

5-4-2005

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Faculty Meeting, Wednesday, May 4, 2005

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, Wednesday, May 4, 2005" (2005). *College of Arts and Sciences Faculty Minutes*. Paper 82.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_fac/82

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.

Minutes of the Meeting
Arts and Sciences Faculty
May 4, 2005

Members Present: M. Anderson; A. Armenia; G. Barreneche; E. Blossy; A. Boguslawski; W. Boles; R. Bommelje; D. Boniface; A. Carpan; J. Carrington; R. Carson; R. Casey; J. Chambliss; M. Cheng; D. Child; G. Child; G. Cook; T. Cook; R. Cowan; D. Crozier; D. Cummings; R. Diaz; J. Eck; H. Edge; L. Eng-Wilmot; R. Foglesong; C. Fowler; G. Gardner; E. Gottlieb; Y. Greenberg; D. Griffin; D. Hargrove; P. Harris; J. Hewitt; A. Homrich; J. Houston; G. Howell; C. Hudspeth; M. Hunt; P. Jarnigan; J. Johnson; J. Jones; M. Kovarik; S. Lackman; T. Lairson; P. Lancaster; C. Lauer; B. Levis; S. Libby; R. Lima; L. Lines; D. Mays; C. McInnis-Bowers; R. Mésavage; G. Meyers; T. Moore; R. Morris; S. Neilson; R. Newcomb; K. Norsworthy; T. Papay; A. Prieto-Calixto; J. Queen; R. Ray; J. P. Roach; D. Rogers; J. Rovira; S. Rubarth; W. Schmidt; J. Schultz; T. Seymour; J. Shivamoggi; R. Simmons; G. Sinclair; R. Smither; B. Stephenson; W. Svitavsky; M. Throumoulos; L. Tillman-Healy; R. Vitray; G. Williams; Y. Yao; J. Yellen; W. Zhang; E. Zivot.

Guest: S. Carrier

- I. **Call to Order:** Yehudit Greenberg called the meeting to order at 12:40 p.m.
- II. **Approval of the Minutes:** The minutes from the April 28, 2005, meeting were approved as amended..
- III. **Announcements:**
 - A. **Approval of Candidates for Degrees of A.B. and A.B.Hon:** Unanimous cheer of approval.
 - B. **President Duncan:** Free Rollins decals for all faculty.
 - C. **McKean Grant** (Lancaster): Grant for recording of historically important music, American Moravian Music, with College orchestra and chorus, voice faculty as soloists – John V. Sinclair.
 - D. **Admissions (Erdmann):** Increase of 400 applications for class, 53% of the pool, yield is at 465. We have 1215-1225 students returning. A stronger class 1195 SAT/1175/1165 in prior years. Need-blind this year; we have more needy students. We are not as diverse as in other years (18% this year). Cornell Scholars 28 of 54 students are coming (10 of 12 full-ride). Honors Degree Program may have 42 – 45. 11% yield of 100 out-of-state honors students offered.
 - E. **Renewed Program (R. Casey):** Galapagos for Professors Project – launching next spring China for Professors. There will be more information.
 - F. **Honors Project Fair (B. Levis):** Immediately after Faculty Meeting in Olin Bib Lab.
 - G. **Recognition of Outgoing Faculty President and Vice-President (T. Cook):** Recognition of Yudit Greenberg and Susan Lackman

IV. Recognition of Visiting Faculty who are leaving this year (Casey): A. Armenia; T. Bridges; J. Burris; S. Butler; C. Hudspeth; F. McDonald; C. McGowan; H. Miranda; J. Puhalla; G. Sinclair.

V. Recognition of Retiring Faculty (R. Casey):

A. Dave Richard – will continue to teach each Spring for the next few years.

B. Thaddeus Seymour (lauded by Barbara Carson)– retired in 1990, taught for 15 years. During his time he taught Freshman Writing at 8 a.m., Master Learner in Community of Learners, advisor for Omicron Delta Kappa, coordinated for RCC program, developed and taught “Literature and Experience” (an intro course for non-majors). Each student got a laminated card with an 8-line poem of Robert Frost, “Dust of Snow.” The faculty responded to the encomium with a standing ovation.

C. Sandra McIntire (encomium by J. Houston) – came to Rollins for business consulting; director of Organizational Behavior program at Brevard; took on similar job at Holt after the Brevard Campus closed; held black belt in martial arts; accomplished collage artist; played Irish fiddle.

VI. Performance of “Heads’ Up” by Rollins Percussion Ensemble under direction of Beth Gottlieb.

VII. Greenberg thanked Lackman for service, plus Faculty for their patience with the combination of Roberts’ Rules and Yudit’s Rules.

VIII. Professional Standards Committee (N. Decker) – Faculty Evaluation Proposal. Discussion opened with motion by R. Lima, and several seconds. Paul Harris led the task force. The revision started as a result as a student initiative in Fall 2001. Decker thanked the committee members individually. This is a reform of the form of the evaluation, as well as a difference in the way the information is being tabulated. Paul Harris then led the discussion, beginning with a PowerPoint presentation. He recapitulated the development of the process. Proposal:

Computer administration

1. 1-Year Trial Period (2005-6)

- a. Faculty control over use of numbers
- b. Narrative responses continue to be used

2. Ongoing Evaluation

- a. Refine questionnaire and reporting
- b. Identify critical indicators of Quality
- c. Discuss relative weight of CIE in process

3. Revisit and decide on adoption

Newman spoke to concern about doing the process on-line; he felt there might be too much emphasis on technology; he would prefer students writing in class, without interruption. He is also concerned about the student who might not find time to respond at all. Levis: Does not numeric scales: was at Rollins because the responses were misused. He, too, finds value in narrative because it is nuanced. Levis likes the areas covered, but he wishes there were more narrative in response to specific questions. Jill Jones raised the question about someone not in the class answering the evaluation; she was told there are registration safeguards. Taylor

appreciated the idea of a trial, and noted there was still a narrative part. Jones is concerned with the lack of nuance; students are tired at the end of the semester, and instead of writing will go straight to the numbers. Vitray is in favor of computer administration for anonymity, and feels that students will take interest in the narrative. Stephenson spoke in favor of a trial, as did Kypraios. Zivot pointed out that as a new faculty member, he is concerned that his evaluation will be based on a form that may or may not be effective. Boguslawski spoke in favor of trial that may be tweaked; but the faculty is negating four years of work because of many people wanting to create a form better than the form we had. Gregory said that she got more detail in the trial form when she participated in the first trial; she says that she is concerned that students will be penalized for not filling out the form. Norsworthy has found that having used a form with both areas, the sections have helped students find topics to write about and have been more thorough. Decker suggests the questions on the form may trigger more exactitude than the open-ended form. Tillman-Healy is in favor of the new form, but she wishes we continue to have discussions on the use of the form in evaluations. McLaren has found that the forms give more information; she suggests that non-tenured faculty be allowed to also use old written form in the classroom in order to retain the same type of evidence. Faculty will be able to track who has responded to the form for each class. Edge reassured Zivot that the questions on the old form that “work” are transferred to the new form. Williams is in favor of the new program; he has gotten more and valuable information from the test form. He believes the most important thing is that we continue to discuss how we use the forms. Schutz believes we use quantitative methods already, whether we want to admit it or not. Schmalstig supports the form; she is concerned that we are making two changes at once; would like to try the new form in the classroom. Simmons likes the idea of a captive audience in the classroom; she is troubled by the questions about faculty personality. Newman asked to separate the two issues: the new form and the procedure. Barranache believes that our students are not that tech-savvy, so he believes we should give the forms in the class. Lloyd questions the carrot/stick approach. Foglesong asked if there was a motion on the floor and was assured there was. D. Rogers reminded faculty about the evaluation form used in the MHR program, and noted it had evolved. He noted they use the Scantron® model. He believes that until we try the experiment we won't know if it works. Wally moved amended the proposal so that the new form is tried in the classroom and not on-line so that students who don't respond to the form. Seconded. Vitray: Would it be possible for professors to have the option to do the form in class or online? Is this a friendly amendment? Taylor: I would like to support the options on in-class vs. on-line. That gives us more data. Edge said we would not have the facility to scan that many responses. Question called. Passed by voice vote.

The amended proposal passed by voice vote.

IX. Yudit called on Tom Cook to close this meeting. There was a motion to adjourn and the motion was passed with a shout of agreement.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan Cohn Lackman, Ph.D., M.B.A.
Vice-President/Secretary