

## **Minutes**

### **College of Arts and Sciences**

#### **Faculty Meeting**

**November 4, 1998**

Call to order at 3:30 pm.

Gary Reiness announced that the Biology Department will host an open house on Friday, November 20<sup>th</sup> from 2-4 pm for those interested in viewing the remodeling.

The minutes for the last meeting are not yet available.

There was no President's report, as he is traveling in the UAE.

#### **Dean's Report**

Residence Life planning is ongoing. A retreat last spring led to the creation of five work groups:

Programmatic planning

Physical Planning

Financial planning

Research at other schools

Communications

New residence halls are needed to accommodate more students, and to replace old dorms. But, significant renovations have been made in the existing residence halls.

Enrollment management planning is also underway. Again, work-groups comprised of faculty, staff and students have been set up to deal with:

Recruiting & Admitting

Financial aid

Retention

Alumnus development

The Lewis and Clark Bicentennial is approaching. How should the college celebrate this event? Ideas are welcome.

The FAT lunch for this month will be tomorrow, focusing on outcomes assessment. The Dean quoted from the accreditation report which urges the college to put in place an assessment process. The Board of Trustees is also interested in our self-evaluation of teaching writing and speaking.

Jean Ward raised the following point: Assessment may miss Instructional Media Services, since it is not under the organizational structure of the College.

Dean Atkinson responded that the problem in Inventing America last night reflected an ongoing concern. All of media services budget is coming out of CAS this year, and the service has not been adequate. More generally, assessments across different organizational structures are being coordinated by the Dean's Office and Executive Council.

During the last meeting questions were raised about promotion and tenure. Discussion of the matter must of course avoid revealing details.

Why are deliberations taking so long?

First, the switch from quarters to semesters has taken away the late fall break in which the work used to be done. Now completed files must be in by late November; external review letters sometimes delay the process. The Divisional Deans have the responsibility of trying to get the letters in on time. Even if the letters arrive, the CPT members are too busy in December to do much work, so files have not typically been read until late January. Big chunks of time are hard to come by during the year.

To remedy this problem, Academic Council is considering asking CPT to meet before school starts in January.

Second, these days, CPT is striving for consensus, rather than majority rule votes. The faculty feels a strong CPT recommendation is important given the President's role in the process. The CPT is also working hard on recommendation letters. The CPT has 2 audiences: the President and the candidate.

Dorothy Berkson recommended that scholarship should be evaluated at the end of Spring, to get outside letters earlier. Dean Atkinson responded that this poses a problem since a candidate's scholarship file is not fully complete at that time; it would be easiest to do for promotion to Full Professor. Dick Rohrbaugh remarked that material should not be allowed to trickle in; the process must stay committed to a complete file. Dean Atkinson responded that the only additions permitted to a file are changes in the status of manuscripts. Dorothy Berkson suggested that the reviewers at least be contacted in the Spring.

Are there new types of outcomes in tenure decisions? In particular, are delaying tenure and promotion without tenure new categories, and if so, should the faculty be concerned about this?

The new categories reflect the fact that the President's role has changed. In the past, trustees sat on CPT, and trustees had to vote to approve CPT decisions. Now the President has the final say. The President has, in Dean Atkinson's experience, heeded closely to advice of committee--conveyed either in writing or verbally. The category of promotion without tenure is listed as a possible outcome in the faculty handbook.

In response to rumors that the President's decisions have gone against the votes of the committee, Dean Atkinson reported that under her time of service, the President has never turned down tenure to some who was recommended tenure by the committee. Evan Williams said this was true during his service as Dean as well.

The CPT has a lot of Lewis and Clark experience; the committee has taken its responsibility seriously. The deliberations are by design opaque to the broader community.

Marty Hart--Landsberg commented that promotion without tenure is a limbo category that we may want to avoid. Dorothy Berkson questioned whether a candidate's decision to accept a change in the tenure rules was really 'consensual'. Dean Atkinson responded that even if that were true, it might, nevertheless be the right thing to do. Steve Hunt asked whether there was a process to correct these perceived problems with the CPT? Dean Atkinson said that last year's CPT wanted to review the document but failed from exhaustion. It is certainly subject to revision. The current CPT should think about this.

A few general points about the review process.

First, CPT has been extremely responsible: reading all scholarly materials and course evaluations, and placing the latter in the appropriate contexts.

Second, the files need to speak for themselves, and this is the candidate's responsibility.

Third, in 1993, CPT included some level of community service in the tenure decision, as is reflected in the current review document. CPT is not seeking high levels of service, but promise of future good citizenship. Chairs should recognize this, and not "overly" protect junior faculty from moderate amounts of community service.

John Abele noted that the handbook calls for interaction between Chairs, Deans and CPT, and this is not being done. Dean Atkinson responded that, as she recalled, in 1996 a change was approved to the Review Document in which "should" consult was changed to "may" consult. But this change was not incorporated into the text of the Review Document.

## **Committee Reports**

### Committee on Admissions, Awards and Scholarships

Kurt Fosso reported that the committee is working on:

1. Implementing Latin Honors--what to do about last semester senior grades?
2. Proposed modification of the Academic Integrity Policy
3. Matriculation statistics
4. What to do when GPA falls for GPA-based scholarships?

### Committee on the Curriculum

Bill Randall first introduced the following motion:

"Resolution

Whereas the schedule for next year would end on December 23, because of the late date for Labor Day

Whereas the Curriculum Committee decided that December 23 was too late to end Final Exams because this leaves too little time for students to travel home for the holidays and the Holiday break would only be 15 days

Whereas the Curriculum Committee was persuaded that we should not start the Spring Semester on the Martin Luther King, Jr., Holiday

Whereas the Curriculum Committee is engaged in the analysis of our current principles in an effort to make them more generally applicable

Whereas there are still many considerations to be resolved before a new set of principles can be presented to the faculty for debate and adoption

The Curriculum Committee is proposing that the Faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences at Lewis & Clark College adopt a calendar for next year only at this time. This proposed calendar is almost identical to this current year's schedule.

### **Motion:**

**The Curriculum Committee moves that the attached Calendar for the Academic Year 1999-2000 be adopted by the Faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences at Lewis & Clark College."**

The motion required no second.

The Curriculum Committee has been reviewing the principles governing the calendar; however rather than debate new principles at this time, the committee is simply asking for approval for next year of the proposed calendar which violates, for a second year in a row, our existing principles.

Key features of the proposed calendar are:

Beginning fall:	8/30/99	Ending fall:	12/16/99
Beginning spring:	1/10/00	Ending spring:	4/30/00

Adds a 2<sup>nd</sup> day to fall break.

First exam will fall on Saturday in the fall and spring

## Debate on the Motion

Two people spoke against the motion. First, in moving from quarters to semesters, we were promised we would avoid an early start. Second, should we coordinate with Reed? With this schedule there would be little time for CPT to meet in early January. More time in January was preferred.

In response, members of the Curriculum Committee noted that the early January start was partially to avoid beginning classes on Martin Luther King day. In terms of the early fall start, the current principles would have us ending on December 23. This was too late. Also, starting before Labor Day this year did not lead to widespread objections from faculty. The Curriculum Committee is trying to identify new principles which we can avoid violating in the future. A lot of energy has gone into considering pros and cons; chairs have consulted members and reported to Deans. The Curriculum Committee has spent a lot of time on this too.

David Savage called the question.

Debate was closed by a voice vote.

## **The motion passed by a voice vote.**

Dick Rohrbaugh felt the calendar issue had not been discussed adequately in humanities faculty meetings; rather a poll was presented. Next time this issue comes before Curriculum Committee could substantive input be solicited? Bill Randall responded that as we turn to the new set of principles, we will have to have input. And substantive amounts of three meetings of the Curriculum Committee were spent on this.

Bill Randall then reported on the General Education Forum. A second e-mail will be out soon announcing the time--Thursday, December 3rd, from 4-6 pm--and place. The committee is interested in feedback on the full selection of general education requirements, not just Inventing America. Evan Williams, Forum Chair, announced that proposals, submitted to any of the task force members, will be accepted through November 18<sup>th</sup>. One general guideline until now has been that general education takes up about 1/3 of courses, but even that rule is open to discussion.

## Committee on Educational Technology

Harry Schleef announced that IT is doing a Y2K survey. The survey has two secondary purposes. First it will allow a better inventory of hardware and software. Second, it provides faculty and opportunity to indicate their needs to IT.

The Committee oversees a classroom software fund; grant proposals are solicited.

## **Old Business**

The following motion to revise the CAS Developmental Review Process, moved in the last meeting, was on the floor for debate.

### **"RESOLUTION TO REVISE THE COLLEGE OF ARTS & SCIENCES FACULTY DEVELOPMENTAL REVIEW PROCEDURES (Revised per discussion at the October 7, 1998 CAS Faculty Meeting)"**

Developmental Review Schedule proposal

WHEREAS, the Academic Council has agreed that a reduction in the frequency of developmental reviews is advisable; therefore be it

RESOLVED that the following substitutions occur in the Lewis & Clark College Faculty Handbook Section 3.6.3. "Promotion and Tenure Reviews and Developmental Reviews: College of Arts and Sciences":

Part II, Page 24, Paragraph 6

Developmental reviews of tenured associate professors occur every six years. Faculty who wish to be reviewed more often than that may request a developmental review by consulting with their chair and/or divisional dean.

Developmental reviews of tenured professors occur if they have been in rank at least six years or if at least six years have elapsed since their last developmental review and if:

1. the faculty member requests a review;
2. the faculty member's divisional dean requests a review; or
3. the faculty member receives two consecutive low percentage salary increases or less.

Part III, Page 25, Paragraph 2

The chair of the reviewee's department (or surrogate) for all developmental reviews will serve as an in-department member of the developmental review committee. As a member of this committee, the department chair (or surrogate) shall consult with the other tenured members of the department to bring the departmental perspective to the committee."

Curt Keedy noted that minor changes have been made to last month's resolution, and accepted by Academic Council as friendly. Recapping the rationale for the motion, first the review cycle will be lengthened to avoid excessive reviews. Second, pro forma Full Professor reviews will be eliminated. Finally, the role of the Chair will be simplified by putting the Chair on the Development Review Committee.

One question was raised: Is information available about what determines salary increase criteria?

Curt Keedy responded that there are 4 levels of merit increase: high, medium, low, and none. The criteria in the handbook are sketchy.

Curtis Johnson called the question.

Seconded.

Debate was closed by a voice vote.

**The motion passed by voice vote.**

**New Business**

Nicole Aas-Rouxparis pointed out that fire department inspections are ongoing and academic departments are being charged for violations. Why are departments paying for this? And if departments must pay, shouldn't they first be warned about what is wrong and given the opportunity to correct it before they are charged? Dean Atkinson responded that she would look into the matter.

The meeting adjourned at 4:55 pm.



respectfully submitted,

Eban Goodstein

---

*Created by: eban@lclark.edu*  
*12-02-98*