Faculty Affairs Committee Minutes   College of Liberal Arts Minutes and Reports

12-3-2019

Minutes, Faculty Affairs Committee Meeting, Tuesday, December 3, 2019

Faculty Affairs Committee

Don Davidson, Chairperson 2019-2021
Ben Hudson, 2018 – 2020, Humanities Rep 2018-2020
Ashley Cannaday, At-Large Rep 2019-2021
Don Davidson, 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
Leigh DeLorenzi, Social Sciences-Applied Rep, 2019-2020
Rachelle Yankelevitz, Science Division Rep, 2019-2021
Absent due to scheduling conflict: Samuel Sanabria, At-Large Rep, 2019-2021

Secretary: Leigh DeLorenzi, Social Sciences-Applied Rep, 2019-2020
Guest: Dean Jennifer Cavanaugh

I.   Call to Order

II.   Approval of minutes from November 19, 2019 (attached)
        a. Approved

III.   Announcements
        1. **Update on our new faculty satisfaction assessment, COACHE—Sam**
            a. Delayed to next FAC meeting.

        2. **Teaching evaluations White Paper**
            a. Don created a Sharepoint for FAC members to work on the white paper. He included some references from Samuel to the document and adjusted formatting.
            b. Don asked Myrna in IT to gather some aggregate data (over last 3 semesters) on the average mean raw CIE scores with standard deviations for men and women at Rollins College. Don will distribute these findings once he receives them from Myrna. After this initial analysis of CIE scores by gender, CIE scores by rank and division will also be analyzed in the future.
            c. **Action**: FAC members to open White Paper document in Sharepoint and edit accordingly – click on "open in desktop app" to see Don's tracked changes.
            d. Jenny voiced an open invitation to a willing member of the FAC committee to attend the Association of Dean's conference on evaluating teaching on March 20-22. Interested members to reach out to Jenny or Don.

        3. **Update regarding CIE administration**
            a. IT reported technical issues with CIE administration this semester. Too many emails were sent to students, which flooded the system. IT made adjustments by reducing the number of emails sent to students from 11,439 to 2,754 per day, or about a 76% reduction in daily email traffic.
            b. Don reports the following CIE completion totals for the last three semesters:

       i.   Fall 2018 = 3163

      ii.   Spring 2019 = 3123

    iii.   Fall 2019 = 3400 (11 percent increase)

         1.   Does the one-week (versus two-week) break after classes makes a difference on response rate? Don to check on this.

   c.   IT is working on creating a CIE tab within Canvas for students to simplify the process. The first step will be to test it with a few classes to make sure the system works before implementing it college-wide.

   d.   Other CIE preferences:

       i.   Jenny: research shows that explicitly stating that CIEs can have a racial/gender bias at the top of the assessment might help offset it from occurring.

      ii.   Removing items that have an "affective" dimension. (i.e., "Do you feel…") in favor of questions that are factual in nature.

    iii.   Focusing on the raw scores and removing the percentiles, which do not accurately portray how professors are comparing due to skew.

IV.   Old Business

   1. Disruptive Student Policy (revised version attached)

      a.   Clarification that departments with more stringent behavioral standards (i.e., Graduate Counseling) are able to defer to their procedures and requirements, as long as it's published in the appropriate places (i.e., syllabus, student handbook).

      b.   FAC voted to endorse the revised policy.

   2. Endowed Chair Policy

      a.   Don reached out to EC stating that FAC endorsed the revised version of the endowed chair policy. He also offered to hold a faculty colloquium for discussing the most current version of the Endowed Chair policy, scheduled during a time when FEC members can be there. He is waiting for a response from Paul and will update FAC as soon as he receives a response.

   3. Size and membership of FEC (CLA Bylaws: Article VIII/Part E/Section 2)

     FAC to begin to draft bylaw changes, first focusing on size, then on membership.

     a. FEC Size:

       i.   *Background*: Current bylaw allows for 6 FEC members, with 1 alternate. If 18 or more promotion cases are in process, then the alternate becomes a regular member. The makeup of committee is one per division and one at large (who serves as alternate). EC puts out who is eligible by division, and then the committee reviews and selects/nominates members to reflect a demographic balance.

      ii.   Currently, there are 31 cases moving through (tenure and midcourse), which is a very large workload for the committee. A few approaches for easing the workload were discussed as follows:

         1.   Creating an algorithm/formula to adjust the size of FEC based on the number of tenure and promotion cases.

            a.   **Option 1:** Paul suggested that after 18 cases, FEC could add 1 FEC member for every 3 cases added.

                i.   Concern: FEC could become too large, and we want to recommend a method that maintains the consistency and continuity of the body. If the membership becomes too

fluid, it might sacrifice continuity, even-handedness, and consistency of evaluating tenure cases.

  b. **Option 2:** Increase the number of FEC members by 1 for every 4 promotion cases, but also implementing a cap on the size of FEC not to exceed set number. Suggestion to defer to FEC for the setting the ideal number.

    i. Concern: FEC members meet during the CLA faculty meetings, and thus are not able to weigh in. This is problematic because they are frequently the most senior members of the faculty with a lot of institutional wisdom.

    ii. One idea would be to ask FEC to change their meeting times from 12:30pm to another time that does not conflict with the CLA faculty meeting.

2. Reconsider the responsibilities of FEC and the sequencing of cases. Part of FEC's time is spent on evaluating the departmental criteria, which can create one to two years of negotiation with departments regarding their criteria. Don proposes giving that task to another body (like FAC, for example).

  a. Concern: FEC should be the committee (body) to review departmental criteria because they are the ones evaluating tenure.

  b. Desire to create consistency and comparability of expectations across departments

  c. Jenny's input: she appreciates reading the CEC letter and finds it very helpful. She is not sure how much time would be saved (a couple of weeks?) if they delegate that task to someone else.

3. Other questions posed:

  a. Should alternates be reserved for midcourse reviews?

    i. Concern: Creating two groups (segregating midcourse vs tenure assignments) might increase the likelihood of inconsistency. Keeping those involved in tenure decisions at midcourse will ensure consistency.

  b. Should FEC be the people to decide on the issue (govern themselves) in adding more members if they are overloaded, rather than putting it in a bylaw?

    i. It's important for FAC to examine the process, in collaboration with FEC, so that we can all look at how FEC is functioning.

 iii. **Action**: Based on FAC feedback, Don to recommend instituting an algorithm/formula (Option 2 above) where FEC increases by 1 person per every 4 cases, but only up to a maximum (ideal) size – which we will ask FEC to help us determine.

b. <mark>**FEC Membership**</mark>

 i. *Background*: The tenure and promotion working group recommended that FEC allow for members at the rank of associate.

 ii. Ideas for changes to membership were discussed as follows:

  1. Allowing tenured faculty with the rank of full or associate to serve on FEC, with the majority being full professors.

    a. Should there be a 2/3 super majority rule added?

          b. This might limit women members because there are fewer women who are full professors.
2. Of note: last year's FEC committee was opposed to having Associates on committee, but the straw poll at a previous faculty meeting showed faculty support for the idea.
          iii. **Action**: Based on FAC feedback, Don to proposes allowing tenured faculty with the rank of full or associate to serve on FEC, with a simple majority of full professors. Don to solicit the advice and insight of FEC members on this idea.

4. **Moving Diversity Committee and Student Life Committee into CLA governance structure (Bylaw)**
   a. Concern about staff losing representation if they moved to those committees.
   b. Ideas discussed:
      i. Since members of these committees are saying they do not feel they have a voice in important conversations at the College, what if each member of these committees were also appointed (simultaneously) to sit on other committees?
         1. Will this make a difference, or will this be mostly a symbolic move without giving them the authority to make decisions?
   c. Conversation tabled to next meeting due to time.

V.   Adjourn

Communication from Gabriel Barreneche,

Dear Don,

Our team has addressed the questions raised by FAC (communicated to us by Dean Cavenaugh) and revised the appropriate sections of the Disruptive Student Policy (attached).

Below are answers to the other questions that the committee had about the policy.

Thank you and the FAC for your consideration.

Best wishes,

GB

1) can the policy include somewhere language that talks about behaviors that maybe inappropriate but due to a student being on the spectrum? Accessibility Services noted that the policy should not single out a particular population in this policy. If this is a policy that is approved for all students, then all students will have to be held accountable to it – which would include our students on the spectrum. Faculty should contact Accessibility Services with concerns about students on the spectrum.

2) clarify removal from the "educational experience" in the "Interim Measure" section - does this mean removal from campus or just the class/experience? The most likely scenario is removal from that one class or experience, unless we believed that there was reason to remove the student from more than just that one experience or class.

3) in the "withdrawal of student from class..." section - include that instructor will be part of consultation on an involuntary withdrawal "...The applicable academic dean of the college in which the course or educational experience is located shall work in consultation with the Director of Community Standards & Responsibility, **the instructor,** and the Dean of Student Affairs to determine..." Modified the language to include this.

4) In the "Grade following withdrawal from course or other education experience" section - clarify if the student would be allowed to complete a course if involuntarily removed (ie. finish a course remotely) Language modified in new draft.

5) Graduate Counseling has stronger departmental policies in place regarding respecting faculty and peers already - asked if this policy would be in addition to their departmental policy. It could certainly be in addition to that. If their policies are *stronger*, that's fine - it's only when they are more lax that it is problematic. They can reserve the right to have stronger standards if it doesn't interfere with any existing policies.

Gabriel I. Barreneche, Ph.D.

Associate Dean for Advising

Rollins College

407.646.2280 I gbarreneche@rollins.edu