

Rollins College

Rollins Scholarship Online

Faculty Affairs Committee Minutes

College of Liberal Arts Minutes and Reports

8-29-2022

Minutes, Faculty Affairs Committee Meeting, Tuesday, August 29, 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, "Minutes, Faculty Affairs Committee Meeting, Tuesday, August 29, 2022" (2022). *Faculty Affairs Committee Minutes*. 90.
https://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_fa/90

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 Minutes Meeting of August 29, 2022 12:30pm – 1:45pm

Location: French House Lounge

In attendance:

Business – Mark Heileman (2022-2024)

Expressive Arts – MacKenzie Moon Ryan - (2022-2024)

Humanities - Todd French - (2021-2023)

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

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

Social Sciences Applied – Allen Johnson - (2022-2023)

At large rep - Caitlyn Bennett (2021-2023)

At large rep - NEEDED (2022-2024)

At large rep – Hesham Mesbah (2021-2023)

Amy Armenia

I. Call to Order

II. Approval of Minutes from April 19th, 2022

- a. Motion to approve – Hesham
- b. Second - MacKenzie
- c. No amendments; no abstentions; all in favor; minutes approved

III. Introductions

- a. Discussion of efficiency models for FAC this year
 - i. Proposal of implementing subcommittees to accomplish tasks more efficiently throughout the academic year.
- b. Selection of Secretary
 - i. Caitlyn Bennett will resume role of secretary.

IV. New/Renewed Business

- a. Discussion of proposal to hire Faculty with tenure. (See Section I, p. 3 below)
 - i. Suggestion to emphasize the department’s autonomy and choice to decide whether they would like to post positions and seek out tenured faculty.

- b. Post Tenure Review Process (See Section II p. 6 below)
 - i. Todd will be following up with Ashley to clarify and gain more insight on this item.
- c. CIEs/Faculty Evaluation Models (See Section III p. 9 below)
 - i. Suggestion to select three developed tools and determine if they would work for comprehensive and efficient assessment of teaching
 - ii. Suggestion of subcommittee to focus review new CIE models and evaluation tools
 - 1. Todd and Hesham offered to serve on subcommittee
 - iii. Suggestion to provide guidance of how to use current CIE model and teaching observation methods versus implementing new CIEs
 - iv. Suggestion to modify CIE title to include Student Evaluation (i.e., Student Perception of Evaluation (SPOT))
- d. FEC request for bylaws changes and additional course releases for Chair and one additional member (See annotated bylaws attachment)
 - i. FAC members will review and discuss this item during next FAC meeting (9/20/22).
- e. General discussion about Faculty quality of work/life
 - i. Suggestion to spend time at each faculty meeting to discuss this item.
 - ii. Suggestion to reinstate faculty travel budget for conferences, especially for professional development and solely just for faculty members who are presenting or are on conference-related committees/roles.
- f. Suggestions from committee members for future work in FAC

V. Adjourn

- a. Motion to adjourn - MacKenzie
- b. Second - Sabrice
- c. Meeting adjourned

I.

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.

II.

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.

III.

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.