

4-4-2019

Minutes, College of Liberal Arts Faculty Meeting, Thursday, April 4, 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, April 4, 2019" (2019).
The College of Liberal Arts Faculty Minutes. 143.
https://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_fac/143

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
4/4/19**

1. Approval of Minutes from 3/21 CLA meetings
2. Business
 - a. Governance At-Large Elections
 - b. Approval of FEC Slate and CLA representatives to All-Faculty Appeals Committee
 - c. Tenure and Promotion Review Bylaws Changes
 - i. Midcourse review (year and material submission date)
 - ii. Intent to seek evaluation
 - iii. CEC composition
 - d. Cumulative GPA Discussion and Vote
 - e. Endowed Chair Policy Discussion



**Meeting of the Faculty of the College of Liberal Arts
4/4/19**

In Attendance

Agee; Anderson; Archard; Armenia; Balzac; Baranes; Barnes; Bernal; Bommelje; Boniface; Brannock; S.-E. Brown; Cannaday; J. Cavanaugh; Charles; Cheng; Chick; Chong; G. Cook; T. Cook; Cornwell; Crozier; D. Davison; Decker; DeLorenzi; DiQuattro; Douguet; Dunn; Ebin; Elva; Ewing; Forsythe; French; Fuse; Garcia; Gerchman; Gilmore; S. Gonzalez Guittar; Gournelos; Grau; Griffin; Gunter; Habgood; Hammonds; Devin Hargrove; Harper; Harwell; Hewit; Hudson; Johnson; Jones; KC Raghambendra; Kincaid; Kistler; Kline; Kypraios; Lewin; Lines; Manak; Mathews; McLaren; McLaughlin; Mesbah; Mohr; Montgomery; Moore; Mosby; Murdaugh; Musgrave; Myers; Namingit; Newcomb; Nichter; Nodine; O'Sullivan; Paladino; Park; Parsloe; Patrone; Perez-Villa; Pett; Pieczynski; Prosser; Queen; Reich; Riley; Roe; Russell; Sanabria; Santiago Narvaez; Sardy; Schoen; Simmons; Singer; Smaw; P. Stephenson; Summet; Tatari; Teymuroglu; Tillmann; Vander Poppen; Warnecke; Wellman; Williams; Wilson; Yankelevitz; Yellen; Zhang; Zimmermann

Meeting started at 12:35 pm.

Approval of Minutes

Motion: *Do you approve the minutes from the March 21, 2019 CLA faculty meeting?*

Debate: Ashley Kistler

Moved: Mattea Garcia

Second: Dan Myers

Approved by acclamation.

Announcements

Ashley Kistler: We are experiencing issues with technology and the projector not working. Reminds those sitting in the back rows that the clickers won't register so faculty members should move forward. A whiteboard will be used added to place candidate names prior to voting. We will be able to see the results of each clicker vote on Karla's computer.

New Business

Motion: *Who shall serve as CLA Faculty President?*

Debate: Ashley Kistler

Ashley Kistler: Announces that Marc Fetscherin has withdrawn his nomination. The nominee is Paul Reich. Asks if there are any nominations from floor.

Moved: Lisa Tillmann calls for a vote by acclamation.

Second: Jill Jones

Approved by acclamation.

Motion: *Who shall fill the two at-large vacancies on Curriculum Committee?*

Debate: Ashley Kistler

Ashley Kistler: The three nominees are Ashley Cannaday, Brian Mosby, and Brendaliz Santiago Narvaez. Asks if there are any nominations from the floor.

Ashley Cannaday: Asks to withdraw her nomination.

Socky O'Sullivan: Asks for nominees to stand.

Ashley Kistler: Asks for candidates to stand.

Moved: Dexter Boniface moves for a vote by acclamation.

Second: Jenny Cavanaugh

Approved by acclamation.

Motion: *Who shall fill the three at-large vacancies on the Faculty Affairs Committee?*

Debate: Ashley Kistler

Ashley Kistler: The two nominees are Beni Balak and Leslie Poole. She asks for nominations from the floor.

Derrick Paladino: Nominates Sam Sanabria

Ashley Cannaday: Self nominates.

Ashley Kistler: Reminds everyone to vote for up to three candidates. The system is set to accept multiple votes. Notes that those sitting in the back row need to move forward to ensure that their votes register.

Results of Clicker Poll (Beni Balak – 41, Leslie Poole – 85, Samuel Sanabria – 73, Ashley Cannaday –

71, Abstain – 0)

Motion: *Who shall fill the at-large vacancy on the Faculty Research and Development Committee?*

Debate: Ashley Kistler

Ashley Kistler: The two nominees are Leigh DiLorenzi and Jenn Manak. She asks them to stand and seeks any nominations from the floor.

Results of Clicker Poll (Leigh DiLorenzi – 34, Jenn Manak – 50, Abstain - 4)

Motion: *Who shall fill the three at-large vacancies on the Student Life Committee?*

Debate: Ashley Kistler

Ashley Kistler: The four nominees are Daniel Flick, Jonathan Harwell, Nancy Niles, and Sarah Parsloe. It was noted by colleagues that both Daniel Flick and Nancy Niles could not be present at the meeting today. Jonathan and Sarah stand. There are no nominations from the floor.

Results of Clicker Poll (Daniel Flick– 34, Jonathan Harwell – 82, Nancy Niles – 61, Sarah Parsloe – 89, Abstain - 0)

Motion: *Do you approve the Faculty Evaluation Committee slate?*

Debate: Ashley Kistler

A slide is shown with the following information about the Faculty Evaluation Committee slate.

Dana Hargrove	(2018-2021)	Expressive Arts
Mario D’Amato	(2019-2022)	Humanities
John Houston	(2017-2020)	Science/Math
Joan Davison	(2017-2020)	Social Sciences
Jim McLaughlin	(2019-2022)	S. S. Applied
Amy Armenia	(2019-2020)	Social Sciences

Alternate: Tom Cook (2019-2020)

Ashley Kistler: The next order of business is to ratify the FEC slate. She reads the names aloud and notes new members. There is no representative from the business division as no full professor was available to serve. Amy Armenia will serve a one year term. The bylaws permit this as they divisional representation is strived for but not strictly required.

Motion: Dexter Boniface

Second: Jenny Queen

Robert Vander Poppen: Moves for a vote by acclamation

Second: Lisa Tillmann

Approved by acclamation.

Motion: *Do you approve the CLA representatives to the All Faculty Appeals Committee?*

Debate: Ashley Kistler

A slide is shown with the following information about the All-Faculty Appeals Committee (CLA).

Lee Lines (2018-2021)

Rachel Simmons (2017-2020)

Dexter Boniface (2019-2022)

Alternates:

Rachel Newcomb (2018-2021)

Stacey Dunn (2018-2021)

Ashley Kistler: Today we are only addressing CLA membership as Crummer elects their own. The members names are read with new members noted.

Susan Montgomery: Asks for an explanation of the charge of the committee.

Ashley Kistler: The committee hears grievances and disputes over outcomes for tenure and promotion. Asks for a motion for vote by acclamation

Motion: Steve Schoen

Second: Lisa Tillmann

Approved by acclamation.

Discussion and Motions: Tenure and Promotion Review Bylaws Changes

Debate: Ashley Kistler

Ashley Kistler: Notes that the SunTrust auditorium is now available but moving at this time would be difficult. The PowerPoint has been distributed via email and asks those with laptops or mobile devices to share with others to follow along. The following bylaws changes are to address inequities or areas of concern that emerged from the reports of the tenure and promotion working group. The first is the timeline for when a candidate goes up for midcourse. This was not a recommendation from the working group but did come up in colloquium discussions. The change would require candidates to go up for midcourse review in their year. There is a separate part in the bylaws for those candidates with prior experience.

Motion: *Do you approve proposed change to Article VIII, E. Section 3a of the CLA bylaws?*

The following information was presented as a slide.

Article VIII

Section 3. Comprehensive Mid-Course Evaluation

Notification

- a. ~~Normally, t~~The comprehensive mid-course evaluation will take place in the spring of the candidate's third year, ~~but no later than two years before the evaluation for tenure is to take place.~~

Motion: Lisa Tillmann

Second: Josie Balzac

Lisa Tillmann: I am serving on FEC this year and strongly support this. First, it makes the FEC schedule more predictable. Second, the sense of FEC members, who are meeting right now, is that the fourth year is too late if issues need to be addressed. If there are concerns there might not be enough time to make changes.

Ashley Kistler: EC heard this from the FEC as well. The sentiment was widely shared during the colloquia.

Robert Vander Poppen: I am strongly in support. When I was on EC there were a number of times the Dean had uncertainty about the projected number of cases to FEC and this would give stability in the planning process.

Deb Wellman: I encourage colleagues to undergo midcourse in year three but the option of the fourth year might be a better choice for a few.

Jonathan Harwell: Asks what the sense of the untenured faculty members was during the breakout sessions at the colloquia.

Ashley Kistler: The minutes indicated there was no unanimous view expressed on this issue. The comments were divided.

Tom Cook: Asked if those currently here would be grandfathered in.

Jenny Cavanaugh: Yes.

Fiona Harper: Indicates she has two colleagues in the pipeline and would like clarification.

Ashley Kistler: They would still have the choice of midcourse year. Once they reach the tenure point they would be under the current bylaws.

Jenny Cavanaugh: Confirms this.

Emily Russell: Calls the question.

Ashley Kistler: Seeing no hands raised notes that the question doesn't have to be called. A two thirds majority is needed to pass.

Results of Clicker Poll (Yes – 80, No – 14, Abstain - 2)

Motion: *Do you approve proposed change to Article VIII, E. Section 3b. and corresponding table in Section 6 of the CLA bylaws?*

The following information was presented as a slide.

Article VIII

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

b. The candidate must submit their materials electronically to the CEC, Dean of the Faculty, and FEC by ~~December 15~~ the first day that the college is open for business in January.

- Corresponding to table in Section 6.

Ashley Kistler: There was a sense that the current date no longer was good due to changes in the academic calendar. A candidate couldn't see their fall course instructor evaluations before submitting midcourse materials so the materials due date should move. A specific date has the potential to be messy if it falls on a weekend, The first day of the spring semester was too late to allow members of a CEC or the FEC to review materials prior to the start of classes. The Dean's office will notify the candidate of the specific date for the year. There is no ambiguity for the candidate but there is ambiguity in the bylaws.

Moved: Deb Wellman

Second: Jonathan Harwell

Ashley Kistler: Seeing no hands calls for the vote reminding everyone that a two thirds majority is needed to pass.

Results of Clicker Poll (Yes – 95, No – 1, Abstain - 1)

Motion: *Do you approve proposed changes to Article VIII, E. Section 3b, 4c, and 5c of the CLA bylaws?*

The following information was presented as a series of slides.

Intent to Seek Evaluation

Article VIII Faculty Appointments and Evaluation, E.

Section 3. Comprehensive Mid-Course Evaluation

b. The Candidate

The candidate must submit their materials electronically to the CEC, Dean of the Faculty, and the FEC by the first day that the college is open for business in January. Submission of materials by this date is final and candidates cannot retract their intent to seek a tenure and/or promotion evaluation once these materials have been submitted.

Section 4. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor Evaluation

c. The Candidate

The candidate must submit their materials electronically to the CEC, Dean of the Faculty, and the FEC by July 1. **Submission of materials by this date is final and candidates cannot retract their intent to seek a tenure and/or promotion evaluation once these materials have been submitted.**

Section 4. Promotion to Professor Evaluation

c. The Candidate

The candidate must submit their materials electronically to the CEC, Dean of the Faculty, and the FEC by July 1. **Submission of materials by this date is final and candidates cannot retract their intent to seek a tenure and/or promotion evaluation once these materials have been submitted.**

Ashley Kistler: The following came out of the tenure and promotion working groups recommendations. This would apply to faculty during midcourse, promotion to tenure, and promotion to full professor. The rationale is if a candidate submits and later retracts this creates work for CEC and FEC members, the Dean, and others along the way. This only applies to a few cases, those candidates with prior experience or other reasons for a flexible timeline. The promotion to full professor is flexible for everyone. The request to make this process equitable for all was discussed at the colloquia. Once all materials are uploaded there would be a submission button on Canvas or an email sent to the Dean indicating your submission is official. This would be the final step where a retraction is not possible.

Moved: Amy Armenia

Second: Chris Fuse

Steve Schoen: Is there any extreme escape valve, for example the case of a spousal death.

Ashley Kistler: There is a clause in the bylaws that the Dean can approve an exception. Asks if there are other thoughts or comments.

Results of Clicker Poll (Yes – 78, No – 12, Abstain - 9)

Motion: *Do you approve proposed change to Article VIII, E. Section 1a. of the CLA bylaws?*

The following information was presented as a slide.

Article VIII, Faculty Appointments and Evaluations

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

Section 1: Candidate Evaluation Committee Structure and Evaluation

a. Membership

The chair of the department to which the candidate has been appointed, in consultation with members of that department, shall select a Candidate Evaluation Committee by May 15 prior to the academic year in which the evaluation takes place. The CEC normally consists of the Chair of the department (unless the Chair is being evaluated) and a minimum of two additional tenured members of the department who are selected by a majority of all **full-time tenured or tenure-track** members of the department, without excluding tenured members who wish to serve. In addition, a member of the FEC serves as an ex officio (non-voting) member when the candidate is being evaluated for tenure or promotion. If two additional tenured members of the department are unavailable, non-tenured

tenure-track members may be appointed. If non-tenured **tenure track** members are **unwilling or unavailable to serve**, the department Chair, with the advice of the candidate and the approval of the CEC, will select tenured members from outside the department to serve on the CEC. If the department Chair is the candidate being evaluated, another member of the department shall be selected as CEC chair. The chair of the CEC will notify the FEC, the Dean of the Faculty, and the candidate of the members of the CEC by June 1.

Ashley Kistler: The final proposal relates to the composition of the CEC. There are several changes. The bylaws say that the CEC members are selected from full-time faculty members in the department. Given the recommendation of the working group the words tenure-track were added to avoid the potential that a visitor or lecturer would be a CEC member. Another wording change to the wording was related to untenured members of the department serving on a CEC and balancing their right to do so with those situations where a faculty member might be uncomfortable serving.

Moved: Dexter Boniface

Second: James Patrone

Mark Anderson: Asks for clarification that untenured can't serve on CEC if enough tenured members are available.

Ashley Kistler: Some departments don't have enough members and this is not a change from the current bylaws.

Pedro Bernal: Asks if untenured members would be voting members.

Ashley Kistler: Currently the bylaws allow this but is not currently our practice.

Pedro Bernal: Expresses concern about the possibility of quid pro quo arrangements.

Ashley Kistler: Yes, this could happen.

Pedro Bernal: Cautions that in some situations this could be awkward.

Dexter Boniface: I am in favor of this and wish we had the projector to show the wording. The bylaw change of full time to tenured seems exclusive but the working group was concerned that the possibility of a lecturer or visitor or someone with limited institutional experience as a CEC member is not in the interest of the integrity of the process. There is an emphasis in the second part as it is possible and the word unwilling gives flexibility for someone who feels it is not appropriate to serve.

Ashley Kistler: Seeing no hands calls for the vote.

Results of Clicker Poll (Yes – 80, No – 11, Abstain - 2)

Discussion and Motion: Cumulative GPA for rFLA

Debate: Emily Russell and Gloria Cook

Ashley Kistler: The next agenda item is the proposal for a cumulative GPA for rFLA.

Gloria Cook: We are asking for approval to change from individual grades to a cumulative rFLA GPA to allow those students struggling in certain disciplines to move forward in the curriculum.

Emily Russell: What we found in curriculum committee is that there is a disproportionate emphasis in rFLA grades that is not found in our majors. rFLA includes the five competencies which require a grade of C- (WCMP is a C), an RCC, and the five foundations (formerly neighborhood) courses that also have a C- requirement. The goal is to raise the bar to a 2.0 across all eleven courses to align with requirements for majors and graduations.

The following information was presented as a series of slides with data found in Attachment 2.

Changing the Grade Requirement for Foundations Seminars to a Cumulative GPA Requirement.

- Replace a minimum of grade of C- with a minimum cumulative 2.0 GPA in all Rollins Foundations in the Liberal Arts courses.
- This 2.0 GPA calculation includes all rFLA coursework - RCC, competencies, and Foundations Seminars.

Rationale

- A minimum 2.0 cumulative GPA across all rFLA coursework would slightly raise expectations of student performance, while also distributing the grade requirement across multiple courses.

Competency

- Grade minimums for competency courses would remain unchanged.
- C- for FCMP, MCMP, Health & Wellness, ECMP and C for Writing.

Motion: *I approve of the cumulative GPA policy.*

Moved: Jenny Queen

Second: Lisa Tillman

Rachel Simmons: I supported the proposal in CC and teach the 300 level rFLA where it is crucial to pass to graduate. Currently if a student's grade falls below a C- it puts a senior in the position not to graduate.

Dexter Boniface: A point of clarification, the idea is the student with a D doesn't have to repeat but can move on. If so that is a reasonable policy and I am in support.

Fiona Harper: I also support the policy. It is unclear where the C- grade requirement in the foundations courses came from. This allows students to get a D and pass the class. The 2.0 is in alignment with our other policies.

Jenny Queen: If I fail do I have to repeat?

Ashley Kistler: Yes. A faculty member unable to attend was worried about student athletes and their eligibility if the rFLA GPA falls below 2.0.

Emily Russell: Is happy to have the conversation with our NCAA representative. As this change is in

alignment with cumulative GPA policies it doesn't appear to be out of step or have implications for eligibility.

Ashley Kistler: The student would be on probation.

Emily Russell: If the student has a GPA below 2.0 in eleven courses they are already on our radar.

Fiona Harper: Is the 2.0 a graduation or ongoing requirement?

Emily Russell: This is a grad requirement. Probation is for terms and overall GPAs and if you fall below you are already on our radar.

Gloria Cook: CC said that if you see a student not doing well in a 200 rFLA this is red flag for the academic advisor.

James Patrone: Is in support as someone who give their fair share of Ds. I would not want to set a student back a year in their general education requirements when a science major is free to keep going with a D. The current system is too punitive for general education.

Anne Murdaugh: If this passes what do I tell current students?

Emily Russell: In general on campus we are seeing a rise in the number of Ws. It is important to have a conversation about resilience. Before a student would be on track for a D but take the W option. In the summer we will update DegreeWorks requirements so the new policy is in effect. As it is a graduation requirement it will pull forward these courses so student doesn't need to do anything. If they have a D now, complete the semester as this a D now looks like success. Use the late CR/NC option if student is failing with an F.

Matt Nichter: Asks if students have to actively opt in.

Emily Russell: No

Ashley Kistler: Asks for any final comments. Seeing no hands notes that a simple majority vote is needed.

Results of Clicker Poll (Agree – 93, Disagree – 2, Abstain - 3)

Discussion: Endowed Chair Policy Discussion

Debate: Ashley Kistler

Ashley Kistler: The final item of business is the endowed chair policy. Indicates that we will start with the survey questions we didn't get to at the last meeting to see where we are. After the survey questions the floor will open up to continue discussion

Survey Question 1: I support the proposed application and review process outlined in the endowed chair policy.

Ashley Kistler: The policy proposes the process is open for self-nominations and requires a periodic review process for those holding the positions. Reiterates that it is a survey, not a vote.

Lisa Tillman: Asks for a discussion to occur prior to the survey questions.

Ashley Kistler: Notes that EC recommended the survey first to see the numbers.

Results of Clicker Poll (Agree – 61, Disagree – 13, Abstain - 15)

Survey Question 2: I support the tiered system outlined in the endowed chair policy.

Ashley Kistler: Notes the tiered system is three levels, Cornell Distinguished Faculty Awards, endowed professorships, and endowed chairs.

Results of Clicker Poll (Agree –48 , Disagree – 27, Abstain - 15)

Ashley Kistler: According to the policy endowed professorships have six year terms, renewable twice for a twelve year total. The Cornell awards are still three years and the endowed chairs are perpetually renewable.

Survey Question 3: I support creating a sub-set of endowed chairs that have fixed term limits.

Results of Clicker Poll (Agree – 63, Disagree – 17, Abstain -11)

Survey Question 4: I support the proposed endowed chair policy.

Results of Clicker Poll (Agree –48 , Disagree –22 , Abstain -16)

Ashley Kistler: Opens the floor for discussion to collect more feedback.

Lisa Tillman: Read the following prepared statement.

I'm Lisa Tillmann. Last August, the start of my 20th year at Rollins, I was named William R. Kenan Chair of Critical Media and Cultural Studies.

I begin and end with this message: this faculty is amazing.

If you haven't heard from me at a faculty meeting this year, it's likely due to my service on the Faculty Evaluation Committee, FEC. Bill Boles, McKean Chair, also serves on FEC.

In December 2017, this faculty passed our Philosophy of Compensation.

Going into that meeting, many of us felt that the proposal put forward by Faculty Affairs insufficiently addressed well-articulated and widely-articulated concerns about equity. As a result, faculty (I among them) proposed amendments from the floor. Three passed:

1. "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." – Passed: 65%

2. "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." – Passed: 68%
3. "Sex/gender inequities, compression, and inversion will be examined regularly and redressed." – Passed: 65%

Those equity statements, *which I coauthored*, did NOT call for a tiered system in which discipline- or department-based chairs would be privileged over "professorships" open to faculty across disciplines. As Kathryn Norsworthy said at our last meeting, under Faculty Affairs' proposal, colleagues in 14 departments—most departments—only would have access to *second-class professorships*, NEVER to Class 1 chairs. This directly violates statement 2's commitment to "equity in and across departments."

As Deb Wellman noted, most chairs that Faculty Affairs proposes we demote are held by women. This violates statement 3's commitment to equity based on sex.

Collegiality. Faculty Affairs held a forum in April 2018 and met with endowed chairholders last October.

February 18 this year, Faculty Affairs sent endowed chairs its proposal and requested feedback. Though many chairs attended and participated in the April and October meetings, our voices did not seem to make their way into the proposal.

In response to the February 18 request for feedback, several chairs communicated opposition to a tiered system that relegates most CLA faculty to second class. Much of that opposition came from chairs who would NOT be affected by changes in policy because they are close enough to retirement age and/or hold discipline-based chairs.

In the February 18 call for feedback, chairs were NOT told that the proposal already had been submitted—as is, without input—to the Executive Committee (EC). No one alerted chairs that this proposal would be discussed 3 days later and voted on at EC.

Endowed chairs are not the only stakeholders on this issue; we ALL are. But chairs ARE stakeholders, and many of us feel *systematically excluded* from the process of developing this proposal. As a coauthor of the equity statements which sparked this proposal, I feel excluded on that front as well.

That is NOT, in my mind, "collegial" per equity statement 2.

At our last meeting, I heard from Faculty Affairs not-so-veiled language suggesting that endowed chairs may not be pulling our weight, that we need further assessment, monitoring, term limits.

From service on FEC, I reiterate: this faculty is amazing. Our colleagues are amazing. Amazing teaching, research and service happen all over this campus and wherever Rollins faculty are. Overwhelmingly, our colleagues are doing their jobs—and far beyond. If you never have served on FEC, I promise you cannot fully appreciate just how deep and widespread this is.

If there are "slackers" among the CLA faculty as a whole, I don't know who they are. If slackers exist among endowed chairs, I don't know who THEY are.

I implore you: let's NOT convey support for hierarchy based on whether or not a wealthy alum has endowed a chair in your department, for demotions and permanent second-class status, and for possible cuts in benefits. That's what a future corporatist administrator might do. Let us behave instead like a faculty union, banding together and lobbying for MORE: higher salaries for everyone, more awards, more endowed chairs.

This faculty is amazing. We deserve—you deserve—no less.

Socky O'Sullivan: Thank you Lisa, I agree entirely. For due diligence, I have an endowed chair but an expiring shelf life so the policy won't affect me. It will affect my love of Rollins. I have devoted much of my life and energy and love to Rollins to make it the best possible school it to be. In the process I have been proud of the way previous presidents have focused on the value of the endowed chair. When I came here there were about five endowed chairs for a hundred faculty members. Changes with the help of Thad Seymour and Rita Bornstein means there is now a significant number. I am actually concerned in the received documents that the problem is that we have too many. I thought this was one of our strengths, not our issue. In 44 years this is the first time at a faculty meeting I have seen a vote before a discussion. The first time that I have heard a faculty committee present a reduction in faculty benefits. This was presented as an expansion, not a reduction. An endowed chair is appointed so long as the faculty member remains active. The current proposal makes one third rotating. From a professional point of view, try explaining to members of regional, state, and national organizations if you received an endowed professorship at 40 and it is taken away at 52. This would leave a serious question mark on your career. I have spoken with colleagues at UF, FSU, and others as well as Rita Bornstein. Rita called Grant and Susan to explain the issues with this. In 1978 a Provost said we had too many tenured faculty and asked them to give up tenure every seven years and reapply. In the 1980's an administrator suggested we would have more money for benefits if we get rid of family benefits. In the 1990s it was suggested we get rid of tuition remission for faculty and staff, and then staff. I expected the committee to study the issue of endowed chairs and why they are important at Rollins. Thad had this conversation and added scholarship as a requirement for full promotion to full professor and developed sabbaticals and endowed chairs to support this. This is an ongoing practice and we are admired for it. People pointed out that we had a thirty million dollar endowment but more chairs. Dress for success, dress for the job you want not have, not the one you do. What do we aspire to have. I hoped that the committee would have proposed to double the number of Cornell chairs in three years and double the number of chairs in the next decade. Vote on this and present it to Grant, who might be unhappy with this. Do what colleagues in Crummer do, they point out facilities are not worthy of them. I wish more of the senior people were here. For those who are new, go online and see how schools view endowed chairs. As all my friends said, this is just strange.

Ashley Kistler: The survey was on the agenda last time. We had time for discussion first at the last meeting before the surveys today. I received two questions by email from colleagues unable to attend. Currently FAC is the body that oversees the process, would that change with the new faculty research and development committee playing a role.

Chris Fuse: FAC discussed this as a likely possibility.

Ashley Kistler: In regards to the Cornell Distinguished Faculty Awards they felt strongly against putting the in same category. This is the one award where all decision making power is in the hands

of the faculty. They would advocate to separate these awards from the process rather than relinquish the decision making power to administrative supervision.

Margaret McLaren: Following from Socky's comments. I appreciate the importance of access for more people and separate the concept of rotation from term limits. Currently if the chair is not designated to a department it does rotate. I have completed research online and talked with others. Term limits are not common. If an endowed chair is earned in your forties and lost in your fifties this does not look good professionally. We should think of ways to increase awards, chairs, and benefits.

Ashley Kistler: Notes that the time is late and seeks a motion to adjourn.

Motion to Adjourn

Moved: Dexter Boniface

Second: Jenny Queen

Approved by Voice Vote at 1:44 pm.

ATTACHMENT 1

Divisions	Executive Committee	Curriculum Committee	Faculty Affairs Committee	Faculty Research and Development Committee
Business	Richard Lewin	Kip Kiefer	David Caban	Nick Houndonougbo
Expressive Arts	Dawn Roe	Caitlin Mohr	John Grau	Robin Gerchman
Humanities	Scott Rubarth	Steve Schoen	Ben Hudson	Denise Cummings
Science and Mathematics	Jennifer Queen	Valerie Summet	Rachelle Yankelevitz	Kathryn Sutherland
Social Sciences	Dan Chong	Martina Vidovic	Don Davison	Shan-Estelle Brown
Social Sciences-Applied	Wenxian Zhang	Patti McCall	Ted Gournelos	Jie Yu

At-Large Representatives	Executive Committee (Faculty President)	Curriculum Committee (Pick 2)	Faculty Affairs Committee	Faculty Research and Development Committee
#1	Marc Fetscherin Paul Reich	Brendaliz Santiago-Narvaez Ashley Cannaday Brian Mosby	Leslie Poole	Leigh DeLorenzi Jenn Manak
#2	n/a	Whitney Coyle	Beni Balak	n/a
#3	n/a	Rachel Simmons	VACANCY	n/a
#4	n/a	VACANCY	n/a	n/a

Student Life Committee

Continuing Members:

Amy Parziale
Zhaochang Peng

Vacancies (pick 3):

Daniel Flick
Jonathan Harwell
Nancy Niles
Sarah Parsloe

ATTACHMENT 2

Data of Students not meeting the required passing grade of C- by terms

Counts	D	D-	D+	F	HZ	W	I	HF	Totals
201501	4	1	4	2	0	11	1	0	23
201509	4	2	5	6	1	4	2	0	24
201601	5	5	3	11	1	32	3	0	60
201609	3	4	3	5	1	19	1	1	37
201701	8	4	9	16	0	36	5	0	78
201709	3	2	3	11	1	21	5	2	48
201801	15	7	4	9	3	41	4	1	84
201809	2	4	3	4	2	33	4	4	56

rFLA 100 courses only

Counts	Sp 2015	Counts	Sp 2016	Counts	Sp 2017	Counts	Spring 2018
D	4	D	4	D	4	D	3
D-	1	D-	1	D-	4	D-	2
D+	4	D+	3	D+	1	D+	1
F	2	F	7	F	7	F	4
HZ	0	HZ	0	HZ	0	HZ	1
W	11	W	16	W	14	W	18
I	1	I	2	I	3	I	2
HF	0	HF	0	HF	0	WF	0
Total	23	Total	33	Total	33	Total	31

Note for Context:

- 1) rFLA 100 (approx. 25 courses) only offered in spring semester
- 2) 1st full cohort was Class of 2018

Counts for cumulative rFLA GPA ranges for 117 students who received D/D+/D- since Spring 2015:

4 students 0-2
 18 students 2-2.5
 51 students 2.51-3
 44 students 3.1-4