

Review and Planning Committee Minutes for October 18, 2000

Note: RPC has posted the reports of the Subcommittee on the Review of Tenure and Promotion Procedures and Policies at the following web location: <http://usgrant.net160.stolaf.edu/rpc/>. Other information relating to current RPC business can also be found there.

Present: Becker (Chair), Baker, Carrington, Conway, Hamlin, Kahn, Marty, Miessler, Norton, Pence, Ross, Schuurman, Solid.

New SAS representative Myron Solid was welcomed to the committee.

MINUTES for the 10/4/00 meeting were approved as submitted.

Updates from the Chair: We are in the process of adding new RPC members. 2 of 3 green sheets were submitted to the Regents and approved. A 3rd green sheet will be presented to the Regents in their December meeting.

FACULTY DAYTIME MEETINGS: Reports were provided by committee members.

There were a variety of reactions to the 4 options. A 5th option was also proposed, using one Tuesday or Thursday chapel period a month for one-hour faculty meetings and delaying classes accordingly to accommodate the longer period.

The chair read a letter from the Committee for the Status of Women urging that faculty meetings be held in the daytime (especially given the current lack of childcare), preferring the simplest most consistent plan.

Student representatives reported on some student response to the suggestions. One response favored option 2 for its consistency, one favored an activities hour, one noted that students are quite pressed for time. One comment noted the importance of rehearsals and labs in the schedule.

Option 5 prompted some discussion about whether a 1 hour time period for faculty meetings was long enough, and concern was expressed about cutting into Chapel time. We would also need to be sure Option 5 will not cause problems for the lab schedule. It was decided that committee members would return to their Faculties for reaction to the new 5th option.

Some observations in the discussion: concern for improved attendance at faculty meetings, desire for empirical evidence for change, suggestion of alternating evening and daytime meetings as a pilot study to see how it works.

There was some discussion about how this issue could be presented to the faculty, perhaps as a choice between a midday option, an afternoon option, and the current practice of evening meetings.

If daytime meetings were shorter, could steps be taken to make them more efficient? Could there be a consent agenda for noncontroversial items? Would there be room for discussion?

There was a review of why we are discussing this issue: lack of day care; the difficulty some faculty have in attending evening meetings; the desire for time in the schedule for important community activities. It was noted that Carleton has afternoon faculty meetings. The question was raised whether Bon Appétit could be flexible with mealtimes if any activities ran late because of schedule changes.

The next step is to get reaction to the new 5th option. The Chair and a small group of members will also try to see if there are any problems with option 5 that can be examined before our next meeting. The Chair will contact the College Pastor for comments.

Here is a summary of the initial reports from departments:

Theater prefers option 3, or, in any case, a midday faculty meeting.

Dance would have difficulty with all options due to staff and space constraints. Friday afternoons are acceptable. The new option 5 would work also.

Music offered option 5. There are different problems with each of the other options.

Math favored option 1, but without consensus. Option 3 might work with one day only.

Physics is strongly opposed to options 1-3, and prefers evening faculty meetings.

Chemistry is opposed to options 1-3. Option 4 could work on Fridays.

Biology is similar to Chemistry, and also prefer evening faculty meetings.

It was noted that the new option 5 might cause labs to run too late.

IGS reported a split between options 1 and 3, and reported excitement about the possibility of an activities period.

History supported option 1 unanimously.

English prefers option 1.

Religion prefers option 1, with some support for option 3.

French prefers options 2 or 3.

Nursing favors the status quo because of busy daytime commuting schedules.

Physical Education is opposed to lengthening the class schedule and prefers option 1.

Political Science is excited about the option 3 activities period.

Economics would prefer not to have a daytime meeting on Mondays, but all options are acceptable.

REPORTS OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE REVIEW OF TENURE AND PROMOTION PROCEDURES AND POLICIES: RPC received a study document on post-tenure assessment. There was some discussion of the role post-tenure assessment should play. It should be a formative review. St. Olaf should lead rather than follow on this issue: develop a plan before having to react to a demand for this. RPC was asked by the Chair to decide what we should consider in this issue.

Perhaps the Dean could send someone to AAHE?

P. 17 of the study document includes a report by David Schodt about post-tenure review models. Also there is a current plan for post-tenure review that should be examined as we consider this issue.

Next week, RPC will begin to examine the recommendations of Report 1 so that we can get implementing language for those items.

The meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,
Peter Hamlin, Secretary