Wendy Brandon, Sharon Carnahan, Roger Casey, Jennifer Cavanaugh, Ed Cohen, Tom Cook, Mario D'Amato, Creston Davis, Nancy Decker, Kimberly Dennis, James Eck, Marc Fetscherin, Richard Foglesong, Elise Friedland, Laurel Goj, Yudit Greenburg, Don Griffin, Mike Gunter, Dana Hargrove, Fiona Harper, Karen Hater, Scott Hewit, John Houston, Gordie Howell, Laurie Joyner, Steve Klemann, Madeline Kovarik, Tom Lairson, Ed LeRoy, Richard Lima, Lee Lines, Jonathan Miller, Al Moe, Thom Moore, Steve Neilson, Rachel Newcomb, Marvin Newman, Socky O'Sullivan, Thomas Ouellette, Twila Papay, Jennifer Queen, Emily Russell, Rachel Simmons, Jim Small, Steven St John, Paul Stephenson, Bruce Stephenson, Darren Stoub, Kathryn Sutherland, Bill Svitasky, Patricia Tome, Rick Vitray, Debra Wellman, Gary Williams, Wenxian Zhang

Guest: Maria Martinez, Toni Holbrook, Sharon Carrier, Sharon Agee,

- I. Call to Order -- Davison called the meeting to order at 12:42 PM

- II. Approval of Minutes – The minutes from the regular faculty of December 12, 2007 and the special faculty meeting of February 19, 2008 were approved as distributed.

- III. Announcements – Davison announced that the faculty party will be helped on April 5 on the patio of the Cornell Fine Arts Center. He asked faculty with their names beginning with A to M to bring an appetizer and N to Z a dessert. Faculty elections will take place at the March faculty meeting and Davison asked for volunteers to serve on committees. Finally the Executive Committee has asked the members of the original Merit Pay Task Force to continue to develop a plan for a merit system. The committee felt that the Task Force could move expeditiously because of their prior research. They have all agreed to serve and will begin the deliberation next Tuesday.

- IV. Old Business—none

- V. New Business

1. Academic Affairs Committee—Proposal on Course Credit (see attachment 1). Carnahan moved the proposal about staff teaching courses for academic credit. She yielded the floor to Thom Moore to present AAC proposal. He explained the process of how this proposal was developed. The AAC had determined that it was for the best interest of the college. He had presented the original proposal to the department chairs who made some recommendations, which the AAC approved unanimously. AAC has discussed the proposal at length. The proposal has been misrepresented by both faculty and staff members. He wanted to present a clear rationale. The current system is not fair to the staff teaching INT courses because support for teaching comes from departments. Staff must have faculty support to have these courses developed properly. The faculty is shirking its responsibilities by not supervising these extra curricular courses. The faculty has a responsibility to develop and assess these courses. Administrators have signed the course approval forms rather than department chairs. There are extra curricular courses going on that are just wrong. Students on AAC voted for the proposal unanimously. Carnahan said that AAC spent a good deal of time on the proposal and consulted with many staff members in order to make the proposal work. She urged the faculty to look at the second page that was distributed to see the full rationale for the proposal. Teachers of INT courses need to establish a relationship with the faculty. Some fear that leadership courses will disappear as a result of this proposal, but the faculty will work with staff to ensure the quality of these classes. They had adopted an integration model to bring these courses into the curriculum. It is not an effort to marginalize. Gunter pointed out the incredible offerings by staff members over the years. He thought that some of these courses should be required for graduation unlike his own courses. But he also thought this was an important turning point for the college. Are we going to become a true liberal arts college? Staff members do not have tenure and therefore do not have the protection that the faculty enjoys. He did not see this proposal as an effort to do away with INT courses but to strengthen the curriculum. Newcomb was not so sure that some courses will not be eliminated as a result of this change. She thought it might allow some faculty to push for limitations on these courses. Moore said that no one on AAC would assure that all of these courses would continue. But all new courses would need approval. The only thing they had to do to continue offering a course without linking to a department is to cut back from two to one credit. Moe expressed concern about the exceptions. Moore stated that internships have always been handled this way. They have been awarded academic credit but do not receive a grade. Only departmental internships are graded. Again credentials would be handled in the same way as before. Barreneche was

concerned that some INT courses will be knocked down to one credit. He thought they could be handled in the same way as RCC. Couldn't we do the same with leadership courses under dean and allow them to continue? Griffin argued that the faculty must have control of the curriculum. Without that there is no way to ensure quality. The process we go through to find individuals to teach depends on quality controls but then others don't go through the same process. This backdoor process is possible without any sort of quality control. We must divorce our considerations from individuals or courses and be concerned about quality. Decker asked how it was going to affect her courses. She encourages students to take German outside her classroom. She sees the improvement of language skills of students in international programs when they go overseas and when they return. That experience helps her with her work. She was also concerned about peer mentors and the exploration courses. Would they not get the same credit? She was concerned about tutor training at the Johnson Center. Would that discourage students from undertaking the training? Moore explained that RCC is an existing program and would not experience any change. Tutor training supervised by Karen Hater would experience some slight alterations. They would no longer receive graded credit. He did not foresee international programs as a problem either. Casey did have some concerns about moving quickly in the face of other changes coming along at this time. The curriculum is the work of the faculty but the college has a mission in leadership and citizenship. It is an applied liberal arts education committed to community engagement and applied learning. With massive curriculum reform under way, he was concerned about the structure to carry this work forward in a suitable manner. He did not want to marginalize these courses at this time. Foglesong saw two issues: who should teach a credit bearing course at Rollins and the question of community engagement. A task force for community engagement had studied this question in the 1999-2000 academic year. But with administration changes, a decision was made to take this program out of the faculty hands and place it into administration hands. Casey said that the program had been established through grants from the Surdna Foundation and David Lord's family. It had been established so that the faculty would be engaged and deeply engaged. Many courses have been faculty driven. He did not see that the faculty have been taken out of the process. A subcommittee of AAC has approved all courses. Only intercession and some topics courses have been exception. Moore observed that it was the new courses subcommittee that brought forward this recommendation to AAC. Cavanaugh felt we should commit to the courses by developing an interdisciplinary department or leadership studies department. Newcomb expressed concern about reducing the course credit to one. Also she felt that these courses will not find a home in a department. Moore argued that students are

misinformed about the process, and he was concerned that administrators and some faculty have not corrected their misconceptions. It was a faculty decision to bring these courses into the curriculum. We are bringing them into the regular curriculum rather than having them as outriders. AAC wanted faculty to vote on this procedural issue. O'Sullivan thanked the AAC for a clear presentation of the issues. The Executive Committee should clear up some of the misunderstanding about these programs, especially student concern about the faculty taking away these courses. So we need to make a special effort to make students understand what is actually happening. Duncan endorsed the concept that the faculty has charge of the curriculum but we are in process of further reform. He worried not about the intentions of this change but about how it has been perceived. Some of these courses do not have a natural departmental home and so we have to be creative. It seems to many that it is targeted at the staff and an expression about faculty concern regarding staff. These are important issues, but he was concerned that everyone needed to be better informed on the issues. Stoub pointed out that the course approval form would still be signed by the department chair if the instructor wanted to offer the course for four credits and a grade. Otherwise it would be one credit. Moore said that as long as there is a faculty member credentialed to see that the course was properly developed. Lines observed that civic engagement and leadership is something that environmental students are very engaged in, but he was not concerned that these courses could not be brought under the supervision of his department. He did not worry that these courses would disappear. Sardy asked about faculty visitors. Moore thought they would not be able to teach INT courses but could teach in a department. Newman called the question, which was approved by voice vote. Davison announced that the Executive Committee had asked for a paper ballot. The motion carried by a vote of 49 to 11.

2. Professional Standards Committee—Brandon moved the amendment to Article VIII of the Bylaw (See Attachment 2). She asked D'Amato to serve as floor manager. He indicated that the change would now provide evaluations for all promotions including promotions without tenure. The motion passed by voice vote. D'Amato then explained the second amendment that changes the confusing language about formal and informal evaluations to annual evaluations and evaluations of visiting lecturers. Only the term Annual evaluation for all non-tenured faculty will now be used. O'Sullivan asked about departments that utilized many visitors; would this change include all visitors having annual reviews? D'Amato stated that it would because these reviews are supported to serve the candidate. Harper asked about the change in the date when the departments must submit these reviews. D'Amato explained that they had to meet AAUP requirements. Cohen

asked about redundancy in the sentence “Annual Departmental evaluations are to be conducted every year for Visiting Professors of any rank.” D’Amato agreed to strike the word “annual.” Wellman pointed out that a February 15th deadline was needed for first year evaluations because of AAUP regulations. D’Amato agreed to the change in date for first-year evaluations. Casey recommended that the wording for evaluations of visiting lecturers be “of any rank.” D’Amato accepted the change. The amendment passed by voice vote.

3. Decker moved the following resolution of the faculty: be it resolved that the faculty of Rollins College express its support for the continued work of faculty and students in the living-learning language community in Strong Hall. Barreneche seconded. Duncan said that he had made a commitment to ATO and to support this resolution would require him to break his commitment. He fully intends that if the appeals committee recommends that ATO be restored to Strong Hall he has no intention of breaking his word. The resolution carried by voice vote.

VI. Adjournment – meeting adjourned 1:53 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Barry Levis,
Secretary

Attachment 1

Proposed Academic Policy

Any course taught by an instructor who is not a tenured or tenure-track faculty member, for which a student receives either graded academic credit or more than one hour of academic credit without a letter grade, must be offered within an academic department or academic program of the Arts and Sciences, and the instructor must hold the credentials required under the guidelines of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools to teach within that department or program, or be approved for an academic exception under SACS guidelines by the Department or Program and Dean of Faculty. Exceptions to this policy may be made for internships, where a student may be awarded up to four hours of academic credit (without an associated letter grade) for an internship outside of the context of a department or program during a semester.

Review of discussions within the AAC

Purpose: To ensure that all academic courses taught at Rollins College receive the support and oversight associated with being part of an academic department.

Issues:

- 1) Several courses are taught by staff members with no affiliation to an academic department. There is no departmental oversight or support structure for these courses.
- 2) Because of the nature of their employment, staff do not necessarily have academic freedom. (No one is accusing anyone of any impropriety, but the system allows for the possibility of administrative pressure influencing course content.)
- 3) This change will allow only tenured and tenure-track faculty to teach courses that do not have an academic departmental or programmatic designation. (According to the bylaws, all tenured and tenure-track faculty are members of a department.) Courses taught by anyone other than a tenured or tenure-track faculty member must carry a departmental designation or the designation of an academic program approved by the faculty (e.g. Women's Studies, Honors, RCC, students in 3-2 program, etc.).
- 4) Currently this change will affect very few courses, most of which will continue to be taught.
 - a. Administrators with courtesy faculty rank (e.g., Karen Hater, Jim Eck) are already associated with a department and hold the necessary credentials to teach within that department.
 - b. Courses taught by TJ's for a grade will revert to cr/nc. This was historically the case until very recently.
 - c. No IFT courses will be affected because they are all one-hour, cr/nc.
 - d. Leadership courses will revert to 1-hour cr/nc courses or will be taught within the context of an existing department.
 - e. INT 315A topics course (Pathways to College) will revert to a 1-hour cr/nc class.
 - f. INT 350 (Cornell Scholars), a 2-hour cr/nc course, will become an Honors course.
 - g. Internships are not affected.
 - h. INT 255P (Conquering the LSAT) will not be affected because it is team-taught by tenured faculty.
 - i. Intercession courses will be reviewed in accordance with this change.

- 5) This change is “house keeping” that should be taken care of before curricular reform gets underway. It will ensure that courses are taught within the departmental structure of the College, but does not exclude innovative courses that are pioneered by tenured and tenure-track faculty who have the support of an existing department.
- 6) The Department Chairs have agreed to encourage the pairing of staff and faculty in the classroom to increase the availability of staff expertise in the academic environment. The Dean of the Faculty has agreed to support this effort. (Department Chairs meeting, 29 Nov, 2007)

Attachment 2

Proposed Bylaw Changes for A&S

Arts and Sciences Faculty Meeting, February 28, 2008

First Proposed Change: Applying Consistent Language to Bylaws Pertaining to All Promotions

FACULTY OF THE COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

SECTION V – BYLAWS

ARTICLE VIII: FACULTY EVALUATIONS

D. PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATION OF CANDIDACY FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR

[text as it currently stands]

“D. PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATION OF CANDIDACY FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION TO PROFESSOR”

[proposed amended text]

“D. PROCEDURES FOR EVALUATION OF CANDIDACY FOR TENURE AND PROMOTION”

Also, any occurrence of the phrase “for tenure or promotion to Professor” will be simplified to “for tenure or promotion.” There are two instances: Section 4, 1st para.; Section 6, 4th para.

Furthermore, any occurrence of the phrase “for decisions on promotion to Professor” will be simplified to “for all other promotion decisions.” There are six instances: Section 4, 5th para.; Section 5, 2nd para.; Section 6, 5th para.; Section 7, 1st para.; Section 8, 1st para. (twice). [Note: all of these instances deal with “due dates” for reports from the Chair of CEC, etc.]

[reason for the proposed change]

The bylaws currently allow for exceptional cases wherein an Assistant Professor may be promoted to Associate Professor without thereby immediately being granted tenure (see Article VIII, Part D, Section 1, Eligibility for Tenure; and Article VIII, Part B, Section 3, Promotion to Associate Professor). The wording throughout the bylaws regarding promotion should be adjusted to cover these exceptional cases.

Second Proposed Change: Clarifying Language Regarding Annual Evaluations and Including the Evaluation of Visiting Assistant Professors

FACULTY OF THE COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

SECTION V – BYLAWS

ARTICLE VIII: FACULTY EVALUATIONS

C. PROCEDURES FOR REVIEW OF UNTENURED FACULTY PRIOR TO THE TENURE REVIEW

Section 1. Annual Evaluations

[text as it currently stands]

“The Candidate Evaluation Committee normally conducts annual formal evaluations. The evaluation will be documented in a report addressed to the appropriate Dean and placed in the candidate's permanent file. The report should include an analysis and evaluation of the candidate's progress toward tenure, based on the criteria set forth in the by-laws and in individual departmental criteria.

Annual evaluations are to be conducted every year in which neither a tenure evaluation nor a comprehensive mid-course evaluation takes place.

Informal reviews or discussions of a candidate's progress in meeting department and College expectations are encouraged. These will not be part of the candidate's formal file.”

[proposed amended text]

“The Candidate Evaluation Committee will conduct annual evaluations. The evaluation will be documented in a report addressed to the appropriate Dean and placed in the candidate's permanent file by ~~April~~ **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.

Annual Departmental evaluations are to be conducted every year for Visiting **Assistant** 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.”

[reason for the proposed change]

Language in the bylaws regarding evaluations of untenured faculty is somewhat ambiguous, making a confusing distinction between “annual formal evaluations” and “informal reviews.” We propose to abolish this unnecessary distinction. Furthermore, we believe that it would benefit Visiting Professors, and the departments in which they are serving, if they were to be evaluated annually, as with all other untenured faculty. Also, due dates have been added. According to AAUP guidelines, non-tenure-track faculty members must be notified by March 1 whether they will be invited back for the following academic year; evaluations for such faculty members, then, should be reported by Feb. 15.