

2-12-2015

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Executive Committee Meeting, Thursday, February 12, 2015

Arts & Sciences Executive Committee

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

Recommended Citation

Arts & Sciences Executive Committee, "Minutes, Arts & Sciences Executive Committee Meeting, Thursday, February 12, 2015" (2015). *Executive Committee Minutes*. Paper 149.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ec/149

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 rwalton@rollins.edu.



ROLLINS
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
February 12, 2015
Agenda

12:30 in CSS 167

Lunch will be served

- I. Call to order**
Carol Lauer
- II. Approval of minutes from 1/22/15**
Thomas Ouellette
- III. Reports**
- IV. Old Business**
- V. New Business**
 - a) Changing distribution method for faculty materials for tenure and promotion – Blackboard **(See Attachment #1)**
 - b) Possible FEC Slate
 - c) Lecturers and other permanent non-tenured faculty and the bylaws statement on “normally” such positions are limited to three years
 - d) Proposed structure of ad hoc dismissals committee **(See Attachment #2)**
 - e) Gen Ed Confusion
- VI. Adjournment**



ROLLINS
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
February 12, 2015
Minutes
Approved

PRESENT

Carol Lauer, Thomas Ouellette, Craig McAllaster, Carol Bresnahan, Bob Smither, Don Davison, Fiona Harper, Derrick Paladino, Gloria Cook (for Jill Jones), Elise Ablin

CALL TO ORDER

Carol Lauer called the meeting to order at 12:32 PM

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM 1/22/15

EC unanimously approved the minutes from the 1/22/15 meeting with corrections.

REPORTS

AAC

Gloria Cook

AAC discussed dropping a neighborhood course for spring term because some students are planning to transfer out of Rollins. It was decided that these students could use the course as an elective at their next institution.

Some of the international field studies have been in place for 17 years. AAC believes there should be a mechanism in place to review field studies every five years.

F&S

Don Davison

Next week, F&S will review revised compensation for international field studies and the lecturers and permanent non-tenured faculty issue. Smither asks that F&S review the benefits package for retiring faculty.

PSC

Fiona Harper

Diversity Advisory Council. Emily Russell, Chair of DAC, met with PSC on February 10 to discuss the council structure and selection procedure for membership. After a good discussion, PSC and DAC agreed that the DAC website will be updated to clarify the membership and how members are selected, as well as to better highlight the various projects DAC is and has been involved with. Finally DAC is currently developing a Diversity Inclusion Grant application for a grant program they are planning to offer for which both faculty and staff apply. PSC received the DAC grant application on February 11 and will review it at our next meeting on February 24, 2015.

Course Instructor Evaluations. PSC reviewed preliminary language submitted by Laura Pfister, Registrar for the Holt School, to include syllabi of Holt, A & S and CPS courses. At the PSC meeting on January 27, PSC discussed the problems associated with the current delivery structure and timing of the CIEs, in consultation with Karla Knight and Laura Pfister. We also heard the results of a survey of several peer and aspirant colleges with regards to CIE distribution. We intend to bring a proposal to A & S EC at the next meeting in March for consideration.

Also multiple requests to revise question 3 of the CIE from a Yes, No, explain in box later to: *If you experienced or observed any discrimination or breach of professional ethics by the instructor during this course, please describe your experience/observation:*

This revision language came from Paul Harris, who also indicated that this question is not involved in the *computing any of the scales, so changing it will not disrupt the rest of the reporting system.*

Highlights of the recommendations by PSC:

- PSC has the following observations and recommendations
 - Holt and A&S have different schedules, so offering the CIE's at different times can be problematic. Due to changes in Banner, Holt and cross-listed A & S courses now carry the same CRN number. Since Holt school ends typically a day to several days earlier than A&S, this situation resulted in A&S students having fewer days than expected to complete the CIEs in Fall 2014.
 - Suggestions:
 - Have common start and stop dates for opening and closing CIEs, as dictated by the last day of class for Holt school.
 - Have language in syllabus about CIE and dates
 - Have CIE dates on the academic calendar
 - Penalizing:
 - PSC recommends email bombardment be removed for three semesters and then compare to data from the previous semesters
 - Grade Release Penalty
 - PSC voted 9 to 1 to keep the grade penalty, in order to not change too many variables at once.
 - Grade penalties
 - No faculty member should link student grades to completion of the CIE
 - PSC proposed CIE delivery changes
 - Reminder rate
 - 1 initial email to students when it opens
 - 1 reminder email at midpoint
 - 1 reminder the day before it closes
 - Window size
 - PSC majority preferred 21 days window, with 14 days also heavily favored.
 - Administration
 - Faculty have the option to administer CIEs in class
 - Faculty must leave the room if they choose to exercise this option
 - This reminder/option will be written into language for the syllabus

Faculty Evaluation Committee

Request from Jonathan Miller to PSC received on Friday February 6, 2015

PSC (the A&S faculty governance committee with responsibility for such matters) reviews the existing procedures for security and confidentiality of P&T reviews, researches best practices and online systems used in the management of faculty reviews in comparable schools, and in consultation with our colleagues in the CPS and Crummer faculties, and appropriate staff in IT and HR, proposes to the three faculties more secure systems for the administration of P&T reviews that better able to protect the confidentiality and integrity of the review process.

Sharon Carnahan response to email discussions regarding this request:

I'm happy to discuss this with PSC or EC but anything FEC committee decides is null after the chair leaves unless it's in the bylaws or a written protocol. I'm not debating that it should be examined, I am just sharing the responsibility.

Library Grant application review

Entitled "Open Education Resource Grant", Jonathan is developing a grant application for faculty and staff to apply for to encourage the use of Open Access materials in the classroom. Current program proposal is for one grant awarded per year, each grant to be sustained over three years. \$1000 per year x3, total award of \$3000. First year to evaluate current materials and develop open access materials, second year to run course using only open access materials, third year to evaluate use of open access and modify as appropriate. OER issues of assessment of success currently under discussion.

SGA

Elise Ablin

SGA has partnered with Uber to subsidize night time rides for students. Students will be able to ride with Uber at a 50% discount.

SGA has created an outstanding faculty award. Details are still being hammered out, but the plan is to award ten faculty members who students feel go above and beyond for students. Awardees will be invited to the SGA banquet.

The RAVE Guardian app is live. We are hoping that at least 50% of students will have downloaded the app by the end of the semester.

President's Office

Craig McAllaster

Report on enrollments in CPS and A&S: McAllaster requested EC's interpretation of the data that shows declining enrollments for A&S (with the exception of the Science Division) and a corresponding increase in enrollment in CPS. CPS now has 36% of the student majors. Davison will review the data.

NEW BUSINESS

Changing distribution method for faculty materials for tenure and promotion - Blackboard

Fiona Harper (See Attachment #1)

Our bylaws state:

“The Chair of the CEC has the responsibility for collecting additional materials required for the evaluation including letters from tenured members of the department and/or department letters signed by the tenured members of the department, and student evaluations, and making them available **electronically** for members of the CEC, FEC, and the appropriate Dean to review by the time the candidate submits her/his materials.”

At a recent meeting, the Librarians expressed a concern about the requirement for tenure and promotion materials to be submitted on USB drives. USB drives can be easily lost and are costly. CPS faculty upload their materials to Blackboard and Pat Schoknecht recommends A&S follow this practice. Lauer will discuss this option with Sharon Carnahan.

Possible FEC Slate

Carol Lauer

We have three volunteers to replace those departing FEC next year. Accepting these three would leave FEC without representation from the Humanities. Lauer will attempt to find someone in the Humanities to volunteer to serve.

Lecturers and other permanent non-tenured faculty and the Bylaws statement on “normally” such positions are limited to three years

Carol Lauer

Article VIII of A&S bylaws states:

“Faculty appointments may be made to tenure-track or visiting positions. No tenure-track appointment may last beyond seven years without the faculty member being granted tenure, with the exception of faculty members on parental leave for childbirth or adoption who accept an extension in accordance with Rollins College Policy. Science Division and Psychology faculty who begin the tenure track in fall, 2012 (assuming the Bush renovation takes place on schedule) and who require specialized laboratory facilities in the Bush Science Center to conduct their research, may, at the time they submit their materials for their mid-course evaluation, declare that they wish a one-year extension of the tenure clock. That extension will convert their fifth year on the tenure track to a non-counting year, allowing them to take the fourth year course release currently offered to tenure-track faculty. This provision expires automatically once these faculty have been accommodated as described. **No visiting faculty appointment may last beyond six consecutive years.** Initial appointments of tenure-track faculty shall normally be for a two-year period. All faculty appointments shall be made by the President with the advice of the Provost, who may act as the President’s agent, and the appropriate Dean. All tenure-track appointments will be made as the result of national searches.”

Maria Martinez is concerned the College may face lawsuits because these faculty could assume they should receive tenure. The Handbook states that lecturers are not tenure-track appointments so we believe we are covered; however, Davison will invite Martinez to attend an F&S meeting to clarify her concerns.

Proposed structure of ad hoc dismissals committee

Carol Lauer (See Attachment #2)

EC wants to add language to the bylaws about the structure of the ad hoc dismissals committee. This committee would be formed in cases where administration believes there is cause to dismiss a tenured faculty member. In such cases, EC will choose a slate of four tenured full

professors to bring before the full faculty for approval. Harper will draft language for the bylaws.

Gen Ed Confusion

Carol Lauer

Some faculty have expressed concerns with the new general education curriculum, particularly with all of the extracurricular events they feel pressured to attend. There is also confusion about whether or not faculty will continue to receive a stipend for teaching in the new gen ed. The Dean's Office will host a meeting to help clear up the confusion.

ADJOURNMENT

Carol Lauer

Lauer adjourned the meeting at 1:43 PM.

ATTACHMENT 1

PSC (the A&S faculty governance committee with responsibility for such matters) reviews the existing procedures for security and confidentiality of P&T reviews, researches best practices and online systems used in the management of faculty reviews in comparable schools, and in consultation with our colleagues in the CPS and Crummer faculties, and appropriate staff in IT and HR, proposes to the three faculties more secure systems for the administration of P&T reviews that better able to protect the confidentiality and integrity of the review process.

Jonathan Miller, Ph.D.
Library Director
Olin Library

ATTACHMENT 2

Article VIII Faculty Evaluations

Appeals Committee: 3 Tenured Faculty with rank of Professor, staggered terms of three years.

F. APPEALS ON DECISIONS OF TENURE AND PROMOTION

Section 1. Grounds

Decisions on tenure and promotion may be appealed in the event of the following charges: discrimination on the basis of race, national origin, religion, sex, sexual orientation, age or physical handicap; procedural improprieties; or violations of academic freedom.

Section 2. Appointment of the Appeals Committee

The Appeals Committee consists of three tenured faculty with the rank of Professor, serving staggered terms of three years. The Professional Standards Committee, upon the approval of the

Faculty of Arts and Sciences and the President appoints these three members. The Appeals Committee will include no members of the Candidate Evaluation Committee or the Faculty Evaluation Committee.

Section 3. Review of the Appeals Committee

A candidate who appeals a tenure or promotion decision has until August 1 following the evaluation to file an appeal. The candidate appeals to the Appeals Committee who reviews the case and decides whether there is sufficient cause for an appeal. If the Appeals Committee finds that sufficient cause does exist, a meeting for a full-scale review is convened.

The Appeals Committee has the authority to review the procedure of a tenure or promotion decision. It does not rule on the substance of a case. To win an appeal, the candidate must demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Committee that the evaluation process has been flawed. In the absence of convincing evidence that the procedure has been flawed, the Appeals Committee affirms the original decision to deny tenure or promotion.

Section 4. Recommendations of the Appeals Committee

After reviewing the case, the Appeals Committee makes a recommendation to the President. It may recommend upholding the decision to deny tenure or promotion, or it may recommend a new evaluation, either by the original committee(s) or by newly constituted committee(s) as appropriate.

Four elected tenured members: 2 A & S, 1 CPS, 1 Crummer

ARTICLE VI

FACULTY APPEALS COMMITTEE

Section 1. Membership and Terms of Office

The Faculty Appeals Committee shall consist of four tenured faculty members, one from the Crummer Graduate School who shall be elected by the Crummer faculty, one from the College of Professional Studies who shall be elected by the Professional Studies 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. Four alternates (one from the Crummer faculty, one from the College of Professional Studies 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, in the event of a majority vote in favor of the appeal, 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.