

3-25-2008

## Minutes, Arts & Sciences Faculty Meeting, Tuesday, March 25, 2008

Arts & Sciences Faculty

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

---

### Recommended Citation

Arts & Sciences Faculty, "Minutes, Arts & Sciences Faculty Meeting, Tuesday, March 25, 2008" (2008). *College of Arts and Sciences Faculty Minutes*. Paper 56.  
[http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as\\_fac/56](http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_fac/56)

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](mailto:wzhang@rollins.edu).

**Approved Minutes**  
**Arts and Sciences Faculty Meeting**  
**Tuesday, March 25, 2008**

Members Present: Vidhu Aggarwal, Barry Allen, Mark Anderson, Benny Balak, Gabriel Barreneche, Pedro Bernal, Erich Blosssey, Bill Boles, Rick Bommelje, Dexter Boniface, Wendy Brandon, Ann Carpan, Roger Casey, Jennifer Cavanaugh, Julian Chambliss, Doug Child, Ed Cohen, Gloria Cook, Tom Cook, Dan Crozier, Denise Cummings, Mario D'Amato, Creston Davis, Don Davison, Kimberly Dennis, Lewis Duncan, Hoyt Edge, Larry Eng-Wilmont, Marc Fetscherin, Rick Foglesong, Elise Friedland, Laurel Goj, Elton Graugnard, Yudit Greenberg, Don Griffin, Mike Gunter, Dana Hargrove, Fiona Harper, Paul Harris, Scott Hewit, Alicia Homrich, John Houston, Gordie Howell, Richard James, Jim Johnson, Jill Jones, Yvonne Jones, Laurie Joyner, Steve Klemann, Philip Kozel, Harry Kypraios, Susan Lackman, Tom Lairson, Carol Lauer, Ed LeRoy, Barry Levis, Susan Libby, Lee Lines, Edna McClellan, Cecilia McInnis-Bowers, Margaret McLauren, Matilde Mesavage, Jonathan Miller, Al Moe, Thom Moore, Ryan, Musgrave, Steve Neilson, Rachel Newcomb, Marvin Newman, Kathryn Norsworthy, Socky O'Sullivan, Derrick Paladino, Jennifer Queen, Charlie Rock, Ed Royce, Scott Rubarth, Emily Russell, Judy Schmalstig, Eric Schutz, Marie Shafe, Rachel Simmons, Jim Small, Eric Smaw, Bob Smither. Steven St. John, Bruce Stephenson, Kathryn Sutherland, Darren Stoub, Mary Throumoulos, Lisa Tillmann, Larry Van Sickle, Rick Vitray, Debra Wellman, Gary Williams, Yusheng Yao, Wenxian Zhang

Guests: Sharon Agee, Donna Lee, Sharon Carrier.

- I. Call to Order – Davison called the meeting to order at 12:38
  
- II. Approval of Minutes - The minutes of the February 26-faculty meeting were approved.
  
- III. Old Business—none
  
- IV. Announcements – Davison announced the faculty party on April 5. – He asked faculty to RSVP to Austa Weaver. Duncan reported that the committee hearing the ATO case had reviewed the fraternity's strategic plan. They have met most of the criteria and will be restored to Strong Hall. He also announced a grant for the Annie Russell Theatre.

## V. New Business

1. Governance elections -- Davison said that the at large positions for committee vacancies will be elected at this meeting and a later round will be held to fill divisional vacancies. He will ask divisional chairs to organize the elections for appropriate committees. (see attachment) The faculty elected the following to the standing committees: Brandon and Lackman to Academic Affairs; Schutz, Tillman, Royce, and Van Sickle to Finance and Services; Paladino, Davis, and Cummings to Student Life; Graugnard and Hargrove to Professional Standards.
2. Approval of FEC slate – Davison announced the slate nominated by the Executive Committee for FEC (also attachment 1). The slate – Lauer, Ouellette, and Vitray – was approved by voice vote.
3. Merit and equity -- Davison reminded faculty that at the last faculty meeting, he had reported that the Trustees have approved the budget that includes a merit pool of \$470, 000. The merit task force is hard at work, and they will keep the faculty up to date about their progress. The Executive Committee has assumed that any proposed merit system will have an appeals process attached to it. So they have asked professional standards to begin developing an appeals process. Duncan had indicated in his letter to the faculty that up to half of the merit pool can be used to address past inequities and historical unrecognized merit. Traditionally these adjustments have been handled by the administration, but Joyner has asked for faculty support in these determinations. The Executive Committee has recommended that the committee consist of the chairs of PSC and Finance & Service along with an outside member of the faculty. Griffin has agreed to serve in this capacity. Davison was asking for faculty endorsement that half of the merit pool could be used for equity adjustments. Mesavage asked how it would be determined. Davison replied that it has not been determined yet. Tillman asked if market would be a factor in this process. Davison said that it would be in keeping with Duncan's letter. Tillman said that market was never part of the original proposal passed by the faculty. Rock agreed with Tillman's assessment. Norsworthy felt that market considerations were inevitable but asked that Joyner get creative in how the system was designed due to her concerns about the negative impact a market model of salary distribution would have on the faculty community due to radically differential salary levels for the same work. Norsworthy also requested that faculty input be solicited in developing the salary adjustment system. Kypraios asked if the committee could be

expanded to include a representation from each division. Davison felt that the committee was representative. Kypraios pointed out that only two divisions were represented. Tillman said that she felt the administration should take responsibility for these decisions. Since this was their idea, they should take the heat rather than have the faculty support something that they were uncomfortable with. Davison said that the members of the Executive Committee including the members of the administration wanted to be as open and transparent as possible. He felt it was important that Joyner wanted to have faculty representation in the process. Tillman asked if anything changes if faculty does not endorse it. Davison could not answer the question since he was not sure how the administration would react. Smither said that the task force had recommended that half of the merit pool be set aside. Are we just voting on that recommendation? Lackman asked for Expressive Arts Division representation because their circumstances are quite different from other divisions. Norsworthy reported that she has been reviewing all of the information that has been circulated and is trying to understand them. She came to realize that market has always been part of it. When she as a member of the task force voted to divide the merit pool, she did not realize that market would play such an important role. Comparisons will be based on disciplines and CUPA data. There are big discrepancies between disciplines at all levels. We do not yet know whom this will affect on the Rollins faculty yet since we have not seen the data. She expressed concern that the culture of the college is being impacted. We need to get creative so that we do not solely make determinations by discipline. Everything currently is going so quickly and it has become so confusing. We just learn one thing and then another thing has come along. Cohen observed that English has no marketability whatsoever. He said that this was the first time we had learned that market will be 50% of the pool. Davison said that was not correct since market would be only one of a number of elements including compression and unrewarded historical merit. Cohen said that he now saw the importance of Rock's motion about stakeholders. The Faculty needs representation on the Board of Trustees so that the trustees could understand the faculty position. Trustees need to be involved in these meetings so that they can see the divisions that they have created. Davison reported on the Rock motion. He had conducted research on faculty participation on boards from peer and aspirant institutions. He forwarded the information to Finance and Service for action. He asked them to consult with Rock. Joyner brought up the board's concerns about recruiting new faculty. We have been able to hire only about half of our top choices. In at least two cases the problem was money. It would be unfair to students in those majors. We have not been able to hire without some salary differentials. Salary inversion will result

unless we do something. We cannot make these decisions in a vacuum. The motion to divide the merit pool carried by voice vote.

4. Student Affairs resolution (Griffin/Boles) – (see attachment 2) Boles moved the motion which was seconded by Eng-Wilmot. Boles accepted the recommendation by parliamentarian to strike the last five words of the resolution. Lairson wanted to add “or upon the request of the president of the faculty,” Boles accepted the motion as friendly. Newman said that there will be Bylaw revisions, and he thought this resolution would be more effective if it was placed in the bylaws. He recommended that it be changed to a resolution to amend the Bylaws. Boles agreed. Jones felt that serious incidents happened frequently and thought that the term probably should be defined in order to determine just how serious an incident is before it is resolved. Edge asked for clarification about the process. Newman called for question. The motion as amended was approved.
5. Bylaw Revision — Departmental Criteria for Tenure and Promotion (see attachment 3). D’Amato said that only one issue in this proposal involved departments submitting criteria for promotion and tenure. Criteria should be submitted for both associate professor for tenure and promotion and professor for promotion. The other part of the issue involved the question of revising the criteria put into place for candidate with tenure for promotion to professor. The candidate will have to follow the new criteria because they have a say in approving the new criteria. New hires can choose the old or new standard because they had no say in that decision. Jones wondered if a person coming up for tenure would have a choice but a candidate for promotion to professor would not. She was concerned that a person could be a year before promotion and could face quite different standards. D’Amato pointed out that the person would have a say in the decision. Schmalstig said that she does not see that wording in the amended text. D’Amato said if a right is not explicitly stated then it is not a right. Schmalstig moved to amend the motion: “Candidates for promotion to Professor, however, must use the most recent criteria.” Lauer wanted to speak against criteria for promotion to professor. She thought it could be very unfair. The candidate should have a choice. Casey asked about early promotion to associate professor. He thought the amendment should add associate without tenure. Davison recommended that the faculty refer the amendment back to PSC. He moved to table the motion to next faculty meeting. The motion to table was approved by voice vote.

VI. Adjournment – The meeting was adjourned at 1:46 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Barry Levis,  
Secretary

Attachment 1

**Arts and Sciences Governance Elections  
March 25, 2008**

**Candidates as of 03/19/2008  
Nominations will be accepted from the floor.**

**Academic Affairs (2):** Wendy Brandon  
Jim Small  
Susan Lackman

**Finance and Service (4):** Eric Schutz  
Steven St. John  
Lisa Tillman  
Ed Royce  
Yvonne Jones  
Larry Van Sickle

**Student Life (3):** Madeline Kovarik  
Derrick Paladino  
  
Creston Davis  
Denise Cummings

**Professional Standards (2):** Elton Graugnard  
Dana Hargrove  
Emily Russell

**Faculty Evaluation Committee Slate**

Carol Lauer  
Thomas Ouellette  
Rick Vitray

**Student Affairs Resolution  
(Griffin—Boles)  
Arts and Sciences Faculty Meeting  
March 25, 2008**

*Be it resolved, that the bylaws of the faculty of arts and sciences, that once a semester, or upon the request of the president of the faculty, the Dean of Student Affairs, or his or her designee, make a report to the faculty about the state of the college in regard to student life.*

*Furthermore, any serious incident be reported to the faculty by a representative of the office of the Dean of Student Affairs at either a regular faculty meeting or a special forum, ~~where a conversation may occur.~~*

**Background and Rationale:**

At the May 2003 Faculty Meeting Don Griffin brought the following resolution to the floor of the faculty:

*That any serious incident [concerning inappropriate student behavior in the residence halls] be reported to the faculty by a representative of the office of the dean of Student Affairs, initially by email, but also at either a regular faculty meeting or a special forum, where a conversation may occur.*

In the discussion that followed, Don explained “What is being asked for is transparency concerning responses to serious cases of inappropriate behavior. Since faculty are ultimately responsible for student life and since student life affects academic life, the resolution asks that the faculty be better informed—that they be educated, in effect—so that they can be useful participants in a community conversation about improving student life on campus.”

The resolution passed.

In the past five years how many reports of serious incidents have been made before the faculty? I can think of only two. The first, presented by then Dean of Students Steve Neilson, concerned the alleged assault of a Holt student in the Cornell Social Sciences building. That allegation was later found to be untrue. The second report was presented this past December when faculty was informed by Provost Roger Casey about the incident in “the yellow house” regarding the larger issue of ATO’s housing for next year.

Because of the dearth of reports to the faculty of serious incidents of inappropriate student behavior, I am asking to have the faculty amend or replace Don's resolution with the following motion:

*That once a semester, or upon the request of the president of the faculty, the Dean of Student Affairs, or his or her designee, make a report to the faculty about the state of the college in regard to student life.*

*That any serious incident be reported to the faculty by a representative of the office of the Dean of Student Affairs at either a regular faculty meeting or a special forum, ~~where a conversation may occur.~~*

I have consulted with Don Griffin and he is fine with the changes made to his original motion.

Rationale:

As Don stated in the resolution passed by the faculty in May 2003, the faculty is ultimately responsible for student life, and student life in turn informs our classroom and academic experiences with students.

Over the past few years, faculty have heard from students about many serious incidents that have allegedly occurred, including a number of sexual assaults, major drug busts, abandonment of fellow students in compromising situations, thefts, drug dealings, assault, and other inappropriate behavior. The key word here is "alleged." There are always a number of rumors swirling around the campus, but no official source of information.

A report to faculty every semester will help us understand the issues that our students face. In addition, a report about serious situations will help us to address the rumor mill.

Don's proposal asked only for residential infractions. However, we are finding that in many cases the most serious incidents are occurring not in the residence halls but instead in non-residential areas.

I have also dropped Don's call for an e-mail notification because it does not provide the faculty with an opportunity to discuss the issue.

Finally, this is a call once again for transparency. An informed faculty is an effective faculty. We have pushed for transparency with the budget, which for many years has been a major point of contention for faculty. A call for transparency in regard to the behavior of our students will provide the faculty with real data and accurate information instead of rumor, gossip and idle speculation.

Attachment 3

**Proposed Bylaw Change for A&S**

**Proposed Change: Submitting Departmental Criteria for Tenure and Promotion to FEC**

FACULTY OF THE COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

SECTION V – BYLAWS

ARTICLE VIII: FACULTY EVALUATIONS

B. CRITERIA FOR FACULTY EVALUATION

Section 2. Departmental Criteria

*[text as it currently stands]*

“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, including those specific to the discipline. The department shall provide a rationale in support of their standards. The department must resubmit these criteria to the FEC and they must be accepted by the FEC before any tenure track search may be conducted.

[Note: This would take effect for the academic year 2004-2005, and for candidates recently hired the following would apply. Any department with a candidate who has a tenure-track appointment but who has not yet reached a mid-term evaluation, must submit a new set of criteria and have them accepted by FEC before the mid-course evaluation.]”

*[proposed amended text]*

“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 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 new criteria at the time they take effect.”

*[reason for the proposed change]*

The current bylaws do not specify that criteria for the rank of Professor are to be submitted to FEC, which is an oversight. Furthermore, currently the submission of departmental criteria is contingent upon requests for a tenure-track position; FEC should, however, have the most current departmental criteria for tenure and promotion readily at hand at all times. Also, PSC believes it is necessary for all departments to review their standards for tenure and promotion on a regular basis. Finally, the “untimely” note at the end of Sec. 2 has been replaced by a sentence clarifying exactly which criteria will apply, in case of changes. Note that if new criteria are put into effect, candidates for tenure may choose which set of criteria to use. Candidates for promotion to Professor, however,

must use the most recent criteria, since they already have input in their department regarding revisions of the criteria.