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Meeting of the Faculty of the College of Liberal Arts
12/13/17

In Attendance


Faculty President Ashley Kistler called the meeting to order at 12:36pm.

Approval of Minutes

Kim Dennis – I request to make a small amendment to the minutes for the November 16, 2017 faculty meeting. Specifically, I ask that the way I began the comment to be included. “I began by saying I wanted to question to what we mean when we refer to “quality” faculty. I think that’s important to include since it is the foundation for the subsequent questions I asked and since this issue of very expensive “quality” faculty keeps coming up in different contexts. With respect to the conversation about our previous Provost, I believe I said that she told potential hires they “would have to” give up their research aspirations if they came to Rollins. My understanding was that she meant to emphasize that teaching is the priority at Rollins and there would be little time for the kind of research they were trained to do in graduate school”

Change accepted by Jana Mathews (acting Secretary)
Minutes Approved by Voice Vote

Announcements

Cornell Distinguished Faculty Awards – Susan Singer

Award Winners:
Anne Stone
Martha Cheng

Olin Library Prize for Undergraduate Library Research – Wenxian Zhang

Wenxian Zhang: In order to enhance the quality of undergrad research at Rollins we would like to sponsor an undergrad research prize. The prize is open to all undergrad students including Holt School. This could be a traditional research project, videos, anything research-related is considered. Submissions are due on February 28. The award will be judged by a committee of faculty and staff panel totaling 6 members. So think carefully about your research assignments and contact your librarians for assistance. The award is a $500 cash prize.

Old Business

Motion to Reorder Agenda to Consider Amendment of Bylaws and Philosophy of Compensation before items of old business

Kistler: Moved

Mario D’Amato: Second

Clicker Vote: 87% passed

Kistler: So the order of today’s agenda is reordered. Remember that back in September we abrogated the bylaws to allow tenure and promotion deadlines to be extended because of the disruptions caused by Irma. This motion is to abrogate the bylaws to put the clause back into bylaws.

Motion to Amend CLA Bylaws Article VIII, Section 4, d. (see attached)

Joan Davison: Moved

Josh Hammonds: Second
Clicker Vote: 96%-passed

Faculty Compensation Philosophy (See Attached)

Chris Fuse: The Task Force has reviewed the Faculty Compensation Philosophy and it was approved by the Faculty Affairs and Executive committees. I want to go through it, talk about it for a few minutes and see what happens.

The preamble did change. We changed its wording to be more closely aligned with the values and principles that we at Rollins College uphold.

The Task Force took the equity section apart and discussed places where possible discrimination could occur. To be perfectly honest, Matt Hawks raised his hand and said that what we are describing is the legal definition. We worried, “What if we missed one?” Other things that we changed: in the third bullet, we took out the statement that starts with “one standard error of regression.” We feel that there are many appropriate ways to do this and wanted to leave this flexible so that it could be easily operationalized.

On the Principle of Competitive Salaries: A number of individuals have been concerned about the third bullet. The Task Force was very careful about what we did with this. We wanted to make sure that we had the voice and desire of the faculty correct. We went back to the Faculty Compensation Survey and want to remind everyone that we had a 63.8% response rate. This bullet deals with question 17 of survey in detail. The Task Force looked at the question and importantly, 60% of survey responses said that faculty compensation should reflect market rate.

The last piece is regarding the Principle of Transparency. The Task Force heard the voice of the faculty and made an addition that allows a subcommittee of AAC to work with the Provost as salary adjustments are being made--but more importantly report back to faculty.

What is left out of this are terms like “nine-month tenure-track faculty or tenure-track faculty.” We did this intentionally to make this as inclusive as possible. We know that we need to look at librarians and contingent faculty. We need to move toward this. The way that the Task Force came to this document was not in a vacuum. We had the compensation survey last April; we had a faculty retreat where faculty compensations comprised a significant portion of the discussion; we had two colloquia and the Oct 26 faculty meeting where it was significantly discussed. The Task Force, Faculty Affairs and Executive committees crafted the document as if it was one cohesive document so that if you remove one thing it weakens the whole document. Personally, I believe that it shouldn’t be divided.

Fuse: Motion to not divide document into sections

James Patrone: Second
Lisa Tillmann: I feel that Robert’s Rules are being used to close off discussion instead of open it.

Kistler: This doesn’t close off discussion. We can still have it. It just means that we can’t divide the question.

Tillmann: We were courteous in giving you advance notice and want to have a discussion of each section.

Kistler: This allows us to still do this.

McLaren: I’m unclear about what this does.

Kistler: This is within the purview of Robert’s Rules. We anticipate that we will have discussion on each section after we pass the document.

Clicker Vote: 65%-approved

Jennifer Queen: Point of order: Are amendments voted on separately?

Kistler: The document cannot be divided but amendments can be proposed and we can vote on each amendment.

Matilde Mesavage: Could you explain if the crossed-out sentences are going to be there or not? (referencing document handed out by faculty)

Kistler: That isn’t the document we circulated; that is an alternative document that was presented to the faculty.

McLaren: I’d like to make an amendment. My first “friendly amendment” is that under principles of equity—

[In keeping with our mission, our culture, and our value of collegiality, the first principle in our philosophy of compensation is to strive for equity in and across departments.]

This is an aspirational document that is supposed to reflect the values of the faculty and we felt that the bar of legal prohibition is too low of a bar and that there should be aspiration in this document.

Kistler: Let me say one thing. I do want to clarify that there are no friendly amendments under Robert’s Rules; all amendments are the same. It isn’t a term used anymore in Robert’s Rules. [referencing philosophy of compensation displayed on overhead screen]– I’m going to turn on ‘track changes’ so everyone can see in red what the proposed changes are.

Alicia Homrich: Ashley, we don’t have a copy of that document.
Kistler: It wasn’t circulated by EC.

McLaren: Motion to move

Kim Dennis: Second

Thom Moore: This is an aspirational document. If we want to be aspirational we would ask that everyone get paid 200K a year. We have to be realistic about this. We have been at this for a year. If we ask for things that aren’t going to be approved, then what is the point? We need to get out of what national politicians are doing and start to move forward. We need to think about compromise. Administrators don’t have any obligation to read or review this. We need to be realistic.

The second point I want to be make is about history. I talked to Grant a year or so ago and he asked me how to solve the problem with the faculty. I was flippant at the time—and I regret that—but I told him that we are going to have to solve it one retirement at a time. I feel like we are moving back to this past. Yes, the reorganization of the college was done poorly. Depending on who you talk to, a lot of things were done poorly. I propose that instead of moving backward that we move forward. I believe that we just need to move on.

Marc Sardy: I was going to start off by saying I absolutely agree with Thom about 200K a year. When I heard the word “equality,” the first thing I thought of was Animal Farm: “Some are more equal than others.” This document has nothing to say about staff or non-tenure track faculty. I’ve been watching these conversations for many years. I want to congratulate the provost for dealing with a very small pie. But since 2007 when our endowment was smaller, ten years later our endowment is 307mil. If we had kept up with the DOW, our endowment would be 6-9 million dollars. What we are doing now is fighting over what little money could be cobbled together by the provost. Why has this institution not kept up with the market the way other institutions have? For us to be worried only about faculty and not concerned with staff is inappropriate.

Kistler: I want to remind people that the discussion is actually on this amendment and what is on the floor.

Susan Libby: I want to bring attention back to this amendment. If the idea that the first principle in our philosophy of compensation is to strive for equality is being radical and uncompromising then we have way bigger problems. I also think that it’s problematic to suggest that future amendments or those that may be made today may be problematic as well. We don’t know what is going to be proposed, and if any future ones are going to be like this one, I don’t know how we can be accused of being unrealistic.

Jill Jones: I just want to actually second what Susan just said. This is a principle. It says, “principle of equity” and “philosophy of compensation.” It is not a philosophy of compensation to follow the law. The first line here is “In keeping with our mission, our culture, and our value
of collegiality…” That is the only line that matters to me in this and if it is not in it, I will not vote for it. I sure as hell wouldn’t and neither should you. Thank you for your patience.

Anne Murdaugh: This document has equity the other one has equality. Does equality all mean that we all get the same salary?

Homrich: Of the forums that I attended, the amendments that are shown in the distributed document are much closer to the voices of the faculty who attended that forum and there were close to 50 faculty there. Those voices confirmed the ideas that were written in red.

McLaren: Greg pointed out to me this morning that ‘equity’ has too much room for interpretation. Then change it back to equality.

Murdaugh: I want to know what I am voting on. I need a definition.

McLaren: I take ‘equality’ to mean ‘fairness.’

Murdaugh: That’s not a definition. I need a definition to know what I’m voting on. Does fairness have to be equal?

Tillmann: I just want to affirm the notion that this is ought to be an aspirational document. To strive for this is important here. If everything we ask for is achievable then it’s not enough. Our philosophy doesn’t have to fit within the parameters that the board and administrators set for us. There will always be a tension between labor and management. The document should not be based on what we imagine or project that the Board and administrators want.

Fuse: I’m not going to get up and defend this, but it’s not like we had the administration or Board of Trustees present for those meetings. This document is based on what we heard from the survey, retreat, forums, and conversations with faculty.

Grant Cornwell: I’m going to try not to speak very much. This is a document produced by the faculty, but I want to engage in it from a philosophical standpoint. Don’t try to channel the reification of faculty salaries to administrators. When you talk about administrators, you are talking about me and Susan [Singer]. We asked for and are looking for guidance here. When and if you can give us guidance, we are happy to receive it and have resulting conversations. We didn’t participate in the shaping of this guidance on purpose. How we work with your guidance will depend on what you bring forward. Don’t imagine what the Board thinks. All of this is very exciting.

D’Amato: I would propose that we change the word ‘equality’ back to ‘equity.’ On this one amendment I think this phrasing it better than the crossed-out version because it simply restates the principle of equity. I support this because it sticks with our values.

McLaren: I accept this change.

Kistler: There is one change between this and the original statement. It is that it does say “in and across departments” and that is a change.
Murdaugh: [yells] “What does ‘equity’ mean?! I’m serious.” [general laughter]

Harry Kypraios: I do believe we are an organization that has strong morals and we jointly produce an output. My students learn about economics, but they also know about communication, and writing, and can do the math. Some of my salary should go to you guys. Relative salaries do matter, especially when the substantive underlying reality is relatively equal. We all contribute a relatively equal amount. I understand this proposal, it means a lot to me. My experience here has been fortunate. It has allowed me to learn, grow, and work. It should be relatively attractive to all potential candidates. I’m more concerned about what’s going to happen to starting salaries. The issue of salary arose when I came here in 1983 as a Visiting Assistant. That year I got an offer at Stetson for a lot more money, the college came some way to match that and now that I’ve been here 40 years, I’ve come to appreciate this place more than I did after that first year. I’ve had great colleagues, but even then, I was willing to give up some money to stay. On the issue of starting salaries: there’s a problem of asymmetric information. None of our candidates knows how great it is to work here until they are here. Imagine the starting salary for a computer science faculty member is 80K and the starting salary for a biologist or historian is 50K. Say we choose a benchmark for each of the programs and set a median salary at 63K. If we start with the same salary across departments, the history department is going to get a peach and computer science is going to get a lemon. Market forces. Just like in the natural sciences there’s this force called gravity, in the social sciences there is this force called market. We are not going to be able to have equity across departments if we ignore these forces. We could move to the practices of a union. The danger is we get to something that resembles the Soviet adage “they pretend to pay us and we pretend to work.”

James McLaughlin: I want to say a couple of things. The principle of equity is the first part of this statement, so it is already in there. What I would propose is that there be two statements: the first would be that the philosophy strive for equity. I also think there should be a second legal statement—we do have to comply with regulations, and I see nothing wrong with this. I think we should leave in the section about legal requirements prohibiting discrimination.

Kistler: Are you proposing an amendment?

McLaughlin: Yes

Kistler: We need to vote on the first amendment before voting on the second amendment.

McLaughlin: I make a motion to amend the amendment: In keeping with our mission, our culture, and our value of collegiality, the first principle in our philosophy of compensation is to strive for equity in and across departments. Faculty salaries will comply with College policies and legal requirements prohibiting discrimination.

Richard Lewin: Second

Paul Harris: Call the question.

Russell: Second
**Kistler:** [reads the amendment]

**Clicker Vote:** 68%-passes

**Wendy Brandon:** I’d like to make a motion to make an amendment to the document that “faculty structure will minimize compression and inversion” should be changed to “sex and gender inequities, compression and inversion will be examined regularly and redressed.”

**Homrich:** Second

**David Charles:** I would just like to reiterate what’s already been said to the prior amendment and apply it to this case. We are in many ways redressing the ills of past administrations. I love the trope of looking forward, but we can’t look forward and ignore what’s happened to the people who are the bedrock of this institution. Last year we redressed the salaries of the assistants and associates, but now we need to look at the colleagues who are above us on the ladder. And I say this by looking at people I look up to in many respects of the term. Many of the people who are proposing changes are—if I am allowed to put these words together—“senior women” and it is important that we support them.

**Ted Gournelos:** Call the question.

**Charles:** Second

**Rick Vitray:** What are we voting on? The amendment or the original?

**Kistler:** The amendment.

**Clicker Vote:** 65% Passes

**Libby:** Here comes another proposed amendment. Under the principle of competitive salaries, the third bullet point, I seek to strike “starting salaries and internal disparities….” and replace it with “Through continuous fundraising, the Board and administration will seek to eliminate discipline-based disparities.”

**Tillmann:** I want to speak strongly in favor of this amendment. Let us return to the phrase “will seek” and the notion of aspirational language. This may not be fully realistic at this time, but we should strive for this. I’d like to add a historical note: discipline-based disparities really came into effect only in 2009. For a college that’s been around since 1885, that’s a fairly recent change. The board at that time and the administration of Lewis Duncan created these disparities. We charge this administration and this board to fundraise to match all salaries to what they believe it takes to hire a professor of business.

**Gournelos:** My issue with this is only through the notion of continuous fundraising. I’m concerned by relying on fundraising to raise our salaries when the amount raised through fundraising varies every year. I would like us to consider additional ways to do this. Our
president has asked us for a guide. I think we should provide a guide how we can address
discipline-based disparities.

Fuse: This is an aspirational document [document put forth by Task Force]; this is an operational
document [document put forth by faculty members].

**Gournelos:** Operational and aspirational are not the same.

**Cornwell:** Since this does directly name the board and administration, I’d like to speak to it.
With all due respect, I think this is really ill-advised. Go up to the principle of growth. [reads]
That is the mandate; that is the message you want to send. Trying to craft through this document
how fundraising would work is a bad idea. It would have to start with seeking an endowment for
faculty salaries and then you’d be limited to 5% of the fund. That is a decades-long road. I have
made faculty salaries a commitment of my administration and I am working on that task. I would
urge you to leave this one out because I don’t think it’s well-crafted.

**Harris:** I don’t know why the first three words are there, eliminate is unrealistic, maybe
minimize? I think there’s a lot of resentment about disciplinary based inequity because we all do
the same job, Equity usually has to do with what you input and what you output. Whether you’re
in art or business, your input, the level of effort is pretty much the same. There was one
regression line, but it was a very messy regression line. I guess I’m ambivalent about this. It is
unrealistic. I would like to return to the Garden. I don’t think the Garden was ever the Garden.
We’re still reacting to the divisional abuse that occurred under the previous administration.

**Mike Gunter:** I have a clarification question for Chris [Fuse]. When you use the word ‘market,’
there are two ways to look at this. Are you talking about competition from schools like us or
competition from outside of the academic market?

Fuse: We have always used the academic market.

Harris: I don’t know why first three words are here if we are going to go for it……

Kistler: I know that Anca is next and [addressing Anca], I will call on you. But I want to be
cognizant of the time. Specifically, I want to propose that since it’s a reading day that we extend
the meeting time until 2pm give us an extended amount of time to discuss.

Jennifer Queen: Second

**Voice vote:** Approve, by acclamation.

Anna Voicu: I’d like to second Grant and Paul; I strongly agree with what they are saying. I
have been thinking that we would maybe like to revisit and reword it before we think and talk
more about it. It’s very vague to me ‘to eliminate discipline-based disparities.’ There are
disparities between English, Economics, Crummer and Business. We all want to be paid like
Crummer faculty, but is that feasible? I don’t think so. How going to do this? The market exists
and we can’t ignore it as much as we want to. I propose that we revisit this and try to come up with better definition or statement. Thank you.

Sardy: One of the issues I have is with this continuous fundraising thing. The College has not had the kind of returns in the past couple of years that it had in the past. Putting this in here is going to create a problem for the Board and the President. I suggest that we table this until we can consider other suggestions.

Kistler: Are you motioning that we table the amendment or the document or both?

Sardy: Withdraw the amendment and the document.

[Gasps and general commotion]

Russell: Call the question on the motion to table.

Robert Vander Poppen: The motion to table can’t be used to call the question. The motion to postpone can be. This is an illegal use of Robert’s Rules.

[Motion removed. Return to discussion]

Tillmann: I propose that that we amend the second bullet under the Principle of Transparency: “The process for selecting recipients of major awards and endowed chairs must be open and transparent. Faculty should be able to nominate and self-nominate in all cases.”

Cornwell: That’s going to be a lot of work and will require the development of processes. But I think this would be a good thing for the College.

J. Davison: I think this responds to cases across the years where maybe people were denied salary increases and then maybe received Arthur Vining Davises or people received awards and then departments denied them for tenure and promotion.

Laurel Habgood: I just want to make a point of fact that having served on several awards committees where nominees’ CEC and FEC documents were on file, I can say that if we make it transparent, we potentially are going to open up those documents to the public.

Jonathan Harwell: Call the question.

Todd French: Second

Vote: 65% passes

Habgood: Call the question on the document.

McLaughlin: Second
Kistler: All in favor of calling the question? [Voice acclamation. Unclear results.] Let’s use a clicker vote to call the question.

Dennis: I want to express concern again that Robert’s Rules are being used to close down debate.

Kistler: Calling the question means that there will be no further debate on the document.

[Clicker vote to call the question].

Kistler: It’s 59% simple majority to call the question. There will be no further debate.

Vander Poppen: Can we confirm that calling the question is by simple majority? I believe it’s two-thirds.

Russell and Lewin: Calling the question does need two-thirds majority.

Kistler: The motion to call the question fails.

Dennis: I would like to propose one more amendment: “The size and cost of other units of the college (e.g. Student Affairs and the administration) must examined and reported upon regularly.”

Josh Almond: I appreciate the intent on this but this is a faculty compensation philosophy and a little inappropriate to involve all areas of college in our document.

Murdaugh: Ditto. To me this reads as petty.

D’Amato: It’s not petty because it deals with the principle about how we cut up our piece of the pie. We want to know how big our piece of the pie is, and is that piece getting bigger or smaller. I suspect it’s getting smaller but I don’t have that data.

Clicker Vote: 47% in favor, 48% opposed, 5% abstain

Kistler: The amendment fails because it doesn’t receive the majority. We still need to vote up or down on the document as a whole. If you could possibly stay until we can vote, I would appreciate it.

Jones: I’m sorry, I have a small change that I feel makes the document make sense. I would like to cross off the last four words “without compromising qualification standards” from the Principle of Competitive salaries.

Kistler: I think that does change the intent slightly of that statement and I would encourage people to think about it.

Kypraios: Does this violate the agreement of voting on document as whole? Can I suggest that we eliminate the entire bullet point?
**Kistler:** That would be a separate amendment. We need to vote on the amendment on the floor.

**Sardy:** I mean, getting rid of “compromising qualification standards”—what we’re basically saying is that any department that has any existing standards of accreditation—like Psychology, Education and Business— that we’re just striking that?

**Queen:** Psychology doesn’t go through accreditation and they certainly don’t determine our salaries.

**Steve Schoen:** Am I correct in that this is an advisory document and in that striking this phrase does not direct the administration to ignore qualifications?

**Kistler:** This is an advisory document.

**Libby:** I was going to say the same thing.

**Paul Reich:** Call the question.

**Almond:** Second.

**Clicker Vote:** 50%, 48% and 2% abstain.

**Kistler:** My parliamentarian is telling me that it passed.

**Schoen:** Is the voting machine rounding?

**Russell:** What I would say in this case is that this looks like a plurality of votes not majority.

**Lewin:** The amendment passes.

**McLaren:** Call question for the whole document.

**Rubarth:** Second

Voice acclamation

**Clicker vote on revised and amended document:** 79% pass

**Cornwell:** As a point of personal privilege, I want to say two things. The first is that this is what faculty governance feels like. Every place that I have ever known and worked at have elected people to craft important work. The work is hard. They then bring forward their best thinking and the faculty to go to work on the proposals. The committees have worked hard, and we wouldn’t have gotten to where we are without them. And I’m grateful to them. It’s the end of the semester, and this is what I will do. We will review your recommendations over the next few weeks. Next semester is the Spring. Susan and I will come back to you and speak to you at this time.
**Fuse:** Motion to Adjourn

**French:** Second

Meeting Adjourned at 2:01pm
Agenda: Meeting of the Faculty of the College of Liberal Arts
12/13/17

1. Approve Minutes from November 16, 2017 CLA Faculty Meeting

2. Announcements
   a. Cornell Distinguished Faculty Awards
   b. Olin Library Prize for Undergraduate Library Research

3. Old Business
   a. Social Innovation Major (see attached)

4. New Business
   a. Philosophy of Compensation (see attached)
   b. Motion to Amend CLA Bylaws Article VIII, Section 4, d. (see attached)
   c. Social Entrepreneurship Proposal (see attached)
      i. Department
      ii. Division Move

5. Committee Reports
   a. Curriculum Committee
   b. Faculty Affairs Committee
   c. Executive Committee
Motion: To amend Article VIII, Section 4, d. of the CLA Bylaws as follows:

Article VIII. Faculty Appointments and Evaluations

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

Section 4: Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor Evaluation

d. Evaluation by the Candidate Evaluation Committee

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 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.

Rationale: Due to the college closure during Hurricane Irma, many CEC meetings were postponed and class observation visits canceled. As a result, the CLA faculty voted on September 21 to abrogate the above section of the bylaws to allow CECs more time to get their letters to the Dean. We are now moving to amend this portion of the bylaws and put this language back in to them.
Rollins College Philosophy of Faculty Compensation, College of Liberal Arts
In concert with our mission to “value excellence in teaching, and rigorous, transformative education,” the objectives of the College of Liberal Arts’ faculty compensation philosophy are to attract, retain, and reward qualified and talented faculty and promote collegiality. Rollins College values the work and contributions of all faculty members and is committed to their ongoing professional development. The administration recognizes that it would not be possible for the College to meet its mission without the contributions of the faculty of the College of Liberal Arts, particularly in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service.

Principle of Equity
- Faculty salaries will reflect equity and comply with College policies and legal requirements prohibiting discrimination.
- The faculty salary structure will minimize compression and inversion.
- Faculty salaries will be examined annually through statistical analysis according to time in rank and years of service. Faculty salaries should not be below their predicted values.

Principle of Growth
- Fair and just salaries will be a budget priority, with the goal to expand the pool of resources allocated for all faculty salaries and compensation.
- Salary adjustments will reflect increases for inflation.

Principle of Competitive Salaries
- The median base salaries of faculty of the College of Liberal Arts at Rollins College, based on time in rank and years of service, will align with the median base salaries of the faculty at the schools in our benchmark group, as identified by our approved methodology.
- To ensure that Rollins College continues to attract quality faculty, prior experience, qualifications, teaching, scholarship, and service will be taken into account when determining starting salaries.
- Starting salaries and internal disparities attributable to external market conditions should be constrained to the greatest degree possible without compromising qualification standards.

Principle of Transparency
- To ensure open communication regarding compensation policies, a subcommittee of the Faculty Affairs Committee, along with the Provost, will annually review and report de-identified salary information and the measures by which starting salaries are established and salaries are adjusted to the College of Liberal Arts faculty.
Rollins College Philosophy of Faculty Compensation, College of Liberal Arts

In concert with our mission to “value excellence in teaching, and rigorous, transformative education,” the objectives of the College of Liberal Arts’ faculty compensation philosophy are to attract, retain, and reward qualified and talented faculty and promote collegiality. Rollins College values the work and contributions of all faculty members and is committed to their ongoing professional development. The administration recognizes that it would not be possible for the College to meet its mission without the contributions of the faculty of the College of Liberal Arts, particularly in the areas of teaching, scholarship, and service.

Principle of Equity

- In keeping with our mission, our culture, and our value of collegiality, the first principle in our philosophy of compensation is to strive for equity in and across departments. Faculty salaries will comply with College policies and legal requirements prohibiting discrimination.

- Sex/gender inequities, compression, and inversion will be examined regularly and redressed.

- Faculty salaries will be examined annually through statistical analysis according to time in rank and years of service. Faculty salaries should not be below their predicted values.

Principle of Growth

- Fair and just salaries will be a budget priority, with the goal to expand the pool of resources allocated for all faculty salaries and compensation.

- Salary adjustments will reflect increases for inflation.

Principle of Competitive Salaries

- The median base salaries of faculty of the College of Liberal Arts at Rollins College, based on time in rank and years of service, will align with the median base salaries of the faculty at the schools in our benchmark group, as identified by our approved methodology.

- To ensure that Rollins College continues to attract quality faculty, prior experience, qualifications, teaching, scholarship, and service will be taken into account when determining starting salaries.

- Starting salaries and internal disparities attributable to external market conditions should be constrained to the greatest degree possible.

Principle of Transparency

- To ensure open communication regarding compensation policies, a subcommittee of the Faculty Affairs Committee, along with the Provost, will annually review and report de-identified salary information and the measures by which starting salaries are established and salaries are adjusted to the College of Liberal Arts faculty.

- The process of selecting recipients of major awards and endowed chairs must be open and transparent. Faculty should be able to nominate and self-nominate in all cases.