

Rollins College

Rollins Scholarship Online

Faculty Affairs Committee Minutes

College of Liberal Arts Minutes and Reports

4-6-2021

Minutes, Faculty Affairs Committee Meeting, Tuesday, April 6, 2021

Faculty Affairs Committee

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

Faculty Affairs Committee

Approved on April 20, 2021

**Agenda 13
Meeting of April 6, 2021
12:30 – 1:45**

WebEx: <https://rollins.webex.com/meet/ddavison>

Don Davidson, Chairperson 2019-2021
Missy Barnes, Expressive Arts Rep 2020-2022
David Caban, Business Rep, 2019-2021
Ashley Cannaday, At-Large Rep 2019-2021
Don Davidson, At-Large Rep, 2019-2021
Leslie Poole, At-Large Rep, 2019-2021
Margaret McLaren, Humanities Rep, 2020-2022
Leigh DeLorenzi, Social Sciences-Applied Rep, 2020-2022
Rachelle Yankelevitz, Science Division Rep, 2019-2021 (took minutes)
Samuel Sanabria, At-Large Rep, 2019-2021
Absent: Leigh DeLorenzi, Social Sciences-Applied Rep, 2020-2022

Guests:

Jenny Cavanaugh
Karla Knight

- I. Call to Order
- II. Approval of Minutes
 - A. March 23, 2021
Approved unanimously.
- III. New Business
 - A. Finish work on FSAR (attachment)
 - a. A subcommittee led by Margaret and including Missy, Rachelle, and Samuel met last week to crease a FSAR revision proposal.
 - b. Jenny confirmed that the FSAR is required to be completed to be eligible for internal grants.
 - c. Subcommittee members felt that one aversive aspect of the FSAR was the feeling that after filling it in, many items were left blank, because no one does everything every year. Our main revision strategy was to consolidate items into about 1-3 text boxes under each area of accomplishments. The

revised FSAR proposal mentions the same prompts as previous FSAR, but consolidates them.

- i. For example, rather than separate boxes for separate teaching-related activities, there is one “teaching” prompt with bulleted suggestions and a single comment box. This reduces the burden to put responses into each separate field. There are also comment boxes for advising and mentoring.
 - ii. Similarly streamlined the service section.
- d. Subcommittee did not revise the research section, because more info is needed on how the info in this section is used. Will consult with Toni and Deborah before revising this in order to better understand their needs as users of the data. We would like to streamline the many fields into fewer items, but do not want to make it more difficult to extract the data.
 - i. One idea is the user creates an “entry” consisting of two parts: 1.) a dropdown menu designating the publication type, and 2.) corresponding text box for the reference info. The user can then add as many “entries” as needed.
- e. Added mentoring under each of the teaching, research, and service categories. The hope is this will allow users to report their activities related to mentoring students and colleagues, which is an important value.
- f. Left the final section about goals as is, since this section is working well for the administrators who use the form.
- g. Will add a text box in the scholarly activities section for works in progress or other scholarly work that does not fit into a publication.
- h. Proposed including a word count guideline of 200-400 words per textbox. The box would not be limited to this number of words; this would be a guideline to help users know volumes of writing are not needed.
- i. Next steps: Margaret will send prototype; Jenny and Karla will check with Toni and Debora about potential revisions to scholarship section; Don will give EC an overview of this process; after more revision/discussion, Debora and Toni will review final prototype; Myrna will work on the programming adjustments.
- j. These changes will not take effect for this year but instead next year.

B. Other new business

- a. We discussed the recent faculty meeting conversation in which Don presented the CIE white paper. We shared interpretations of the meeting’s events.
 - i. The Diversity council response suggested they interpreted the purpose of the whitepaper to be offering recommendations, when the purpose was to evaluate the CIEs at Rollins in light of the national literature.

- ii. Consider more conversation/collaboration with the diversity committee in the future.
- iii. The faculty seems to want to deeply reevaluate the CIEs and their role in evaluation.
- iv. We questioned whether the FAC is the best body to undertake a revision of the CIEs. We discussed this potential role and its limits. We emphasized that FAC can participate in a conversation about an holistic view of evaluating faculty performance with CIEs being possibly one component.
- v. The campus has work to do on communicating with CECs and FECs about how to responsibly use CIEs. There is inconsistency among CECs across campus in how CIEs are used. We need more standardized practices for CECs, and guidance on how much weight CIEs should hold in candidate evaluation. They currently play a large role in evaluation.
- vi. CIEs do also play a role in supporting candidates when they can provide evidence to support a narrative of quality teaching.
- vii. When Don and the incoming FAC chair discuss the transition to next year's committee, they will emphasize that revising faculty evaluation should be a part of the committee's work.

IV. Adjourn