

Rollins College

## Rollins Scholarship Online

---

Faculty Affairs Committee Minutes

College of Liberal Arts Minutes and Reports

---

10-8-2019

### **Minutes, Faculty Affairs Committee Meeting, Tuesday, October 8, 2019**

Faculty Affairs Committee

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholarship.rollins.edu/as\\_fa](https://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_fa)

---

**Faculty Affairs Committee**  
**October 8, 2019**  
**CSS 167**  
**12:30 – 1:45**  
**Approved Minutes**

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  
Leslie Poole, At-Large Rep, 2019-2021  
David Caban, Business Rep, 2019-2021  
John Grau, Expressive Arts Rep, 2018-2020

12:30 Meeting called to Order  
Secretary: Leigh DeLorenzi

- I. Call to Order
- II. Motion to approve minutes from 9/24/19
  - a. Approved
- III. Announcements
  1. Updates from Don on Executive Committee Meeting:
    - a. The Executive Committee created a sub-committee of divisional reps to form a search committee for replacing Associate Dean of Curriculum, Emily Russell. There were some recommendations for Dean Cavanaugh be added to the sub-committee since the Associate Dean of Curriculum will be working closely with the Dean of the Faculty.
    - b. The EC discussed the FAC recommendations regarding lecturer promotion and salaries. The President and Provost requested clarification and guidance on the base salary recommendation of \$55K for senior lecturers, and voiced concern that this proposed salary increase would deplete the raise pool used for all faculty across the college. FAC Chair recommended that the senior lecturer salary recommendations be viewed as aspirational, where the college can show good-faith incremental progress toward the salary ideal over time.
    - c. EC considered whether the FAC Chair should decide if and how lecturer salaries might be funded with the faculty raise pool. Don stated he did not believe he had the authority to decide if or how the raise pool should be allocated for lecturer raises, and instead deferred to administrators who might have more information on the financial health of the college. Don, Grant, and Susan will meet again in late October to discuss the issue further.

- d. EC endorsed principles 1, 5, 6, 7, and 8 of the senior lecturer promotion recommendations. Due to time constraints, EC tabled the decision on principles 2, 3, and 4 and will resume the discussion over the next two EC meetings.
- e. Don asked for feedback from FAC committee members on the EC meeting outcomes
  - i. FAC discussed the need for a systemic response to solve the complex issue of funding faculty salaries.
  - ii. FAC discussed the difficulty of balancing competing demands faced by administrators in the higher education marketplace. When finite resources have to be allocated to many, it's difficult to find a single equitable solution where no one is placed at a disadvantage.
  - iii. FAC members echoed concerns as to whether Don has the proper authority to make a decision regarding how salaries are allocated, citing that FAC lacks a holistic view of the budget. Additionally, committee members expressed concerns about placing FAC in the position to authorize salary decisions of peers, potentially prioritizing the needs of one group of faculty over another.
  - iv. Some FAC members voiced an opinion that the role of the committee is to deliver the recommendations to EC, but not to directly authorize financial decisions.
  - v. Committee members discussed whether EC would be a more appropriate body to decide the issue of whether lecturer salaries are paid from the faculty raise pool, or whether another solution is possible through a new funding model.
  - vi. Don to communicate FAC feedback at the next EC meeting.

#### IV. Old Business

- 1. In the last meeting FAC was asked to clarify the language of a bylaw regarding faculty appeals (Article VI, Section 3, All Faculty Bylaws of the College)

**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. Jennifer Cavanaugh and Don distributed 4 examples from peer institutions with similar policies. From those examples, Don drafted the following bylaw revision choices for FAC consideration:

*If the Appeals Committee recommends a new evaluation, then it must submit a written report clarifying the procedural error which is sent with the original decision for reconsideration . . .*

*(a) back to the point where the error occurred.*

*or,*

*(b) to the President for review.*

*Only the evaluation materials submitted with the original file may be considered in the new evaluation.*

- b. Discussion: FAC discussed whether another option should include the Provost in the new evaluation, or if that would present HR conflicts and/or privacy challenges.
- c. FAC discussed how issues or violations outside of procedural errors (e.g., a candidate's unethical behavior) should trigger a separate response from HR to address those issues.
- d. FAC members reach a consensus that the bylaw language revision should direct the appeals committee... *to submit a written report clarifying the procedural error which is sent with the original decision for reconsideration back to the point where the error occurred.*
- e. **Motion to approve bylaw revision:**
  - (a) Motion: Don
  - (b) Second: Ben
  - (c) Approved by voice vote at 1:25pm.

2. CIE White Paper Next Steps

- a. Discussion as to whether FAC should maintain focus specifically on the issue of gender and racial bias in CIEs, or if FAC should focus more broadly on outlining best-practice recommendations for evaluating teaching at Rollins.
- b. Discussion on how we might consider evidence-based strategies for evaluating teaching (i.e., thoughtful peer-mentorship).
- c. How can we look holistically at a teacher's performance without ignoring themes that might emerge from the student narratives in CIEs.
- d. FAC members will continue to review the literature on evidenced-based strategies for evaluating teaching and examine methods from other institutions.
- e. FAC will continue discussing this at the next meeting

V. New Business

1. Chair for FAC meeting of 10/22/2019

- a. Don will be late to the 10/22/19 FAC meeting due to a schedule conflict, and asks if someone will Chair the meeting, or if it should be rescheduled.
- b. Ben Hudson agrees to chair the 10/22/19 FAC meeting until Don arrives.

VI. Adjourn