

Rollins College

Rollins Scholarship Online

Faculty Affairs Committee Minutes

College of Liberal Arts Minutes and Reports

9-24-2019

Minutes, Faculty Affairs Committee Meeting, Tuesday, September 24, 2019

Faculty Affairs Committee

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

Faculty Affairs Committee
Approved Minutes for Sep 24, 2019

Members in Attendance:

Don Davidson, Chairperson 2019-2021
Leigh DeLorenzi, Social Sciences-Applied Rep, 2019-2020
Ben Hudson, 2018 – 2020, Humanities Rep 2018-2020
Rachelle Yankelevitz, Science Division Rep, 2019-2021
Ashley Cannaday, At-Large Rep 2019-2021
Don Davidson, At-Large Rep, 2019-2021
Samuel Sanabria, At-Large Rep, 2019-2021
John Grau, Expressive Arts Rep, 2018-2020
Leslie Poole, At-Large Rep, 2019-2021
David Caban, Business Rep, 2019-2021

VISITORS

Jenny Cavanaugh, Dean

12:30 Meeting called to Order

Secretary: Leigh DeLorenzi

1. Motion to Approve Minutes from 9/10
 - a. Approved with spelling corrections of names.
2. Update from Don on Executive Committee meeting
 - a. EC met to discuss the Tenure and Promotion Working Group Task Force Report
 - b. FAC has been charged with making recommendations on assessment of teaching quality (i.e., CIEs) at Rollins.
3. CIE White Paper Discussion
 - a. Discussion about how to organize the White Paper on CIEs
 - b. Suggestion that FAC should expand on Ben's recent white paper on a related topic.
 - c. Discussion on whether members of FAC should pair up and develop 2-3 page summaries of the research on the following four topics regarding faculty CIEs and:
 - i. Racial Bias
 - ii. Gender Bias
 - iii. Sexual Orientation Bias
 - iv. Ability Bias
 - d. Proposed estimated length of white paper is 8-12 pages, presenting the science of CIEs and an overview of concerns from the literature (December 1, 2019).
 - e. Plan is for FAC to use Spring Semester 2020 to formulate recommendations on best practices for teaching evaluations at Rollins.
 - f. Question about whether we should also include other topics related to CIEs (i.e., the disconnect between CIEs and student learning).
 - g. FAC members agreed to read a number of articles on bias in CIE, and will return in two weeks to focus the discussion about how best to evaluate faculty at Rollins.

4. All Faculty ByLaws, Article VI, Section 3 states the following:

Section 3. Recommendations and Authority in Appeals Cases

After reviewing the case, the All-Faculty 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. 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 All-Faculty Appeals Committee affirms the original decision to deny tenure or promotion.

- a. Grant and Susan have requested clarification on the above cited By-Law. Specifically, they would like for FAC to provide greater detail on what recommending a new evaluation should entail.
 - b. Context: all-faculty appeals committee has authority over procedural matters, not substantive. (i.e., a violation of procedure or bias in faculty evaluation)
 - c. In the case of an appeal, if the faculty appeals committee determines there was a procedural flaw, they can recommend a new evaluation. The above-cited ByLaw does not elaborate on how the new evaluation should be done, who should be present, whether there should be separate committee, etc.
 - d. The FAC discussed the following questions:
 - i. If an appeal is approved, does the appeal committee recommend the evaluation be done again from scratch?
 - ii. Rather than starting an evaluation from scratch, would it be more efficient to remand it back to the point of error and ask the appeals committee to identify the procedural flaw, provide corrective action, and then conduct the evaluation from the point of error?
 - iii. What happens if the error occurs at the CEC, Dean, or Provost level?
 - iv. Does the appeals committee give some description/instruction around what they believe is the procedural error or provide a written justification for the decision?
 - v. Should a hybrid committee be formed (i.e., FEC with CEC and/or an external review from outside of the institution) or is this the role of the FEC liaison who is charged with making sure the CEC is following its own standards and applying its own criteria?
 - e. Discussion on examples of violations of procedure (i.e., a vote isn't taken, or a CEC fails to apply their own criteria). Several members requested clarification as to what differentiates a procedural error from a substantive error.
 - f. Discussion as to whether the appeals committee should provide a written report to the FEC, then have the FEC determine how best to proceed. FEC would serve in an operational role to specify which corrective steps should happen, and centralizes the power/authority in matters of tenure and promotion
 - g. Due to time constraints, the discussion on ByLaw clarification is suspended until the next FAC meeting in two weeks.
5. Faculty Salaries
- a. FAC Chair to meet with Provost to discuss the matter of senior faculty salaries.

- b. The primary reported concerns of some senior faculty are that senior faculty salaries are low, and that previous adjustments in salary were not sufficient.
 - c. Brief discussion on concerns that the faculty pool available for making salary adjustments may be strained by multiple parties (i.e., the pool is also needed for adjusting lecturer salaries). Are there other sources of funding for faculty raises?
 - d. FAC will request from Provost concrete salary figures/ranges of Rollins Faculty, and continue the discussion in the next FAC meeting in two weeks.
6. Meeting Adjourned