

1-24-2019

Minutes, College of Liberal Arts Faculty Meeting, Thursday, January 24, 2019

College of Liberal Arts Faculty, Rollins College

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



Part of the [Educational Administration and Supervision Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

College of Liberal Arts Faculty, Rollins College, "Minutes, College of Liberal Arts Faculty Meeting, Thursday, January 24, 2019" (2019). *The College of Liberal Arts Faculty Minutes*. 141.
https://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_fac/141

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 The College of Liberal Arts Faculty Minutes by an authorized administrator of Rollins Scholarship Online. For more information, please contact rwalton@rollins.edu.



**Agenda: Meeting of the Faculty of the College of Liberal Arts
1/24/19**

1. Announcements
2. Approval of Minutes from 12/12 and 11/29 CLA meetings
3. Business
 - a. Revisions to the Academic Honor Code: Discussion and Vote
 - b. Governance Reform Divisional Structure: Discussion and Vote
 - c. Tenure and Promotion Review Working Group Report and Discussion



**Meeting of the Faculty of the College of Liberal Arts
1/24/19**

In Attendance

Agee; Almond; Anderson; Angell; Archard; Armenia; Balzac; Baranes; Bommelje; Boniface; Brannock; S.-E. Brown; V. Brown; Caban; Cannaday; J. Cavanaugh; Charles; Chong; G. Cook; Coyle; Crozier; A. Davidson; Decker; DeLorenzi; DiQuattro; Douguet; Ebin; Elva; Ewing; Fokidis; Forsythe; Framson; French; Grau; Habgood; Devin Hargrove; Harris; Hewit; Homrich; Hudson; Johnson; Jones; Kincaid; Kistler; Kline; Kodzi; Lewin; Luchner; McClure; McLaren; Mesbah; Mohr; Montgomery; Moore; Morris; Murdaugh; Myers; Namingit; Newcomb; Nichter; Niles; Norsworthy; O'Sullivan; Park; Pett; Pieczynski; Pistor; Reich; Roe; Roos; Ryan; Santiago Narvaez; Sardy; Schoen; Simmons; Summet; Svitavsky; Tome; Voicu; Warnecke; Williams; Wilson; Wunderlich; Yankelevitz; Yao; Yellen; Zhang

Announcements

Meeting started at 12:33 pm.

Susan Montgomery: In April 2018, the LACS program hosted the Latin American Studies symposium for the first time giving undergraduate students the opportunity to present their research on issues related to Latin America. We inherited the symposium from Birmingham College Southern who hosted it for 25 years. Last year there were 36 accepted student presentations; Rhodes, Davidson, Flagler, Furman, USF, Baylor U, FSU, FAU and 11 by Rollins students. We will once again host this undergraduate symposium under the new name of Latin American Latinx Studies Symposium. This new title expands the scope of the symposium giving students the opportunity to present their research on Latinx topics such as immigration, healthcare, and politics. Very relevant issues in the US. Information regarding the symposium is available on the symposium website – <https://www.rollins.edu/las-symposium/index.html>

I am here to invite you to attend the symposium. The registration fee will be waived for members of the Rollins community. I ask you for your help in promoting the symposium to your students. If you have students who have completed a research project with a focus on Latin America or Latinx, please encourage them to submit a proposal. I emailed to all faculty the link to the symposium website where students can submit their proposal. Unless you unsubscribed from my email, you should have received it. The deadline is March 1. We have been promoting the event to Florida colleges and universities as well as ACS member schools. We plan to improve on our success from last year with your help. If you have any further questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Ashley Kistler: Asked for a moment of silence in honor of our colleague, Michele Boulanger, who recently passed.

Approval of Minutes

Motion: *Do you approve the minutes from the November 29, 2018 CLA faculty meeting?*

Debate: Ashley Kistler

Ashley Kistler: There are two sets of minutes due to the shortened timeline between the November and December faculty meetings. Asked for amendments to the minutes from the floor. Seeing none sought a clicker vote to approve the minutes and establish if quorum had been met.

Motion: Paul Harris

Second: Todd French

Results of Clicker Poll (Yes – 73, No – 0, Abstain - 2)

Motion: *Do you approve the minutes from the December 12, 2018 CLA faculty meeting?*

Debate: Ashley Kistler

Motion: Patricia Tome

Second: Paul Harris

Results of Clicker Poll (Yes – 70, No – 0, Abstain - 3)

New Business

Motion: *I approve the proposed changes to the Academic Honor Code.*

Debate: Ashley Kistler, Jenny Cavanaugh

The following information was presented as two slides.

Academic Honor Code Amendments

Context

- 2017-18 Honor Council suggested edits to Honor Code, but not presented in time to SGA and Curriculum Committee
- Current Honor Council made additional edits
 - Updated document reviewed by SGA, Curriculum, EC
 - Consideration of Holt Council
- Notable Changes
- Holt students permitted to serve on Council
- One Council to serve both CLA and Holt
- “HF” not automatic sanction on second offense
- “HF” not automatic sanction on cases that go to formal hearing
 - Faculty advisor and Council discretion
 - Fewer instances of “plea bargaining”

Jenny Cavanaugh: Is presenting today on behalf of Gabriel Barreneche. The copy editing and revision of the Academic Honor Code started last year. The substantive items that came up are now in front of you. The document has been approved by the Honor Council, SGA including Holt, Curriculum Committee, and Executive Committee. The original version did not include Holt and this is inefficient. There is now a single Honor Council with Holt representation. The other two changes are related to sanctions. In the original code a student at the informal hearing chose either responsible or not responsible. If pleading not responsible the next step was a formal hearing and the only outcome is not responsible or HF. In practice, students weren't willing to take the risk of an HF so plead responsible and that didn't feel right to the advisors. The revised version removes that an HF is the mandatory outcome at a formal hearing, giving more flexibility. The Council also believed that the mandatory HF sanction for a second offense was problematic and there is now flexibility in deciding the sanction and in consultation with faculty.

Paul Harris: Asked what happens to students with a third offense and how many offenses before suspension from the College.

Jenny Cavanaugh: The third time can be a suspension. The members of the Council can't suspend a student, but sends written recommendation to the Dean.

Paul Harris: Can you be responsible third time without HF?

Jenny Cavanaugh: There is no requirement for this. She notes students are often much harsher than faculty.

Ashley Kistler: Reiterates that the document was approved by the Academic Honor Council, SGA, Curriculum Committee, and Executive Committee.

Dan Chong: Are there discussions of number of offenses versus severity?

Jenny Cavanaugh: The code does not address this but relies on the discretion of the Council, laying out a series of possibilities. Another code change would be needed to address this interesting point.

Toni Holbrook: Is the council aware if the student had prior Honor Code violations?

Jenny Cavanaugh: Yes.

Ashley Kistler: Asks if there are any other questions. Seeing none asks for the motion to vote.

Motion: Dexter Boniface

Second: Paul Harris

Results of Clicker Poll (Yes – 68, No – 8, Abstain - 2)

Motion: *I vote to affirm and retain the current divisional structure outlined in Article V, Section 4 of the CLA Bylaws.*

Debate: Ashley Kistler

The following information was presented as four slides.

- In Spring 2016, the CLA faculty endorsed the current governance structures for a three-year trial period
- Criteria for Divisional Structure: Self-Determination, Divisional Coherence, Numerical Balance
- Article V: Governance Structure, Section 4. Procedures, The College of Liberal Arts divisions and their constituent units are:
 - Expressive Arts: Art and Art History, Music, and Theatre and Dance;
 - Humanities: English, Modern Languages and Literatures, Philosophy and Religion, and Critical Media and Cultural Studies;
 - Science and Mathematics: Biology, Chemistry, Environmental Studies, Mathematics and Computer Science, Psychology, and Physics;
 - Social Sciences: Anthropology, Economics, History, Political Science, and Sociology;
 - Social Sciences (Applied): Communication, Graduate Studies in Counseling, Education, Olin Library, and Health Professions;
 - Business: Business and Social Entrepreneurship
- Departments by Division
 - Expressive Arts (30) - ART/ARH (8), MUS (11), THE/DAN (11)
 - Humanities (46) – CMC (3), ENG:18, MLL:15, PHI/REL:10
 - Science (48) – BIO (10), CHM (7), ENV (5), MAT (10), PHY (6), PSY (10)
 - Social Sciences (30) – ANT (6), ECO (8), HST (4), POL (8), SOC (4)
 - Social Sciences-Applied (42) – COM (12), Counseling (5), EDU (7), HLP/HPE (9), Olin (9)
 - Business (23) – BUS (20), SE (3)

Ashley Kistler: Notes that we are in the third year of the trial of the reformed governance structure reform. The EC has elected to separate the issues of divisional structure and committees. The February faculty meeting will be about committees to allow for time to discuss feedback from the December faculty meeting. Let us know if you have concerns. Today is about affirming our current divisional structure. We are not voting on bylaws as if the divisional structure is affirmed today no bylaws change is needed. The floor is open for discussion. Seeing none, asks for the motion to vote.

Motion: Paul Harris

Second: Dexter Boniface

Results of Clicker Poll (Yes – 72, No – 4, Abstain - 3)

Discussion: Tenure and Promotion Review Working Group Findings and Recommendations

Debate: Dexter Boniface

Attachment 1 includes the information presented as slides that Dexter Boniface reported from.

Dexter Boniface: Starts by noting that the committee was convened by EC last spring to look at a holistic review of tenure and promotion and thanking the members of the group. The work was divided into two phases, one last spring and one this fall. The data collected and analyzed came from department criteria, the bylaws, and the Dean's office helped by providing information from benchmark institutions. The final report provided to faculty includes department specific information where appropriate. This presentation provides an overview with the most actionable items.

There are greater inequities for scholarship requirements for promotion to full than at tenure and it is recommended that departments look at this accordingly.

Rollins is anomaly in excluding associate professors from this type of work/committee. This was discussed during governance reform three years ago and the current FEC is opposed to this with some compelling rationale. There is recognition that it is a charged issue. The recommendation is to create an opening for a possibility of associate professors to serve on FEC. Notes that the faculty rely on EC to deliver a slate of FEC candidates and passing this provision still leaves the option for a no vote. Divisional representation is desirable and sometimes difficult to achieve with the only full professors eligible to serve on FEC.

The composition of the CEC is a thornier issue and the committee had no clear recommendations as there seemed to be more problems than solutions. There is the suggestion to update the bylaws to reflect current practice including participation limited to tenured/tenure track members, as the language now permits lecturers or visiting assistant professors.

The standardization of criteria is done well in the bylaws but could use some clarity for those with prior experience including tenure decisions are final and spell out both when a candidate submits and when the candidate is eligible/awarded.

In terms of the timeline of evaluations we are not alone in this, but more than half of the institutions do this less frequently (omitting review in 1st and/or 5th year). The committee questioned how much new is gathered each time and believed the first is important but the year after midcourse might be optional.

Ashley Kistler: Notes that we are not voting, but using the time remaining to discuss the recommendations and ask questions, taking the temperature of the room. There will be at least one colloquium for straw polls before a vote is brought to the faculty.

Paul Harris: Read the report and voiced that the recommendations were quite good in terms of the tenure timeline. Suggested that something might be added about the post tenure review (PTR) timeline. The PTR occurs two years prior to sabbatical. For those who have just completed a promotion review and a year later are completing a PTR nothing substantial really changes in a year. Perhaps alter the bylaws where appropriate so PTR isn't necessary if within one to years of last promotion.

Dexter Boniface: Notes this is consistent with procedural issues and will build in this item.

Victoria Brown: Asks who decides on the quality or value of online publications. Does the candidate make the case or the department?

Dexter Boniface: The department should consider and make the decision if it is appropriate for the discipline. The department values are represented in the criteria. The committee observed that many departments have no reference to this and if they are worried it is a concern they should include language in their next review.

David Charles: Stated that he was not sure if it is in the purview, but best practices of CEC protocols would be helpful as challenges in the consistency for departments arise. There is an opportunity here.

Dexter Boniface: The issue came to the committee and in meeting with the FEC, the FEC expressed issues with CEC are a foremost concern. Our committee centered on the composition, John Houston, chair of the FEC, is working to develop guidelines and protocols. The fair question is where such a document would live, codified in the bylaws or with a chair of a particular committee. How the CEC conducts themselves is a different domain.

David Charles: With the change of chairs, department knowledge might not be consistent in CEC meetings.

Dexter Boniface: When looking at the report, issues with CEC composition is primarily in small departments. The composition is straightforward in large departments, but when there are not enough tenured/tenure-track members there are no clear guidelines for when and who are chosen as outside members. There is no clear solution for this important process issue. If FEC develops a document it should go before the faculty.

Ashley Kistler: One of the issues is that the FEC workload is so great they can't attend faculty meetings. The reason for the colloquium is so members can be present and share insight. Therefore the straw polls will be conducted there and not at this faculty meeting.

Socky O'Sullivan: Appreciates the reasonable and thoughtful work. Before the FEC was formed the tenure process resembled a Southern gothic novel with real authority not in the hands of the faculty but the administration. FEC has integrity and independence. The greatest challenge is if FEC is perceived as not having integrity and independence, Currently the FEC does an extraordinary job and administrators see this. Don't want to go back to the Provost or President overturning decisions.

Dexter Boniface: Are you for or against associate professors serving on FEC?

Socky O'Sullivan: Against.

Kathryn Norsworthy: Echoes thanks to the committee and raises a question to think about regarding CEC composition. With more associates and untenured on CECs, consider the political environment and awareness of being evaluated by those of higher rank/position. Asks if this was a conversation by the committee and notes it should also be discussed in the colloquium.

Dexter Boniface: There is a tension between two principles, department autonomy and rank. The bylaws favor the department. Some expressed going outside the department is perilous with potential for an outside member casting the deciding vote. There is a case to be made for rank. Small departments with two untenured might not be the best choice to make a decision for promotion to full. The principles are in conflict and my read of bylaws is fundamentally for the CEC as a departmental body. Reiterates that current bylaws permit any full time member, including visiting assistant professors and lecturers, can be a CEC member.

Jill Jones: Is impressed with the thorough report, Notes that departments control the CEC which primarily composed of assistant and associate professors, while FEC, full professors, serves as a balance. If associates serve on FEC the check and balance system might be lost.

Dexter Boniface: Asked for others to weigh in about the issue of associates serving on FEC. The

committee knew from prior discussions the arguments against, but were surprised by the research. How do you philosophically justify keeping associates off the committee as a protective measure when tenure is the protection, not promotion to full.

Margaret McLaren: Adds that conversations that the committee had were fairly evenly split concerning this issue. They were aware of the issue of voting above rank in the departmental process and the FEC as a balance to this. There was much conversation without a consensus resolution.

Dexter Boniface: Echoed Jill's comments that the way the system is set includes checks and balances for CEC (often associates) and FEC (full), where each committee doesn't always agree.

Tonia Warnecke: Notes when CPS (College of Professional Studies) existed, she served on the tenure and promotion committee as an associate professor. She enjoyed the experience and learned much which was good professional development. She was only engaged in cases for tenure.

Dexter Boniface: Questions if this was noted in the CPS bylaws or by chance?

Tonia Warnecke: Did not remember the bylaw provision but noted it just happened that way as no candidates for promotion to full professor submitted during that time.

Dexter Boniface: Asks if it would be more palatable to limit cases to tenure?

Ashley Kistler: Notes EC brought this up with the FEC. Members of the FEC did not favor this as it is disruptive to the dynamic of the group on how they operate.

David Charles: Is intrigued by this issue and having voices of more recent colleagues who see changes in discipline/market, providing a different view to complement institutional history.

Dexter Boniface: Thanks everyone for feedback.

Ashley Kistler: Thanks the working group and notes EC will convene a second working group to address issues of evaluating teaching and the balance of teaching, scholarship, and service. Unless other business, seeks a motion to adjourn.

Motion to Adjourn

Moved: Paul Harris

Second: Susan Montgomery

Approved by Voice Vote at 1:44 pm.

ATTACHMENT 1

Overview

- Periodic review of the tenure and promotion process ensures that it is fair and equitable, provides clear guidance to faculty colleagues and supports the ongoing development of our faculty.
- In the spring of 2018, the Executive Committee created a faculty working group and charged them with conducting a holistic review of our current tenure and promotion process.

Membership

The Working Group consists of seven members, six divisional representatives and one associate professor representative:

- Dan Crozier (Expressive Arts)
- Dexter Boniface (Social Sciences), Chair
- Jonathan Harwell (Social Sciences-Applied)
- Margaret McLaren (Humanities)
- Nancy Decker (Associate Representative)
- Stacey Dunn (Natural Sciences and Mathematics)
- Tim Pett (Business)

Research and Scholarship

- Phase one examines a range of issues relating to scholarship:
- Inequities across departments in the amount of scholarship required
- The role of community-engaged and/or public scholarship
- Digital publishing and other changes in scholarly publications
- The potential of external evaluation of scholarship in assessing the overall quality of scholarly work (including an evaluation of processes at our benchmark schools)

Procedural Issues

- Phase two examines procedural issues:
- The role of associate professors in the tenure and review process
- The composition of the Candidate Evaluation Committee
- Standardization of criteria for eligibility for tenure and promotion
- The (annual) evaluation timeline for untenured faculty members.

Other Issues (Not Investigated)

- Given the scope of our investigation, the working group opted not to investigate two issues in our original charge, namely:
 - Assessment of teaching quality
 - The balance of teaching, scholarship, service and advising
- It is recommended that these issues be examined by another working group or committee in consultation with other relevant bodies.

Inequities Across Departments in the Amount of Scholarship Required

Findings: Inequities exist in terms of the amount of scholarship required for tenure and especially promotion (to full professor). Furthermore, a handful of departments require the same amount of

output for promotion (to full professor) as for tenure.

Recommendations: Departments on the low end of scholarly output should conduct a review of peer departments (utilizing our benchmark list) to determine if their criteria are consistent with peers in the discipline. Consistent with our bylaws, departments should establish “stronger” criteria of scholarly accomplishment for promotion from Associate to Full Professor than those required for tenure.

Role of Community-Engaged Scholarship and/or Public Scholarship

Findings: Most departments do not specifically address the role of community-engaged and/or public scholarship, or consider this type of scholarship a form of service.

Recommendations: To the extent that such scholarship is a strategic priority at Rollins, departments have an obligation to consider how to promote this type of work. Departments should thoughtfully consider whether or not community-engaged and/or public scholarship is equivalent to other forms of scholarship or is better conceived as part of service.

Digital Publishing and Other Changes in Scholarly Publications

Findings: Many departments recognize online or electronic journals though most do not specifically address digital publishing and other changes in scholarly publications.

Recommendations: The rise of predatory open-access publishing should be a concern for all academics. The committee recommends that departments be explicit about what types of electronic journals, books, and other sources are suitable for scholarly publication in their discipline.

External Evaluation of Scholarship

Findings: Most departments at Rollins do not require external evaluation of scholarship as part of the tenure and promotion process. A survey of our benchmark institutions reveals that Rollins is not exceptional as roughly half rely solely on internal review.

Recommendations: It is important that departments at Rollins develop methods to evaluate both the quantity and quality of research and scholarship. The faculty would benefit from a larger conversation about the potential value of external evaluation as a means of assessing the quality of scholarly work.

The Role of Associate Professors in the Tenure and Review Process

Findings: A review of Rollins’ benchmark schools reveals that Rollins is an anomaly: Rollins is the only school in our benchmark group that does not include Associate Professors on the FEC (or equivalent) committee.

Recommendations: The working group recommends that the bylaws be changed so that the composition of the FEC is limited to tenured professors with a *preference* for faculty holding the rank of Full Professor.

Composition of the Candidate Evaluation Committee (CEC)

Findings: The CLA Bylaws outline the membership and procedures of the CEC.

- The Bylaws permit CEC members to participate in decisions above their rank.
- The Bylaws indicate that any “full-time” member of a department can participate on a CEC when insufficient tenured members are not available.
- The Bylaws state that members from outside the department should only be appointed to the CEC when department members are unavailable.
- The Bylaws state that the CEC chair is responsible for collecting student evaluations and

making them available to the rest of the committee.

- The Bylaws indicate that candidates for Mid-Course Evaluation must submit their materials by December 15.

Recommendations:

- Participation on the CEC be limited to the tenured and tenure-track members of the faculty.
- The bylaws should be updated to reflect optimal and current practices.
- The deadline for Candidates for Mid-Course Evaluation should be moved from December 15 to later in December or possibly January 1.

Standardization of Criteria for Eligibility for Tenure and Promotion Review

Findings: The CLA Bylaws provide standardized criteria for eligibility for tenure and promotion review. For the most part the criteria are clear and straight-forward. Some issues arise with respect to candidates with prior experience.

Recommendations: The working group recommends that the bylaws be revised to make explicit that any and all tenure decisions are final. The bylaws set the clock for when faculty are eligible for the “awarding of” tenure and promotion. This language could be made clearer by stating both when candidates are eligible to *apply for* tenure and promotion as well as be *awarded* tenure and promotion.

The (Annual) Evaluation Timeline for Untenured Faculty Members

Findings: A review of Rollins’ benchmark schools reveals that many institutions (11 of 25) conduct reviews every year of probation but more than half (14 of 25) conduct reviews less frequently; for instance, many schools do not conduct reviews in the first and fifth years.

Recommendations: Rollins should retain the practice of conducting a review during a faculty member’s first year. The annual review which follows a faculty member’s successful midcourse should be optional.