

## **A&S Council Minutes**

January 30, 2013

Present: Joanna Mosser Joseph Lenz, Muir Eaton, Dave Courard-Hauri, Tim Knepper, Colin Cairns, Joseph Schneider, Matthew Esposito, Marc Cadd, Eric Manley, Dan Alexander, Leslie Marrs, Karla Kash

Joanna called the meeting to order at 3:34 p.m.

Minutes from the November Council meeting were unanimously approved.

### **Dean's report:**

- Carla Herling hired as new web coordinator/admin assistant in Medbury
- College P&T elections begin next week: 1 Fine Arts, 1 Science, 1 Hum/SocSci
- Revision at the university level for external review of programs-- instead of once every 7 years, now once every 10 years to align with cycle of accreditation reviews.
- Admissions push: this spring, the number of applications is down, but number of admits is where it should be. For the first time in a while, numbers are down a bit in the sciences.
- Security- how to respond to an active shooter, 2/5 cancelled, Fri 2/8 10am in Meredith 235, Mon 2/11 2pm in HI 102
- All annual college award nominations are due February 15

### **Course approvals:**

CHIN 001 and CHIN 002 have the same course description – TABLED

GERM 140 rationale for change needs clarification—TABLED

Colin will request clarification from Marc Cadd regarding these three courses.

Per 2012-13 Council policy, all other courses for review are presumptively approved:

(All course changes): ARAB 001, ARAB 051, ART 197, CHIN 051, CHIN 052, CHIN 150, GERM 001, GERM 002

### **Handbook changes:**

***Motion 1: Addition of Conflict of Interest Policy*** (*Handbook Section 1.1.3, pg. 2*)

Joanna researched what other colleges use in their conflict of interest policies, in order to sharpen the language in this handbook policy.

Dan Alexander proposed that for department levels, B and C might be too finely grained.

Perhaps it would be better to remove B and C and instead have a conversation with the Dean when there's a potential conflict of interest. There are lower-stakes issues that can be solved with common sense.

Several departments have married couples: the partner's input is valuable and should not be silenced, but this new info is likely outweighed by the difficulty in being forthcoming in discussing someone's spouse.

Definition of "related person" does not capture all conflicts of interest (friendships, ex-friendships). To avoid ambiguity of "personal relationships" there's value in adding that faculty

members are encouraged to be forthcoming about relationships that may be in play and discuss if a potential conflict of interest exists.

Insert: "Conflicts of interest involving others than related persons can exist. If a faculty member finds him or herself in a potential conflict of interest he or she should discuss the matter with his or her dean or the provost in order to decide if recusal is appropriate."

Strike B.

Change C, as noted.

Motion 1 is unanimously passed, as revised.

***Motion 2: Inclusion of policy and procedures for faculty honors*** (Section 3.4, pgs. 21-24)

Representing the divisions of the college-- is there a problem with appointment?

This issue with divisions of the college will be addressed in a larger discussion re: strategic plan.

Motion 2 is unanimously is passed.

***Motion 3: Requires inclusion of summer & J-Term course evaluations in tenure + promotion files*** (Section 3.1.61.b (pg. 17) and 4.7.1.2 (pg. 38))

In summer courses it's easier to recognize who does the evaluations because it's a smaller group. Some courses across the college have enrollment of 1 during the year; these students still must submit course evaluations.

Online courses use the same provisions for course evaluations as on-campus courses.

Motion 3 is unanimously passed.

***Motion 4: Clarification regarding the selection and eligibility of external reviewers of scholarly/creative work*** (Section 3.1.62, pg. 17-18).

Worry that new language is too specific.

There may be a very small number of people in field who can evaluate work. Is there a statute of limitations on past collaborations? The small field justification can be a wedge to allow for problematic abuse.

Perhaps we could define collaborators that aren't acceptable. If 70 people contributed on a far-ranging project, they may not know each other. Are those 70 people not allowed as reviewers?

Generally chairs are from widely divergent fields, do lots of research to find an exact fit for external reviewer; the candidate must participate somehow because the chair may not be competent in the field. It still allows for lots of gray area.

Presumably collaborators share interest in candidate's success or failure. Why not strike collaborators all together? Certainly a co-author is a collaborator.

Aim to retain P&T's ability to presumptively trust, and define how far back we define collaborator. Attempt to avoid a situation in which an outside person might find something murky.

Candidates should have access to the letters—but it's rarely in time to comment in the

narrative. Candidates will recognize writers as collaborators. If a reviewer says "I have interacted with them" it invalidates the letter. P&T will exercise judgment in determining whether these letters are valid.

It's unconscionable for chairs to choose the reviewers; department can recommend, candidates should recommend, candidate should be able to challenge reviewer choice.

Worry that this might restrict scholarship in fields that are very small. With this guideline, those who want to do put together an anthology could be keeping a majority of people in a small field from being external reviewers in the future

Editors are in a position to comment on the work in detail—being in the position of editor doesn't mean that someone would abandon their integrity in writing for someone whose work they might have included in an edited work.

Insert: "Departments should be cautious in using a collaborator as an external reviewer"

Motion 4 is tabled.

***Motion 5: Removes the ability of a recused member of the P&T Committee to participate in the final vote on a candidate*** (Section 3.1.64, pg. 19)

A P&T member from a department with a candidate up for review has already voted at the departmental level, and the only effect their vote can have is negative (need 3-2 for positive rec). If person voted negatively, would take to 3-3, which is a negative recommendation.

Including recused member in discussion is a conflict of interest—the department has already had its say. Committee may give deference to department member of the candidate... seems unfair to have that person on the committee. There's an opportunity to answer questions that other candidates don't have.

Some Council members worry about disenfranchising an elected member of the P&T committee.

Motion 5 is passed with a majority vote; two abstentions.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.