

11-22-2016

Minutes, Faculty Affairs Committee Meeting, Tuesday, November 22, 2016

Faculty Affairs Committee
College of Liberal Arts, Rollins College

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

Recommended Citation

Faculty Affairs Committee, "Minutes, Faculty Affairs Committee Meeting, Tuesday, November 22, 2016" (2016). *Faculty Affairs Committee Minutes*. Paper 11.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_fa/11

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Liberal Arts Minutes and Reports at Rollins Scholarship Online. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Affairs Committee Minutes by an authorized administrator of Rollins Scholarship Online. For more information, please contact rwalton@rollins.edu.

**Faculty Affairs Committee
Minutes for November 22nd, 2016 Meeting**

Committee Members Terms and Affiliation

Julian Chambliss 2016-2017, Social Sciences Rep
Bobby Fokidis, 2016-2017, at Large Rep
Eric Smaw 2016 – 2017, Humanities Rep
Marianne DiQuattro 2016-2018, Expressive Arts Rep
Stacey Dunn 2016-2018, Science Division Rep
Erin Gallagher 2016-2018, at Large Rep
Joshua Hammonds 2016-2018, Applied Social Sciences Rep
Amy McClure, 2016 – 2017, at Large Rep
Denise Parris, 2016-2018, Business Rep

Committee Members in Attendance

Julian Chambliss 2016-2017, Social Sciences Rep
Bobby Fokidis, 2016-2017, at Large Rep
Eric Smaw 2016 – 2017, Humanities Rep
Marianne DiQuattro 2016-2018, Expressive Arts Rep
Stacey Dunn 2016-2018, Science Division Rep
Erin Gallagher 2016-2018, at Large Rep
Joshua Hammonds 2016-2018, Applied Social Sciences Rep
Amy McClure, 2016 – 2017, at Large Rep
Dexter Boniface, President of Faculty, Guest
Udeth Lugo, Guest
Grant Cornwell, President, Guest
Susan Libby, Guest
Kim Dennis, Guest

I. Call to order: Meeting called to order at 12:30 pm.

II. Approval of Minutes:

- a. An addition was made to the minutes from Nov. 15th. Committee approved revised minutes via email vote.

III. Old Business:

- a. Postponed until November 29th, 2016.

IV. New Business:

- a. Discussed the methodology and criteria for determining peer schools:

President Cornwell introduced the topic (via conference phone) and offered his support through this process.

Udeth opened the review of each criterion and invited questions about the methodology.

Clarification question about co-ed institutions – how would including single-sex schools have impacted list? Udeth explained that it was a matter of choosing schools that most closely matched Rollins. Only two schools were left off of list because they were single-sex.

Question about how this list will be used. Udeth explained that the list will be useful for some purposes (institution-wide questions), but not others (e.g., self-study of individual departments). President Cornwell mentioned that there will be questions we have further down the road when we want to compare ourselves to peer schools on a variety of issues such as IT or Student Affairs staffing. For now, however, we will be doing more specific analyses such as examining faculty and staff salary and compensation. Later we may utilize the benchmarking list to look at broader educational issues.

Question about faculty size at different institutions. President Cornwell and Udeth explained that faculty-student ratio was considered, but most of the schools look very similar (12:1 to 10:1) and this did not prove to be a helpful variable. President Cornwell suggested that if anyone sees schools on the list that ought to be excluded for a reason, to raise that concern (e.g., because their mission or methods departs from ours).

Question about criteria #6 regarding idiosyncratic differences and what those might be. President Cornwell gave the example of Bard College and how their budgetary practices are so far from standard practices that comparing ourselves to them would not be useful.

Question about the list in context of salary compensation comparisons. Do we know how they deal with these issues yet? President Cornwell and Eric shared that we don't have this information yet.

Question about geographic region and why it was not considered. Wouldn't location impact resources per student? President Cornwell explained that there are few colleges like us in the southeast region. Most private liberal arts colleges are in the Northeast, Midwest or West.

Question about HEDS – do they share their salary information? We are members but do not know our own information. Udeh explained that we won't know until we move further into process. HEDS draws upon IPEDS and AAUP.

Question on Criterion #2, why 3 years? It was a compromise – IPEDS is often late in posting data. Using 3 years is better than using 1 year because it allows us to get an average of resources per student over time, but 5 years may be too far out because the data might not be available for 6 or 7 years.

President Cornwell shared that he is hoping that the benchmarking criteria will move forward so that FAC can dive into the charge of examining compensation structure. He prefers greater transparency in faculty salary rather than Rollins' tradition of keeping that information very private. We need to examine salary issues regularly and need to look at the granular level to move forward.

Dexter shared that the tradition of privacy around salary is relatively recent and he shared President Cornwell's desire for return to greater transparency. Dexter commented that it is helpful that we have a methodology (at all!) and in looking at the resulting list he finds it to be acceptable – a reasonable list of schools that passes the “smell test” and offers the promise of having a serious benchmarking group.

Eric noted that we have achieved two important goals (1) establishing an institutional structure for reviewing faculty salaries in FAC, (2) establishing benchmarking criteria. We now need to establish a body

of internal and external information about salaries. Each of these will be helpful to future committees in continuing our work.

Udeth stated that core resources per student tells us about our capacity to educate and produces a list that is similar to the lists we get when we use other variables.

Committee voted unanimously in favor of approving the benchmarking criterion statement and passing it along to EEC.

- b. Discussed the memo to the Provost regarding non-certificate programs. Two small changes were made and the committee approved the revised memo via email after the meeting.
- c. Briefly discussed plans for facilitating meetings with faculty to address benchmarking criterion statement.

V. Adjourned: Meeting was adjourned at 1:57 pm.