

Rollins College

Rollins Scholarship Online

Faculty Affairs Committee Minutes

College of Liberal Arts Minutes and Reports

6-1-2022

Annual Report, Faculty Affairs Committee, 2021-2022

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, "Annual Report, Faculty Affairs Committee, 2021-2022" (2022). *Faculty Affairs Committee Minutes*. 75.

https://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_fa/75

This Report 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.



Annual Report
Faculty Affairs Committee
Academic Year 2021-2022

Submitted by Missy Barnes, Chair

June 1, 2022

Faculty Affairs Committee members for Academic Year 2021-2022:

Business - David Caban (2020-2022)

Expressive Arts - Missy Barnes - (2020-2022)

Humanities - Todd French - (2021-2023)

Science and Mathematics - Sabrice Guerrier - (2021-2023)

Social Sciences - Stephanie Gonzalez Guittar - (2021-2023)

Social Sciences Applied - Leigh DeLorenzi - (2020-2022)

[Due to a family emergency, Leigh DeLorenzi stepped off the committee and was replaced by Allen Johnson for the remainder of the semester]

At large rep - Caitlyn Bennett (2021-2023)

At large rep - Hilary Cooperman (2021-2023)

At large rep – Hesham Mesbah (2021-2023)

Introduction

This year the members of FAC focused primarily on issues of equity as relates to CIEs and the Tenure and Promotion process at Rollins.

Below is a summary of the official actions taken by the Faculty Affairs Committee for the academic year 2021-2022.

It is organized into three sections: amendments to the CLA Faculty Bylaws proposed by the FAC, actions and reports conducted by the committee, and pending business that carries forward to the new committee for AY2021-2022. All reports and supporting documents are located in the Faculty Governance website and an electronic archive maintained by the Dean of Faculty Office.

Section I Bylaws Proposed by the Faculty Affairs Committee

A. Proposed Bylaw change allowing Associate Professors to serve on FEC

FAC was charged with considering the possibility of allowing tenured, associate professors to serve on FEC. Research of our benchmark institutions indicated that other colleges include associate professors on faculty tenure and promotion committees. After consideration and discussion, the members of FAC unanimously voted in favor of the proposed change laid out below. This item was then brought to EC, and ultimately the full faculty, for consideration.

Article VIII/ E./ Section 2. Faculty Evaluation Committee Structure and Evaluation

Current:

Section 2. Faculty Evaluation Committee Structure and Evaluation

a. Membership

This committee is constituted of six members and one alternate, all of whom must hold the rank of full professor. All members except the alternate are voting members. When the number of faculty to be reviewed by Faculty Evaluation Committee in a given year exceeds eighteen faculty, the alternate becomes a full voting member of the committee for that year. No more than five committee members will participate in the evaluation of any given candidate. Members of the Faculty Evaluation Committee are nominated by the Executive Committee of the Faculty and ratified by the Faculty by simple majority vote. Membership will normally include one tenured professor from each division of the College of Liberal Arts with consideration given to issues of diversity. Members will serve staggered three-year terms and may not serve consecutive terms. Members of the FEC receive one course-released time every year they serve on the Committee

Proposed:

a. Membership

This committee is constituted of six members and one alternate. It is preferred that members hold the rank of full professor but up to two members may be tenured, associate professors. All members except the alternate are voting members. When the number of faculty to be reviewed by Faculty Evaluation Committee in a given year exceeds eighteen faculty, the alternate becomes a full voting member of the committee for that year. No more than five committee members will participate in the evaluation of any given candidate. Members of the Faculty Evaluation Committee are nominated by the Executive Committee of the Faculty and ratified by the Faculty by simple majority vote. Membership will normally include one tenured professor from each division of the College of Liberal Arts with consideration given to issues of diversity. Members will serve staggered three-year terms and may not serve consecutive terms. Members of the FEC receive one course-released time every year they serve on the Committee.

B. Proposed Bylaw change allowing the FEC to evaluate a candidate for tenure and/or promotion when the CEC has submitted a negative recommendation

FAC discussed historical instances wherein the bylaws related to tenure and promotion are not in alignment with our benchmark institutions. In particular, the FAC considered bylaws that have led to problematic outcomes in recent years.

From the Rollins College of Liberal Arts Faculty Bylaws amended 8/13/2021

Article VIII

E. PROCEDURES FOR MID-COURSE, TENURE, AND PROMOTION REVIEWS

Current:

Section 4. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor Evaluation (p 23)

d. Evaluation by the Candidate Evaluation Committee

Having reviewed the candidate's file and deliberated, the CEC writes a report and recommendation, which makes a case for or against the candidate and sends it, along with the letters from the outside evaluators if applicable, to the FEC, with copies to the Dean of the Faculty and candidate, by October 1. (The CEC letter is due by October 23, 2020 for AY2020-2021). The candidate may choose to write a response to the report and recommendation, and should send this response electronically to the CEC, the Dean of the Faculty, and the FEC within one week. Should the CEC make a negative recommendation, the candidacy cannot go forward except on appeal.

e. Evaluation by Dean of the Faculty

Having received a positive recommendation of the candidacy by the CEC, the Dean of the Faculty will conduct a separate evaluation.

Section 5. Promotion to Professor (p 26)

d. Evaluation by the Candidate Evaluation Committee

Having reviewed the candidate's file and deliberated, the CEC writes a report and recommendation, which makes a case for or against the candidate and sends it, along with the letters from the outside evaluators if applicable, to the FEC, with copies to the Dean of the Faculty and candidate, by October 15. (The CEC letter is due October 30, 2020 for AY2020-2021). The candidate may choose to write a response to the report and recommendation, and this response will be sent to the CEC, the Dean of the Faculty, and the FEC within one week. Should the CEC make a negative recommendation, the candidacy cannot go forward except on appeal.

e. Evaluation by Dean of the Faculty

Having received a positive recommendation of the candidacy by the CEC, the Dean of the Faculty will conduct a separate evaluation

Proposed:

Section 4. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor Evaluation

d. Evaluation by the Candidate Evaluation Committee

Having reviewed the candidate's file and deliberated, the CEC writes a report and recommendation, which makes a case for or against the candidate and sends it, along with the letters from the outside evaluators if applicable, to the FEC, with copies to the Dean of the Faculty and candidate, by October 1. (The CEC letter is due by October 23, 2020 for AY2020-2021). The candidate may choose to write a response to the report and recommendation, and should send this response electronically to the CEC, the Dean of the Faculty, and the FEC within one week. ~~Should the CEC make a negative recommendation, the candidacy cannot go forward except on appeal.~~

e. Evaluation by Dean of the Faculty

Having received ~~a positive recommendation of the candidacy by the CEC~~ **the CEC's recommendation**, the Dean of the Faculty will conduct a separate evaluation.

Section 5. Promotion to Professor (p 26)

d. Evaluation by the Candidate Evaluation Committee

Having reviewed the candidate's file and deliberated, the CEC writes a report and recommendation, which makes a case for or against the candidate and sends it, along with the letters from the outside evaluators if applicable, to the FEC, with copies to the Dean of the Faculty and candidate, by October 15. (The CEC letter is due October 30, 2020 for AY2020-2021). The candidate may choose to write a response to the report and recommendation, and this response will be sent to the CEC, the Dean of the Faculty, and the FEC within one week. ~~Should the CEC make a negative recommendation, the candidacy cannot go forward except on appeal.~~

e. Evaluation by Dean of the Faculty

Having received ~~a positive recommendation of the candidacy by the CEC~~ **the CEC's recommendation**, the Dean of the Faculty will conduct a separate evaluation.

Rationale:

This proposed change would lead to greater oversight and allow for a more equitable tenure and promotion process. In addition, the change will bring our bylaws into alignment with our benchmark institutions.

Clarification:

The following bylaw would remain in effect under the proposed change:

E. PROCEDURES FOR MID-COURSE, TENURE, AND PROMOTION REVIEWS

Section 2. Faculty Evaluation Committee Structure and Evaluation

e. Review by the FEC

Upon completion of its review of its candidates, the FEC writes a report and recommendation. The recommendation of the FEC may agree or disagree with that of the CEC or of the Dean of the Faculty. In the event of a negative evaluation by the FEC, the FEC will consult with the CEC on points of disagreement. If the FEC is still not satisfied with the arguments of the CEC, it submits its negative recommendation to the Provost for their report and recommendation.

The members of FAC unanimously supported this proposal. The proposal was then brought to the EC, where discussion began but was tabled for further consideration.

C. Proposed bylaw change allowing a tenured associate or full professor from another institution to be hired with tenure

FAC was charged with considering the possibility of allowing tenured, associate or full professors to be hired with tenure. Research of our benchmark institutions indicated that other colleges have a process that allows for the hiring of faculty with tenure. After consideration and discussion, the members of FAC unanimously voted in favor of the proposed change laid out below. This item was then brought to EC, and ultimately the full faculty, for consideration.

Current:

ARTICLE VIII

FACULTY APPOINTMENTS AND EVALUATIONS

A. FACULTY APPOINTMENTS

Section 1. New Appointments

No tenure-track appointment may last beyond seven years without the faculty member being granted tenure, with the exception of faculty members on parental leave for childbirth or adoption who accept an extension in accordance with Rollins College Policy. Faculty beginning the tenure track between Fall 2015 through Fall 2020, may, by no later than June 30 of the year prior to their tenure review year, declare in writing to the Dean of the Faculty that they wish a one-year extension of their tenure clock. The extension will convert the faculty member's fifth year on the tenure track to one non-counting year. The timeline for pre-tenure evaluation and course release in years one through four is unchanged. This provision automatically expires once these faculty have been accommodated, as described in this bylaw. No visiting faculty appointment may last beyond six consecutive years. Initial appointments of tenure-track faculty shall normally be for a two- year period. All faculty appointments shall be made by the President with the advice of the Provost, who may act as the President's agent, and the Dean of the Faculty.

All tenure-track appointments will be made as the result of national searches. The department to which the candidate will be appointed will usually conduct the search. Search committees shall have one faculty member from outside the department who will be appointed by the Dean of the Faculty in consultation with the department. The appointee will be a voting member of the search committee. The recruitment and selection of candidates for faculty appointments will conform with the equal employment opportunity and affirmative action policies of the College.

The Dean of the Faculty shall not recommend the appointment of anyone of whom a majority of the voting tenured and tenure-track members of the appointee's department does not approve.

While faculty members are not normally hired with tenure, this option is permitted in the special circumstance of appointment to endowed chairs. In such a case, the candidate must possess the rank of Associate or Full Professor at the previous institution and already have been granted tenure at that institution.

If the endowed chair is in a specific discipline, a search committee will be formed within the appropriate department with representation from at least one other department appointed by the Dean of the Faculty. The committee will set out the criteria necessary for a successful candidate to the position. If the chair is not department based, the Dean of the Faculty will appoint a search committee consisting of representatives from relevant departments and programs.

When the search committee has reached a final decision, it will send a letter of recommendation to the Faculty Evaluation Committee (as defined below). The search committee and the FEC, in assessing the merit of the candidate, along with the usual evaluation of research and service, will give special consideration to teaching quality in their evaluation. The FEC will examine the credentials of the candidate and will give the Dean of the Faculty its approval or disapproval of the recommendation of the search committee, based on a stringent evaluation of the candidate against the tenure guidelines of the department or program. The Dean of the Faculty will then pass along to the Provost his or her recommendation as well as the recommendation from the FEC. The Provost in turn will make a recommendation to the President, who then makes the final decision on the appointment.

Proposed change (additions/changes in red):

No tenure-track appointment may last beyond seven years without the faculty member being granted tenure, with the exception of faculty members on parental leave for childbirth or adoption who accept an extension in accordance with Rollins College Policy. Faculty beginning the tenure track between Fall 2015 through Fall 2020, may, by no later than June 30 of the year prior to their tenure review year, declare in writing to the Dean of the Faculty that they wish a one-year extension of their tenure clock. The extension will convert the faculty member's fifth year on the tenure track to one non-counting year. The timeline for pre-tenure evaluation and course release in years one through four is unchanged. This provision automatically expires once these faculty have been accommodated, as described in this bylaw. No visiting faculty appointment may last beyond six consecutive years. Initial appointments of tenure-track faculty shall normally be for a two- year period. All faculty appointments shall be made by the President with the advice of the Provost, who may act as the President's agent, and the Dean of the Faculty.

All tenure-track appointments will be made as the result of national searches. The department to which the candidate will be appointed will usually conduct the search. Search committees shall have one faculty member from outside the department who will be appointed by the Dean of the Faculty in consultation with the department. The appointee will be a voting member of the search committee. The recruitment and selection of candidates for faculty appointments will conform with the equal employment opportunity and affirmative action policies of the College.

The Dean of the Faculty shall not recommend the appointment of anyone of whom a majority of the voting tenured and tenure-track members of the appointee's department does not approve.

While faculty members are not normally hired with tenure, this option is permitted in the special circumstance of appointment to endowed chairs. In such a case, the candidate must possess the rank of Associate or Full Professor at the previous institution and already have been granted tenure at that institution.

The option of being hired with tenure is permitted in the special circumstance of appointment to endowed chairs or on a case-by-case basis when the candidate has already been granted tenure and holds the rank of Associate or Full Professor at the previous institution.

If the endowed chair is in a specific discipline, a search committee will be formed within the appropriate department with representation from at least one other department appointed by the Dean of the Faculty. **For a tenured candidate, a search committee will be formed within the appropriate department with representation from at least one other department appointed by the Dean of the Faculty.** The committee will set out the criteria necessary for a successful candidate for the position. If the chair is not department-based, the Dean of the Faculty will appoint a search committee consisting of representatives from relevant departments and programs.

When the search committee has reached a final decision, it will send a letter of recommendation to the Faculty Evaluation Committee (as defined below). The search committee and the FEC, in assessing the merit of the candidate, along with the usual evaluation of research and service, will give special consideration to teaching quality in their evaluation. The FEC will examine the credentials of the candidate and will give the Dean of the Faculty its approval or disapproval of the recommendation of the search committee, based on a stringent evaluation of the candidate against the tenure guidelines of the department or program. The Dean of the Faculty will then pass along to the Provost his or her

recommendation as well as the recommendation from the FEC. The Provost in turn will make a recommendation to the President, who then makes the final decision on the appointment.

Rationale:

At this time there is no possibility for the college to hire someone with tenure unless they are being hired to an endowed chair. Without the possibility of hiring someone with tenure when there is no endowed chair connected to the open position, we lose excellent potential candidates.

D. Process for Post-tenure review

The FAC was charged with developing a proposed process for post-tenure review. Currently there is no official process in place.

ARTICLE VIII

FACULTY APPOINTMENTS AND EVALUATIONS

D. PROCEDURES FOR POST-TENURE EVALUATIONS

The CEC, with the support of the Dean of the Faculty, is charged with the responsibility of encouraging improved teaching and professional development for all members of the Faculty. Tenured faculty will normally be evaluated every seven years, two years before their eligibility for a sabbatical. Exceptions may be recommended by the Dean of the Faculty, with the approval of the Faculty Affairs Committee.

While the primary purpose of continued assessment is to promote improved teaching and professional development, it also assists tenured faculty in the identification of strengths and correction of any deficiencies. Should the CEC or the Dean of the Faculty detect deficiencies which are particularly significant, the evaluation proceedings may be initiated at any time.

The faculty member's professional assessment statements play a primary role in these seven- year evaluations. The faculty member creates a professional assessment statement called the Faculty Development Plan. This plan, with supporting documents, goes to the members of the CEC to review by January 1. The CEC then meets with the faculty member to discuss the professional assessment statement and writes a brief letter of evaluation in response to it, noting their developmental assessment of the faculty member and how the plans fit into the department's goals. This letter is sent to the Dean of the Faculty by April 15 of the penultimate year before the faculty member is eligible for a sabbatical.

Deans play a central role in providing ongoing encouragement and support for faculty efforts at professional development. The Dean of the Faculty meets with the faculty member separately to discuss the professional assessment statement, and supporting documents, and the letter of the CEC. The Dean of the Faculty then writes a brief letter of evaluation, stating points of concurrence or disagreement. The faculty member receives a copy of this letter by August 15 of the evaluation year.

Both letters, along with the Faculty Development Plan, and other supporting materials, are placed in a file for the faculty member that is kept in the office of the Dean of the Faculty. While a faculty member has reasonable latitude for changes of professional direction, this file is then used in decisions about release time, requests for funding, and merit awards.

Timeline for Annual and Post-Tenure Review:

	Annual	Post-Tenure
Notification by Dean's office of eligibility	N/A	April 15
CEC formed by:	December 1	December 1
Candidate materials submitted to CEC and (post-tenure only) the Dean	January 1 (January 19 for AY 2020-2021)	January 1 (January 19 for AY 2020-2021)
CEC's letter to Dean and candidate by:	February 15	April 15
Dean's letter to candidate and CEC by:	N/A	August 15

**Recommended addition to the bylaws (proposed process for post-tenure review) can be found in red below:

The Post-tenure review process will include teaching observations arranged between the CEC and the faculty member under review.

Collection of Materials for Review

The faculty member undergoing post-tenure review will upload the following materials to Canvas by January 1:

1. CV

2. Professional Assessment Statement, including:

- All relevant professional activities are addressed: teaching, research and scholarship, and College service.
- The statement includes the assessment of her/his successes and failures, as well as a plan for future development.
- In the area of scholarly research, the College is particularly interested in knowing:
 - How the faculty member has developed professionally since the last formal evaluation.
 - How the faculty member's research interests and professional **activities** constitute a coherent path of development.

- How the faculty members' research interests are connected to their work on campus and to the larger community.

3. Prior departmental evaluations

4. Teaching Portfolio—including a selection of relevant materials such as:

a. Sample Syllabi

b. Sample Assignments

c. Examples of Student Work

d. Reflection on Student Evaluations

e. Letters from former students

5. Examples of research or creative activity

Rationale:

At this time there is no process in place for the Post-tenure review. This proposal would offer some structure to the process for all departments.

Section II Reports and Actions Taken by the Faculty Affairs Committee

A. Proposal to revise the FSAR

An item of business carried over from academic year 2020-2021 was consideration of the FSAR. As concluded by the 20-21 FAC:

The FSAR is used for only two purposes. First, Olin Library and the Provost's Office uses the faculty publication portion for College reports. The other purpose is the Dean of the Faculty reads the last item in the FSAR which asks faculty what they need in order to complete their work. Accordingly, a subcommittee of the FAC created a prototype of a streamlined version of the FSAR. The subcommittee and the full membership of FAC recommends including *Mentoring* as a separate text box in the Teaching, Scholarship, and Service sections. (A revised FSAR prototype is available in the 2020-2021 FAC annual report).

The FAC for academic year 21-22 offered a response to the revised FSAR

FAC agrees that the revised FSAR document is an improvement from the previous format. Specifically, we agree that:

1. the submission of a CV is the best platform for describing professional progress each year – we suggest the required submission of an updated CV, with highlighted additions from the previous year
2. faculty should be able to submit other forms of evaluation, such as those reflections required during annual, mid-course, tenure and/or promotion, and post tenure reviews. All faculty not under review in a given year are encouraged to submit the 250 word reflections.

We believe the shorter 250-word reflections on the form are only a starting point for deeper self-assessment and reflection. We support the suggested 250 word reflections (as offered by the EC) and propose an additional reflective process that goes beyond documentation alone of teaching, scholarly activity, creative achievements, and service to the College.

Our proposal is to establish a voluntary, in-person day of reflection for all faculty who wish to come together and share progress, goals, successes, and challenges in teaching, advising, scholarship, professional work, and campus life. The focal point of such a day would be centered around a brief departmental meeting but may also include all-campus events and forums for focused areas of reflection across departments.

We believe this day of reflection would facilitate a more meaningful opportunity for us to conceptualize our goals and areas for growth, while simultaneously fostering support and mentorship within our community. Nancy Chick at the Endeavor Center could serve as an important resource for designing such an event.

B. FAC received proposed changes to the Cornell Distinguished Faculty Award from administration.

The original description reads:

The Cornell Distinguished Faculty Award. Each year Rollins bestows up to three Cornell Distinguished Faculty awards to recognize exceptional professional accomplishments in at least two of the faculty's three primary emphases of teaching, research, and service. Because teaching is the first priority at Rollins, it is expected that all awardees will have established a record of excellence in instruction. With the exception of holders of endowed chairs, all tenured and tenure-track faculty in the College of Liberal Arts are eligible for consideration. Recipients hold the title of Cornell Distinguished Faculty for three academic years. In each year of the award, the Cornell Distinguished Faculty member receives a \$5,000 stipend. At the end of the three years, \$2,500 is added to the base salary of each Cornell Distinguished Faculty member. One can receive a Cornell Distinguished Faculty award no more than twice, only once during a ten-year period, and no more than once in any rank (at the time of the appointment of the award). At the end of each academic year, awardees submit reports to their appropriate dean or director in which they summarize their activities in teaching, scholarship, and service. In the third year in which they hold the Cornell Distinguished Faculty award, recipients give public presentations in which they report on a recent, distinctive accomplishment. Selection Process. The selection

committee for these awards – proposed by the Dean of the Faculty for approval or amendment by the Faculty Affairs Committee – is comprised of five faculty members and an alternate. The alternate member participates in the committee’s deliberations when one of the regular members is not available to serve. The committee includes holders of endowed chairs, current Cornell Distinguished Faculty, or former Cornell Distinguished Faculty who are not eligible for the award. Each member serves for two years, with half the committee rotating off each year. To the degree possible, the membership of the selection committee reflects the diversity of the faculty. By September 1 of each fall, the selection committee distributes a call for nominations for the Cornell Distinguished Faculty awards. All individuals with faculty rank in the College of Liberal Arts are eligible to submit nominations of their colleagues. A nomination consists of a letter setting forth the achievements of an individual who is worthy of recognition. By October 1, all nominees are notified and invited to submit to the selection committee, by November 1, a C.V. and statements in which they summarize their achievements in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. They may also submit supporting documents such as recent FSARs; course evaluations and other evidence of excellent teaching; syllabi and other instructional material; copies of publications, presentations, or performances; and accounts of service to the campus and the community. Nominees may also request up to two letters of support from professional colleagues at Rollins particularly in the areas of scholarship, creative accomplishments, or service outside the campus community. The selection committee makes its recommendations on the basis of the nominations, the nominees’ responses, and materials available in the office of the appropriate dean or director; the committee may also consult with the appropriate dean or director. The selection committee forwards its recommendations to the VPAA/Provost for presentation to the President in time for an announcement at the final faculty meeting of fall term or the first meeting of spring term

Proposed revision

The Cornell Distinguished Faculty Award. Each year Rollins bestows one Cornell Distinguished Faculty award to recognize exceptional professional accomplishments in at least two of the faculty’s three primary emphases of teaching, research, and service. Because teaching is the first priority at Rollins, it is expected that all awardees will have established a record of excellence in instruction. With the exception of holders of endowed chairs, all tenured faculty in the College of Liberal Arts are eligible for consideration. Recipients hold the title of Cornell Distinguished Faculty for three academic years. In each year of the award, the Cornell Distinguished Faculty member receives a \$5,000 stipend. One can receive a Cornell Distinguished Faculty award no more than twice, only once during a ten-year period, and no more than once in any rank (at the time of the appointment of the award). At the end of each academic year, awardees submit reports to their appropriate dean or director in which they summarize their activities in teaching, scholarship, and service. In the third year in which they hold the Cornell Distinguished Faculty award, recipients give public presentations in which they report on a recent, distinctive accomplishment. Selection Process. The selection committee for these awards – proposed by the Dean of the Faculty for approval or amendment by the Faculty Affairs Committee – is comprised

of five faculty members and an alternate. The alternate member participates in the committee's deliberations when one of the regular members is not available to serve. The committee includes holders of endowed chairs, current Cornell Distinguished Faculty, or former Cornell Distinguished Faculty who are not eligible for the award. Each member serves for two years, with half the committee rotating off each year. To the degree possible, the membership of the selection committee reflects the diversity of the faculty. By September 1 of each fall, the selection committee distributes a call for nominations for the Cornell Distinguished Faculty awards. All individuals with faculty rank in the College of Liberal Arts are eligible to submit nominations of their colleagues. A nomination consists of a letter setting forth the achievements of an individual who is worthy of recognition. By October 1, all nominees are notified and invited to submit to the selection committee, by November 1, a C.V. and statements in which they summarize their achievements in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service. They may also submit supporting documents such as recent FSARs; course evaluations and other evidence of excellent teaching; syllabi and other instructional material; copies of publications, presentations, or performances; and accounts of service to the campus and the community. Nominees may also request up to two letters of support from professional colleagues at Rollins particularly in the areas of scholarship, creative accomplishments, or service outside the campus community. The selection committee makes its recommendations on the basis of the nominations, the nominees' responses, and materials available in the office of the appropriate dean or director; the committee may also consult with the appropriate dean or director. The selection committee forwards its recommendations to the VPAA/Provost for presentation to the President in time for an announcement at the final faculty meeting of fall term or the first meeting of spring term.

FAC response:

While the FAC understands that we do not have authority to make final decisions regarding an administrative action in relation to this award, the FAC agreed that the CDFA should remain as it has been described. The primary concern expressed relates to the morale of the faculty.

C. Endorsement of recommendations from the 2020-2021 CIE White Paper

FAC repeatedly returned to discussions around CIEs and the inherent problems related to bias and the inequitable ways the CIEs have at times been used in the tenure and promotion process.

The current members of FAC endorse the recommendations made in the CIE White Paper Final Report developed by the FAC of academic year 2020-2021, which was updated March 6, 2021.

The faculty of Rollins College strive to be excellent teachers. Faculty value the information they receive from their course evaluations each semester as they reflect on and fine-tune their classes. The Faculty Affairs Committee offers several recommendations designed to heighten awareness of the subtle ways bias influences course evaluations as well as ways to best use the information contained in the CIEs. The FAC hopes these suggestions will increase

awareness of the potential forms of bias and contribute to a discussion of how to effectively evaluate teaching in liberal arts colleges.

1. The Office of Institutional Analytics should conduct the Race and Gender Bias Study every four years and report the results to the Faculty Affairs Committee. We recommend that the next study also include an analysis of student comments. This enables an analysis of both quantitative and qualitative information contained in the evaluations. Regular reporting of this information allows faculty and administrators to monitor the institution's progress regarding resisting bias in teaching evaluations and aids in effectively using the information contained in the CIEs.
2. The FAC recommends that the text box for faculty comments on the CIE is made a permanent feature on Course Instructor Evaluations.
3. The FAC recommends that the name of the instrument be changed from Course Instructor Evaluation to "Student Perceptions of the Course and Instruction."
4. The FAC encourages faculty to view the [online tutorial](#) available for using the CIE. The instructional tutorial is very thorough and provides useful contextual information for properly interpreting course evaluations, possible biases in raw scores and comments, and interpretation of the comparison percentiles.
5. CIEs can provide useful longitudinal information by identifying trends and patterns in faculty instruction. The strategy for interpreting CIEs is combining the quantitative measures (raw scores) with the qualitative information available in students' comments. The FAC affirms that a holistic approach to evaluation is preferable in which CIEs are combined with other sources of information about teaching quality and development.
6. The FAC recommends that evaluators avoid relying on the percentiles except when they reveal a consistent pattern below the 10th percentile. The overall distribution of teaching scores at Rollins is very high. Therefore, small changes in raw scores can produce large changes in the corresponding percentile score.

Addendum from members of the 2021-2022 FAC:

The FAC notes that when a numerical value is shared between numerous instructors, only the lowest percentile range is indicated in the CIEs.

The current FAC also offer this reminder from the Rollins College Faculty Handbook, Section III, CLA Policies and Procedures (p 17).

Informed Use of Course and Instructor Evaluations. Results from Course and Instructor Evaluations (CIE) should be used only as they were designed to be used. Evaluators should review both narrative and numeric results available in CIE reports. The level to which comments indicate a legitimate concern about a candidate can be confirmed or contradicted by the numeric data. Likewise, numeric data often depends on narrative responses to provide clarification and aid in interpretation. If evaluators ignore either narrative or numeric results, they risk making faulty decisions about the candidate.

D. Endorsement of a second opportunity for pre-tenured faculty to “stop the clock” due to challenges related to COVID-19

FAC was asked to endorse the proposal stated above. It was unanimously endorsed, and was brought to EC for an official bylaw change.

Section III. Pending Business Carrying Over to AY 2022-2023

There are items that will carry over to the new Faculty Affairs Committee.

1. Complete potential revisions to the CIEs, devise a plan for departments to indicate how CIEs are used in evaluation, devise a plan for departments to articulate how teaching is evaluated
2. Continue to consider and act on issues of inequity in the tenure and promotion process.
3. Participate in the next salary study of inversion, compression, and benchmark comparisons.

Appendix 1
FSAR Prototype

FACULTY SELF-ASSESSMENT REPORT FOR ACADEMIC YEAR 2019-2020

Name:

Date:

Completing the FSAR provides faculty an opportunity to reflect on their past academic year in relation to teaching, scholarship, and service. This information is also used to prepare institutional reports and to update publicity materials. It is filed in your permanent record and therefore needs to be accurate and complete.

Completion of FSAR is required for internal grant eligibility.

I. TEACHING

1. *COURSE ASSIGNMENTS*

Fall 2019			
Dept. & Course #	Course Title	# of Credits	# of Students
Totals:			

Spring 2020			
Dept. & Course #	Course Title	# of Credits	# of Students
Totals:			

Summer 2020			
Dept. & Course #	Course Title	# of Credits	# of Students
Totals:		0	0

Teaching

1. List your teaching activities for this academic year. You may wish to mention:

- Awards
- New Course(s) developed
- Significant Revisions to a Course
- Innovative Application of Technology
- New Teaching Technique

And courses taught for:

- Honors
- RCC
- General education
- rFLA

COMMENT BOX here with suggested word/character limit (100-200 words)

2. Did you lead or participate in:

- International experience or study abroad
- Immersion
- Community engagement or service learning

Please specify your role in these experiences and whether the experience included faculty and/or students.

COMMENT BOX here with suggested word/character limit (100-200 words)

ADVISING

Academic advising may occur differently across departments. Please comment on your advising activities, including number of advisees per semester, professional development you have undertaken related to advising, and any other relevant aspects.

COMMENT BOX here with suggested word/character limit (100-200 words)

MENTORING

Describe teaching mentorship activities you have undertaken in addition to those above, such as mentoring students or working with colleagues.

COMMENT BOX here with suggested word/character limit (100-200 words)

II. SCHOLARLY ACTIVITIES

With full bibliographic detail, please list all refereed journal articles, other print publications, electronic publications, artistic performances/presentations, presentations at national and local meetings or competitions, or media appearances/interviews for the **academic year**.

Publications, Performances (drama, literary readings), Exhibitions (art), Musical Performances and/or Recordings, Patents Published or Exhibited, Community-Based Research (e.g., "research that equitably involves community members, organizational representatives, and researchers in all aspects of the research process and in which all partners contribute expertise and share decision making and ownership"), Service-Learning Research in 2019-2020.

[In this section we would either have:

-a bulleted list of publication types with a single textbox at the end in which to enter reference information, or

-The user adds entries by using an "add entry" button, which produces a drop-down list of publication types, along with a text box. They select the relevant publication type from the drop-down, then enter the reference info in the text box. They can then add another entry, which produces another drop-down and text box, etc.

In the text box below please specify which type of publication and include full bibliographic information: author(s), date of publication, title of work, page number range if applicable, place of publication, performance or installation.

Publication Types:

- **Books**
 - **Single authored books**
 - **Co-authored books**
- **Edited books**
- **Articles**
 - **Single authored**
 - **Co-authored**
- **Edited volumes and book reviews**
- **Chapters in books:**
 - **Single author of a chapter in a book**
 - **Co-author of a chapter in a book**

- **Broadcast Productions**
- **Web-based publications**
- **Publications in the Popular Press**
- **Art Exhibitions**
- **Dramatic Productions**
- **Literary Readings**
- **Musical Performances/Recordings**

COMMENT BOX here with no word/character limit (for listing above)

Presentations at National, State, or Regional Meetings or Lectures Delivered at other Academic Institutions. (note if related to Community Engagement)

COMMENT BOX here with suggested word/character limit (100-200 words)

Special Academic Honors Awards and Grants Received in 2019-2020:

For awards please specify, e.g., Fulbright, Guggenheim, commissioned works/prizes, honorary degrees, etc.)

COMMENT BOX here with suggested word/character limit (100-200 words)

Grants/Contracts:

- **External grants or contracts awarded in 2019-2020**
- **Internal grants or grant administration**
- **Grant applications submitted**
- **Grant applications not funded**

COMMENT BOX here with suggested word/character limit (100-200 words)

Mentoring

Describe research mentorship activities you have undertaken in addition to those above, such as mentoring students or working with colleagues.

COMMENT BOX here with suggested word/character limit (100-200 words)

III. SERVICE: PROFESSIONAL/COMMUNITY/COLLEGE

Comment on your activities in which you have provided *service to the college* during this academic year.

Examples of college service include:

- College governance or committees
- Department committees or assignments
- Miscellaneous campus activities

COMMENT BOX here with suggested word/character limit (100-200 words)

Comment on your activities in which you have provided *service to your profession* during this academic year.

Examples of professional service include:

- Journal editorships
- Service to professional organizations
 - Committees appointed/elected to, offices held, etc.
- Conferences organized, association awards/nominations, professional external review activities

COMMENT BOX here with suggested word/character limit (100-200 words)

Comment on your activities in which you have provided *service to the community* during this academic year.

Examples of community service include:

- Boards
- Presentations
- Workshops
- Volunteer work
- Awards

COMMENT BOX here with suggested word/character limit (100-200 words)

Mentoring

Describe service mentorship activities you have undertaken in addition to those above, such as mentoring students or working with colleagues.

COMMENT BOX here with suggested word/character limit (100-200 words)

AS YOU LOOK AT YOUR ACCOMPLISHMENTS THIS YEAR, IS THERE ANYTHING FURTHER YOU WANT TO NOTE OR MAKE A PART OF YOUR RECORD?

COMMENT BOX here with suggested word/character limit (100-200 words or more)

IV. GOALS FOR AY 2020-2021

- 1. What progress have you made in achieving the goals you set for yourself last year?**
- 2. What specific goals have you set for yourself over the next academic year (or longer range), whether in teaching, advising, scholarship, professional work, or campus life?**
- 3. What is the most important thing Rollins can do to help you achieve these goals?**

COMMENT BOX here with suggested word/character limit (100-200 words or more)

Appendix 2
Strategic Budget Priorities
Budget Concerns from Divisional Meetings

2/4/21 Science Division Meeting

These are not minutes. They're a summary of this one part of the meeting in which we discussed this topic: What are our strategic priorities going forward into a hopefully post-Covid new normal for Rollins?

Our target student:faculty ratio is going to be 11.5:1. We're not getting back the faculty who were let go. This creates pressure points. Courses are full, students can't get courses they need, there are inequities in number of students faculty teach per semester. What does new Rollins look like?

This discussion is happening in various places on campus including a curriculum optimization task force.

- 1.) **Course releases** were discussed at the recent EC meeting. Susan and Grant proposed a course release and stipend plan, sought faculty input, but EC/faculty won't vote or approve this. S&G will bring this to the Board. EC advocated for all department chairs to have option of stipend or course release. Some time soon, dept chair course releases will likely be an option again. Other types of course releases are up in the air.
- 2.) **Going from 140 to 128 credit hours required for graduation.** One part of this would be that no major could have over 60 credit hours. Another part would be to lower the allowed number of hours that students could enroll in per semester without instructor consent (to avoid exacerbating the existing financial issue that students graduate in 3-3.5 years; currently they can do 23 cr/sem w/o consent). So far, it seems like most other divisions are ok with this. Science division and Education are notable exceptions.
 - a. We discussed this previously in 2012 and 2015 and it almost passed then. In 2015, we compared Rollins to then-benchmarks and found that we require a lot of major courses. Since then we have new benchmarks which have the same resources per student that we have. **We need to re-do this analysis, and Jenny Queen asked for help doing this from departments whose majors currently require more than 60 credits.**
 - i. Some aspects of this analysis: Do the benchmarks require 128 cr for graduation? Do the benchmarks have 6-credit labs? Are typical courses 4 credits or 3? Or other? Number of courses and number of credits are not the same thing given how lab-heavy some majors are. If the benchmarks have majors with smaller credit numbers, how are they doing this? Can we compare their research output with student coauthors to ours?

- b. Going to 128 would impact science division more than others because we have 6 credit labs and because graduate schools have strict coursework requirements.
 - i. People from various departments commented that if they cut courses, students would not be competitive for grad school.
- c. One proposal has been that labs stay at 6 credits for faculty but move to 4 credits for students. Our discussion rejected this because it creates big inequities for students who would be doing more work in science 4-credit courses than other majors' 4-credit courses.
- d. Students are currently required to take 16 credits of non-major, non-gened electives, which is part of our identity as a liberal arts college.
- e. The general pattern for most colleges is: 1/3 gen ed, 1/3 in the major, and 1/3 general electives. We're way off from that; $128/3=42$ credit hours and that will not work for most science majors.
 - i. Current number of credits across majors: Chem = 82 = about 13 courses. Biochemistry and molecular biology=72. Bio = 70. Marine bio = 70 = 13 courses. Physics = 62. Psych = 58. Math = 54. Computer Science = 50. Env studies = 44.
 - 1. Physics just cut courses based on their external review. Physics has no electives.
 - 2. EnvStudies went from 68 cr in 1996 to current 44. It was difficult and gradual; discussions about what would be gained and lost in terms of coverage. But Env studies is quite different from rest of sciences division because it's so interdisciplinary.
- f. The issue isn't that we don't have enough seats. There are currently underenrolled courses, but they are upper level in majors. The issue is there are not enough classes with openings which fulfill lower-level requirements.
- g. It would go a long way to just have a few more psych, comm, and business profs to teach some lower-level courses.
- h. We pondered: If you had one fewer class in the major, could you teach more popularly-needed courses slightly more often? It's not this simple because of the timeframe on which upper level courses need offered.
- i. We need to create a thoughtful response from science division
- j. Idea: What if science majors take fewer geneds?
 - i. Sciences are fundamentally different from other divisions: classes with labs. If you went to 128 without cutting number of required courses, then students would just go into that major knowing they do fewer exploratory courses.
 - ii. Idea of having a BS degree in addition to a BA degree. Counter argument that we're actually light compared to most BS degrees elsewhere.

- k. There may be implications of this for pre-engineering and other tracks. We need to explore this.

Social Sciences Applied Division

The Faculty Affairs Committee is seeking faculty input on strategic budget priorities facing us. The FAC believes that there should be faculty input on these issues as the College looks ahead to its next budget year (without the deficit we faced in this year).

Some of the strategic budget issues directly affect faculty, and we are seeking faculty input on them. Here is a partial list:

Faculty size, staffing policies, and course caps:

- The size of our faculty (new hires)
- The student-faculty ratio—plan to go from 10:1 to 12/13:1
- Course caps (related to above)
- Recognizing these are curricular issues and in the purview of faculty (Depts. have different needs from one another)

Compensation:

- Restoring salaries to pre-covid levels
- When will faculty travel funds be restored?
- Raises for AY 2020-21 and 2021-22 (cost of living)
- Bringing salaries in line with national benchmarks
- Restoring course releases (for administrative work such as Chairing a Dept., coordinating a program, serving on the FEC, Chairing a major governance committee, and other instances of releases that were in place prior to covid)

Please add your concerns below:

1. Compensation for RCC and rFLA courses that require many more hours of meetings, preparation, and labor compared to in-department courses
2. Changes to the Holt program, esp. with regard to staffing. For example, programs like COM who have a significant investment in and connection to Holt are now required to staff their Holt classes only with adjuncts or with full-time faculty who are teaching Holt courses on overload. Some feel this moves Holt into second-class degree status that are fiscally confusing (i.e., do overloads and adjuncts cost the Holt school more?) Are these changes the “new normal”? Are these staffing policies an austerity measure, or more of a strategic choice to reposition the Holt undergrad program?

3. Administration is saying we need to raise caps. I've overheard one suggestion that professors should combine sections of classes to equal up to 40 students depending on the space on campus. This would drastically change our pedagogy.
4. These changes have implications for advising. With a smaller faculty, my advising is increasing by 20 advisees. With larger classes, my grading loads are also rising. A core aspects of Rollins is having personal relationships with students, but I will have a hard time accomplishing that with 60 advisees.
5. I've never worked at an institution where there weren't any course releases for chairs. We have to argue very forcefully to have all course releases reinstating, and as soon as possible for department chairs.
6. Just as it has in society at large, the pandemic has not impacted faculty equally. COVID-related budget cuts disproportionately affect women, people of color, and those with caregiving responsibilities. While all departments have been impacted in some way by these budgetary changes, some faculty faced more dire consequences - forcing some to have to consider leaving Rollins all together. Therefore, budget restorations should be prioritized in a way that seeks to retain these faculty/departments.
7. We need to look at all the different forms of compensation for work (not just salary), and set priorities of some kind. A first priority should be retaining faculty and course releases for department chairs.
8. In graduate programs, faculty are in charge of maintaining the catalogue, marketing, admissions, info sessions to the public, advising, internship placement, and much much more. We need to avoid making blanket policies "one size does not fit all" and there are many unique departments/roles at Rollins.
9. Without travel funds, we cannot attend conferences. We cannot continue with our research. We have less time and less funds to do our research, and research requirements have not changed. This is an essential part of our work as faculty. In some cases, we are having to delay or waive sabbaticals, we are having to delay grant money, and we can't travel to do our research.
10. We need to revisit tenure requirements for research so that we are not penalized as a result of these delays.
11. Much of the dialogue seems to be focused on CLA but not on Holt.
12. Certain accreditations could be at risk if we do not have an appropriately-sized faculty. Especially when you consider Department of Education requirements. These critical staffing challenges are placing our accreditation in danger, especially since we were informed there will be no tenure-track positions for the next academic year.
13. With changing credits from 140 to 128, it begs a philosophical question: what does it mean to get a college degree at Rollins? We are a Liberal Arts college, we want them to take interesting classes across the minimum requirements. They will have fewer options now.

14. I fear that reducing classes may lead to eliminating programs. Some programs struggle with majors, but have really strong minor programs. How will decisions about programs be made based on reduced choice? These classes enhance the liberal arts. We want to be able to excite students in new ways that they hadn't thought of before.
15. It seems strange that I have to take 20 classes to get an AA, and only 30 to get a BA, and they are accredited by the same accreditation body.
16. How does this impact transfer students?
17. Financial Aid – Will scholarships allow students to take additional courses if the requirements for the degree are reducing the number of classes?

Humanities Division Meeting January 22, 2021

It was noted that under current covid conditions many faculty took much more than a 2% pay cut because of the loss of course releases and stipends. Many faculty's actual loss in compensation was around 15%. Moreover, these cuts (stipends and course releases) hurt faculty who are teaching RCC, rFLAs, chairing Depts and programs (and generally taking on a larger share of work) the most. So, the 2% cut was equal without being equitable. Faculty should be consulted about how these cuts impacted or will impact them.

It was also noted that our travel funds were suspended this year. Participating in conferences is a vital aspect of our professional lives and we request that travel funds be reinstated.

There was overwhelming agreement that: course releases should be reinstated, stipends should be reinstated, travel funds should be reinstated, and class sizes should be under the control of Depts.

Some of the reasoning and our discussion of the issues above:

Course Releases--Course releases that were provided before covid should be restored, and in some cases such as Chairs of large Depts. increased (to 2 releases per year)

There was a strong consensus on restoring all course releases, especially, but not only, for Chairing Depts. Chairing Depts. requires extra work that takes time; stipends are not adequate to provide the time needed to address the administrative work that Chairs do.

This year is especially burdensome on Chairs as they are teaching full course loads while Chairing and teaching itself requires more time and energy during covid.

There was serious concern that the crisis of covid-19 may be used to cut back on faculty compensation (such as course releases and stipends) in an ongoing way, rather than as an exception in AY 2020-21. Many view this as a form of "disaster capitalism" (Naomi Klein) that is, using a crisis to chip away protections and benefits from workers.

Stipends--Stipends should be restored and perhaps increased.

-rFLAs are extra work and require extra meetings. This is why they had stipends. If there are no stipends the meetings should be eliminated. Also, eliminating stipends for rFLA while increasing the class size represents a double reduction of compensation for faculty--less compensation for even more work. rFLA was introduced to the faculty as a pilot program that would result in an across the board reduction in course load to 3/2. Faculty would like this on the table again.

-RCCs also require a substantial amount of extra work, including starting classes earlier in the year, taking on new advisees, going through orientation, and extra meetings and activities, and working with Peer Mentors.

Class sizes--should be left to the Dept.

There has been an increase in class sizes in Depts and in rFLAs.

Class size is related to faculty compensation because a larger class involves more work and more time (especially, but not only grading).

But more importantly, class sizes affect our pedagogy. What we do and can do in the classroom is often circumscribed by the number of students in the class.

One disturbing trend is that the College fired full time lecturers which now must be replaced by adjuncts, and full time faculty have also taken up some of these courses. At the same time full time faculty are not being compensated for their administrative work of chairing depts and programs. Those faculty are teaching extra courses, essentially serving as full-time faculty and as unpaid adjuncts.

Some other thoughts raised on these issues:

The Board of Trustees and the President passed a Resolution conveying their respect for and valuing of the faculty. How is this being played out in these policies that increase our workload and reduce our compensation?

We worry that increased class size may have a long term effect of reducing retention because it will inhibit the one-on-one attention that attracts students and that Rollins prides itself on.

Faculty view the cuts as a bait and switch and a divide and conquer strategy by the administration.

We would like budget transparency and open discussion of the pool of money for salaries, stipends, course releases, in the context of the overall budget with the recognition that the cutting of stipends and course releases is a cut to compensation that should be restored as soon as possible (like the 2% salary cut).

Conclusion: The elimination of course releases, stipends, travel funds, and the increase of class sizes results in a cut to faculty compensation and is a serious issue that needs to be redressed.

