

Rollins College

Rollins Scholarship Online

Faculty Affairs Committee Minutes

College of Liberal Arts Minutes and Reports

2-18-2020

Minutes, Faculty Affairs Committee Meeting, Tuesday, February 18, 2020

Faculty Affairs Committee
College of Liberal Arts, Rollins College

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

Recommended Citation

Faculty Affairs Committee, "Minutes, Faculty Affairs Committee Meeting, Tuesday, February 18, 2020" (2020). *Faculty Affairs Committee Minutes*. 57.
https://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_fa/57

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

Meeting of February 18, 2020

CSS 217

12:30 – 1:45

Approved

Members in Attendance:

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

David Caban, Business Rep, 2019-2021

John Grau, Expressive Arts Rep, 2018-2020

Leigh DeLorenzi, Social Sciences-Applied Rep, 2019-2020

Samuel Sanabria, At-Large Rep, 2019-2021

Rachelle Yankelevitz, Science Division Rep, 2019-2021

Secretary: Leigh DeLorenzi, Social Sciences-Applied Rep, 2019-2020

Absent due to scheduling conflict: Leslie Poole, At-Large Rep, 2019-2021

Guests in Attendance:

Dean Jennifer Cavanaugh

Kathryn Norsworthy

Susan Singer

Meghal Parikh

- I. Call to Order
- II. Approval of Minutes (attachments)
 - a. February 4th Minutes – Approved
 - b. February 12th Minutes -- Approved
- III. New Business
 - a. Endowed Chair recommendations
 - i. Discussion as to how FAC should proceed with the Endowed Chair policy and/or revisions. Below is a summary of the key points:
 - Senior faculty are not feeling respected or appreciated for the work that they do. FAC should first ask administration to prioritize funding to recognize senior faculty for their contributions. It seems the focus has been on several capital projects around campus, but little being done to invest in faculty. Second, any changes to endowed chair policy should apply to those candidates who apply for a chair in the future, not to those currently holding an endowed chair. Lastly, once an endowed chair receives that title, they should retain the title of

Endowed Chair into perpetuity, while also allowing the benefits (e.g., course releases, stipend, pay raise) to rotate to other colleagues holding the chair after a 6-year term. Request for Guest, Kathryn Norsworthy, to share her thoughts.

- **Kathryn Norsworthy Responds:** Expresses appreciation for the work of the FAC on the matter. After a long career of almost 30 years at Rollins, the part of this that is most upsetting is the way the process has unfolded. The language in the recent reappointment letters was discouraging for the current endowed chairs. The institution should be taking steps to nurture relationships with faculty, and to keep those relationships safe and trusting. The language in the letters recently sent out to Endowed Chairs (i.e., 2-year term at which time they *may* be eligible for renewal) does not promote trust, security, or loyalty.
- **Don:** I want to recognize procedural rules for the meeting. Guests are not permitted to comment unless formally recognized by the Chair to speak. Guests are welcome to attend the meeting, but the topic should be discussed primarily by the committee.
- In a technical sense, all chairs have a term limit, because there is an implicit suggestion that these could rotate to other faculty – which does not happen often, but has happened. Creating a two-tiered system would be new, and Cornell Chairs may experience that as a demotion. Most Cornell Chairs are currently women, and we should keep that in mind.
- In response to the observation that most Cornell Chairs are women, should we be making policy decisions solely based on the makeup of the Cornell Chairs right now?
- The alternate policy drafted by FAC last year was an attempt to make a compromise.
- There is a need to hear from all parties involved. As a committee, we have heard the rationale for not having a rotation/tiered system, but we have not heard from those holding opposing viewpoints.
- The rationale for having a rotation would be that we could spread those benefits over more of the faculty, rather than awarding that to only a small group of faculty.
- One could presume that the odds would be in favor of the senior faculty to receive these endowed chairs (even if they are rotating) because they will likely have more time and experience as a function of their rank.
- Why can't we spread the benefits to more members of the faculty without causing harm to the person currently holding a Chair that would have to give up the chair?
- This is set up as a zero-sum game, there are no clear “winners.”

- FACs first recommendation to administration should be to raise more money to properly recognize senior faculty. I am not committed to the tier system, but I am in favor of term limits. 80 percent voted in favor of term limits. It would be a good compromise to let Endowed Chairs keep their title, while allowing their benefits to rotate after a term limit is reached.
- There may be other alternatives possible that have not been discussed outside of these options.
 - Discussion as to whether or not FAC agrees the system should be tiered. If not tiered, move toward the earlier proposal that current Endowed Chairs are “grandfathered” in, and all future policy changes should apply only to future chairs. We would still need to decide what happens after a Chair is vacated, are all chairs then rotational? Or should there be a maximum amount of time that anyone can hold a chair?
 - Need for clarification between fixed term limits and rotation – these are different issues.
 - Discussion about the previous CLA meeting vote, and reasons why the language leading up to the straw poll created confusion. The faculty were split between who was for the term limit, and those who were opposed/undecided.
 - Several FAC members acknowledged that when they voted during that straw poll, they did not realize they were voting for fixed term limits instead of rotation. Some members concerned about relying on the straw poll for direction after acknowledging that they were also confused during the vote. Others disagree and think that if faculty were confused, they had the ability to abstain.
 - Motion to vote against making it a tiered system.
 - FAC members express concern about voting because they are still confused about the implications of a vote, and the terminology confusion around rotations, tiered systems, etc. Several attempts to clarify the terminology for FAC members needing more information.
 - Discussion about one particular Endowed Chair who was not informed that her chair was rotating, even though historically the chair was considered rotating. Caution that FAC should not serve as a grievance committee but as a policy committee.
 - Two FAC members voice support for not making it a tiered system, but making all chairs go up for reconsideration after a certain amount of time.
 - Three FAC members voice support for the earlier proposition that current Endowed Chairs be grandfathered in, and all future policy be applied to incoming chairs who are informed the chair is rotating

upon application. We need to carefully consider the implications for all of these options.

- Two members voice opposition to holding a vote until everyone on FAC feels comfortable because the topic is complex and confusing, and we should take our time to consider the implications carefully.

b. CIE results (Dr. Susan Singer and Meghal Parikh)

- i. Susan – Satisfactory teaching is a prerequisite to tenure. Here being average is not sufficient. Conversation has been we don't have sound ways to do that. Implicit bias affects response to student survey. Canada can no longer use student report due to bias. Words that students use to describe men and women. For men, as they age, the ratings go up. For women, as they age, ratings go down. Rollins has a well-developed tool for student evaluations with sound psychometrics. Bias is impacting our surveys. I don't think we need to invent a better assessment, because human beings are bias. Presents other tools for teaching evaluations from TEVAL.org. What are all the different ways we can measure teaching effectiveness? I hope we look at these results and not go into how we should reinvent the instrument.
- ii. Meghal – Main objective was to see if there was a gender bias in our CIEs. The results reflect only full time CLA faculty, no Holt sections included in the analysis. Data spans from Fall 2016 to Fall 2019, seven semesters. Results indicate that gender bias at Rollins is consistent with national trends. There was a statistically significant negative bias toward women faculty compared to male faculty.
- iii. Susan – may want to look at how this impacts a professor, over time, how they perceive the feedback. For example, women tend to get very concerned and attempt to address it, while men tend to brush off the results and keep going. Gender bias in CIEs begins to further erode the confidence of women and underrepresented groups. Every semester this is chipping away at a person's sense of confidence.
- iv. Susan – We are bringing this to FAC because we want to be transparent and work together to examine this problem, and also see that we are facing the same problems related to gender bias in teaching as other institutions. This is a great starting point for us to consider better, more reliable methods for evaluating teaching. When we present this to the faculty, we should carefully consider the language to make sure the results are not taken out of context. Provost requests that we run any language with her so she can also show it to the college legal counsel. We want to be sure not to misconstrue the results in a manner that could potentially further alienate pre-tenured women and faculty of color.
- v. FAC to include the results in the final edition of the white paper that will be shared with the faculty.

- c. Language for bylaw revision (attached) – We will address this in the next faculty meeting.

IV. Adjourn