Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Faculty of the College of Liberal Arts
September 19, 2019
12:30-1:45

Presiding: Paul Reich, President of the Faculty
Recording minutes: Jennifer Queen, Vice President of the Faculty/Secretary

Members in attendance: Agee; Anderson; Althuis; Barbero; Bernal; Boles; Bommelje; Boniface; Brannock; S.-E. Brown; Cannaday; Carnahan; G. Cavenaugh; J. Cavenaugh; Cheng; Chong; Cornwell; Coyle; Crozier; Cummings; Davidson; D. Davison; DeLorenzi; Douguet; Dunn; Ebin; Elva; Ewing; Fetscherin; Forsythe; Garcia; Gerchman; Gilmore; Gonzalez Guitarr; Grau; Greenberg; Gunter; Habgood; Hammonds; De. Hargrove; Harper; Harris; Harwell; Hewit; Hudson; Jones; Kadiyala; KC Raghabendra; Kiefer; Kincaid; Kistler; Kline; Kypraios; Lewin; Libby; Luchner; Maskivker; Mathews; McClure; McLaren; Mohr; Montgomery; Morrison; Mosby; Musgrave; Myers; Myslik; Namingit; Nichter; Niles; Nodine; Park; Parsloe; Patrone; Pett; Pieczynski; Poole; Queen; Ray; Reich; Riley; Roe; Roos; Rubarth; Russell; Sahm; Sanabria; Santiago Narvaez; Sardy; Schoen; Simmons; Singer; B. Stephenson; P. Stephenson; Stone; Summet; Sutherland; Svitavsky; Tatari; Teymuroglu; Tome; Vidovic; Vitray; Voicu; Walton; Warnecke; Wilson; Yellen; Yu; W. Zhang; Zimmerman

Invited guests: M. Weiner, A. Candage, M. Leaden, G. Beaudin

I. Meeting called to order at 12:33pm.

II. Approval of Minutes from May 1, 2019 CLA Meeting
   a. Paul Harris moved to approve the minutes from the May 1 meeting. Laurel Habgood seconded.
   b. Clicker vote: 74 Yes votes; 1 No votes; 3 Abstentions. Motion passed.

III. Announcements
   a. Paul Reich announced the result of the electronic confirmation to fill a committee vacancy. Rochelle Elva will serve on the Student Life Committee for a one-year term.
   b. Leslie Poole introduced Sandspur Editors Alex Candage & Maura Leaden who spoke briefly about the paper.

IV. Committee Reports
   a. Executive Committee: Paul Reich reporting
      i. Met twice since beginning of year. Approved All Faculty Bylaw change re: provost role in T&P. Will come to faculty for discussion and vote at next all college faculty meeting. Search for new Associate Dean of Academics will begin soon. Divisional reps, & Pres of EC, plus Dean of the Holt School and the Dean of Student Affairs will serve as search committee. Will convene a new working group to review T&P criteria for service and
balance of teaching, scholarship, and service to continue work from last year. Asked for interested faculty to reach out to their divisional reps.

b. Curriculum Committee: Martina Vidovic reporting
   i. Met once due to Hurricane Dorian. Approved two small changes for the Physics Department (1) regarding the Advanced Placement Policy and (2) regarding major map course renumbering. Currently reviewing the academic calendar for the year 2020/2021.

c. Faculty Affairs Committee: Don Davison reporting
   i. Re-examined the lecturer policy at the request of EC. Agreed to the principle of offering a multi-year contract to lecturers who achieve six consecutive years of successful teaching evaluations. Concurred that a three-year contract seems appropriate but recognize the dean and department chairs should have flexibility in these contract decisions given the diverse needs of departments. Strongly believe that the evaluation of lecturers should not be given to FEC—an already overworked committee—nor should a new committee be created. Instead believe evaluation of lecturers should be completed by the department chair plus one or two other members of the department in consultation with the Dean of Faculty. Finally, supports the principle of offering the ‘senior lecturer’ designation. Returning to EC for consideration.
   ii. Members agreed that they should expand the research conducted by Ben Hudson on potential bias when using course instructor evaluations (CIE) into a ‘white paper.’ White paper will examine the advantages and disadvantages of course instructor evaluations, the potential sources of bias by students when completing the evaluation, and a review of national best practices that should be followed when evaluating teaching. Goal is to issue white paper by December 1 and then follow up in spring with recommendations regarding best practices to be followed.
   iii. Raised several questions regarding the proposed Disruptive Student Policy. Dean Cavenaugh will follow up and return to the committee with the information.
   iv. Agreed to examine faculty salaries.

V. Business
a. International Programs Update: Giselda Beaudin reported on issues of declining enrollment numbers for study abroad and fielded questions. (see attached PPT)
   i. Q: Is this a Rollins issue or a national trend? A: This is a national trend mostly related to accessibility.
   ii. Q: Could the increasing trend toward double majoring and minoring be affecting these numbers? Can this be folded in to advising workshop? A: Don’t know about data, but may have to plan further ahead. Also, could delayed declaration of major be affecting this data?
   iii. Q: One point not a trend. Why are you saying this is a trend? A: Three semesters of declining numbers.
iv. Q: Data from a survey with students last year indicate that lower SES students don’t have a chance to earn income while abroad. This could be a barrier for students, especially if they are responsible for contributing to family income. A: There are some programs where students can earn while abroad. Or we can work to minimize impact by steering them to places with an especially low cost of living.

b. Studio Art Minor in Holt (see attached map and rationale also distributed with meeting agenda)
   i. Paul Harris moved to approve the Studio Art Minor in Holt. Mattea Garcia seconded.
   ii. Rachel Simmons introduced proposal and fielded questions.
      i. Q: Will more classes be offered in the evening? Or just will there just be day courses cross-listed as Holt? A: Art History will continue to support at least one course per year in the evening. The department has already been offering about four cross-listed CLA studio art courses starting at 4pm each year.
      ii. Clicker Vote: 86 Yes votes; 4 No votes; 1 Abstention. Motion passed.

c. Diversity and Inclusion Philosophy and Principles (see attached statement also distributed with meeting agenda)
   i. Maridath Wison moved to approve the Diversity and Inclusion Philosophy and Principles statement. Susan Montgomery seconded.
   ii. Stephanie Kincaid & Toni Holbrook gave short history of the statement and asked for questions. There were none.
   iii. Clicker Vote: 76 Yes votes; 6 No votes; 7 Abstentions. Motion passed.

d. Tenure and Promotion Review Working Group Report Redux (see attached also distributed with meeting agenda)
   i. Paul Reich gave short history of original report and resulting business conducted previous academic year. Brought up issues of FEC workload.
   ii. Paul Harris moved to go into a committee of whole (CoW). Jill Jones seconded.
   iii. Passed unanimously by voice vote.

iv. Report for CoW: Paul Reich reporting
   1. Two straw polls taken after debate. (1) Should the membership of the Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) be expanded in order to accommodate the large number of evaluation cases? Clicker Vote: 68 Yes votes; 11 No votes; 7 Abstentions. (2) Should Associate Professors be added to the FEC? Clicker Vote: 67 Yes votes; 10 No votes; 6 Abstentions. FAC will use the results as they consider bylaw revisions this year.
   2. Members encouraged to reach out to P. Reich, D. Davison, or their FAC divisional representatives with more comments on FEC membership.

VI. Motion to adjourn by Dexter Boniface. Jennifer Queen seconded. Meeting adjourned at 1:42pm.
# International Programs

Updates for College of Liberal Arts Faculty

September, 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall semester participants</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring semester participants</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter participants</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Break participants</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer participants</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semester total</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>140</td>
<td><strong>95</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-term total</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall total</td>
<td><strong>363</strong></td>
<td><strong>406</strong></td>
<td><strong>421</strong></td>
<td><strong>455</strong></td>
<td><strong>507</strong></td>
<td><strong>575</strong></td>
<td><strong>423</strong></td>
<td><strong>420</strong></td>
<td><strong>405</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Case for Semester Study Abroad

• Nationally the trend is towards short-term so semester study abroad sets our students apart
• Longer experiences = more opportunities for intercultural development, reflection, immersion, and language learning
• Semester study abroad at Rollins is the MOST accessible option in terms of cost
• IP Revamped Mission Statement Articulating the 4 Pillars: https://www.rollins.edu/international-programs/about-us/mission.html

DETERRING FACTORS

We asked CLA students what deterring factors they consider when deciding whether or not to study abroad for a semester.

(n = 159)
Debunking the Cost Barrier

- Rollins Approved Semester Programs:
  - Rollins tuition plus accommodation (double room with shared bath)
  - Majority of Rollins scholarships, all federal financial aid and all state financial aid can be applied to the semester abroad
    - Including Athletic scholarships
  - Generous need-based scholarships to offset the costs for airfare and visa
  - Off-campus students can receive larger awards to offset increased costs
  - Many of our program partners offer additional scholarships
Debunking the Degree Completion Barrier

• Rollins Approved Semester Programs:
  • Are designed to align well with Rollins degree programs
  • Rigorous faculty and staff review process with approval by the Curriculum Committee
  • Reviewed comprehensively every 3-5 years by IP and faculty on the Global Initiatives Committee
  • If there are concerns, the program moves forward to the Curriculum Committee
  • Courses on these programs are approved for general credit
  • Students work with faculty advisors and department chairs for course approvals for major and/or minor requirements

Debunking the Degree Completion Barrier

• rFLA Competencies
  • FCMP: semester programs are an opportunity to do intensive language
  • Mathematical Reasoning and Ethical Reasoning may be possible
  • Writing and Health and Wellness are difficult to fulfill abroad

• rFLA Foundations Seminars
  • 200-level divisional seminars can be taken abroad
  • Social sciences (C), expressive arts (A), and humanities (H) are good options
  • Sciences (S) can be harder to find abroad
  • From the Catalog: “The Associate Dean of Academics may approve courses at regionally accredited institutions of higher education other than Rollins for rFLA credit.”
Debunking the Degree Completion Barrier

• On an Approved Semester Program, students typically take 4-5 courses for 12-16 credits
• Most students study abroad in the junior year, though sophomore year and senior fall are also popular
• Sample schedule on track towards the 4-year degree:
  • 1 rFLA Foundations Seminar
  • 2 major electives
  • 1 course towards the FCMP or 1
• IP is interested in working with departments to identify programs that are a particularly good fit for your students
2019-20 Preliminary Participation Rates

- With support from faculty, we hope to reverse the downward trend!
- Fall 2019
  - 74 participants
  - Up from 65 in Fall 2018, but still low compared to prior years
- Spring 2019
  - 45 applicants for a 9/30 deadline
  - 34 participants in spring 2018
- Study Abroad Fairs in 2018 and 2019
  - Highest attendance ever
  - 185 confirmed students in 2018, and 196 confirmed students in 2019
The studio art minor includes a core of foundation courses that introduce students to the fundamental concerns of the art making process. Advanced level courses build upon this foundation and provide each student the opportunity to create individualized programs that reflect his/her interests. Through both practice and theory, developing artists refine their skills and techniques, expand their creative and imaginative capacity, and develop critical and analytical judgment.

**Students declaring a studio minor should contact their advisor or the Art and Art History Department chair to discuss course sequencing.**

Six (6) courses are required: Two (2) foundation courses, three (3) electives, and one (1) art history. One (1) of the required three electives must be at the **300 level** or higher. At least one of these electives must be an approved Digital Media course (see below for list).

### FOUNDATION COURSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Sequence/Prerequisite</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>G.E.*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ART 110 2D Foundations</td>
<td>1st Year Course (Required)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ART 120 3D Foundations</td>
<td>1st Year Course (Required)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ART HISTORY COURSES

Students must complete at least one Art History course chosen from the following list:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Sequence/Prerequisite</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>G.E.*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ARH 110 Introduction: Ancient-Medieval Art</td>
<td>Check Catalogue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ARH 120 Introduction: Renaissance-Modern Art</td>
<td>Check Catalogue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ARH 140 Introduction to Global Art</td>
<td>Check Catalogue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ARH 145 Introduction to African Art</td>
<td>Check Catalogue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ELECTIVES

Two (2) intermediate studio courses at the **200 level** or above, and one (1) advanced studio course at the **300 level** or above. At least one of these electives must be an approved Digital Media Course (see below for list).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Sequence/Prerequisite</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>G.E.*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ART Intermediate Studio: 200-Level or above</td>
<td>ART 110 &amp; 120; Check Catalogue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ART Intermediate Studio: 200-Level or above</td>
<td>ART 110 &amp; 120; Check Catalogue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ART Intermediate Studio: 300-Level or above</td>
<td>ART 110 &amp; 120; Check Catalogue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DIGITAL MEDIA COURSES:**

- ART 230: Introduction to Digital Media
- ART 223: Graphic Design I
- ART 323: Graphic Design II
- ART 310: Introduction to Video Art
- ART 295: Photo – Technique, Form and Content
- ART 300: Photography II
- ART 392: Digital and Mixed Media Printmaking

---

Name: ________________________________  Date: ________________________________
The Department of Art & Art History is hoping to add our existing Studio Art minor to Holt's curricular programs beginning in Fall 2019 (see attached minor map). We see a Studio Art minor in the Holt School as an opportunity to expand the study of visual art to the broader Central Florida community, further diversify the Holt School curriculum, and better serve the needs of our entire student population.

For the last 20 years, the department has regularly offered cross-listed courses such as Human Figure Drawing, 2D Foundations, and European Art. More recently, we've been averaging 4 cross-listed courses per year including electives and core courses representing the broad spectrum of our curriculum from photography to printmaking. Holt students in our courses have expressed an interest in taking additional studio art courses, particularly if they could earn a minor by doing so.

We have found that we can easily create a Studio Art minor in Holt without any changes to our course offerings and without any additional staffing, we would simply offer a few courses later in the day, though all Studio Art courses would be open to Holt students regardless of time offered (as in Music and English). We also believe that by offering a Studio Art minor in Holt, we may see a modest bump in our enrollment numbers over time. Of course, we will track these numbers closely during the first few years of the minor in order to manage the program's growth.
I. Rationale and Philosophy

Rollins College is committed to the diverse, equitable, and inclusive environment that is crucial for its mission of providing a liberal arts education for global citizenship and responsible leadership. In such a welcoming environment, all individuals are more likely to achieve their creative and intellectual potential. Simultaneously, the mission requires a Rollins community that supports and encourages inclusivity, empathy, and mutual respect in order to foster open exchanges of ideas, and that values the perspectives of groups historically underrepresented in higher education.

According to the College’s Non-Discrimination Policy, Rollins does not discriminate “on the basis of sex, disability, race, age, religion, color, national or ethnic origin, ancestry, marital status, veteran status, sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, genetic information, physical characteristics, or any other category protected by federal, state, or local law, in its educational programs, admissions policies, financial aid, employment, or other school-administered programs.”

To develop into global citizens and responsible leaders, students learn to respect and appreciate individuals with diverse cultural, political, social, religious, economic, and personal identities and backgrounds. They are open to new perspectives that challenge their world views and their ways of knowing and of doing. They cultivate the art of civil discourse and respectful disagreement.

To become productive workers in a global economy, Rollins students cultivate a critical consciousness in relation to their own locations in the “global village” and learn to respectfully collaborate with people from a multitude of countries, cultures, regions, backgrounds, and worldviews. They are open to change based upon what they discover through their cross-cultural exchanges and their experiences collaborating and problem solving with students, faculty, and staff from diverse backgrounds.

To live meaningful lives, Rollins students develop and expand their abilities to appreciate multiple perspectives and possibilities as the foundation for embracing a range of enriching life and work opportunities and fulfilling their potential.

Students best develop these skills and habits of mind by seeing them modeled on a campus that encourages the civil exchange of ideas and the respectful, just treatment of all members of the community, whether faculty, staff, or students. From a stance of humility, students benefit from exposure to multiple ways of knowing and being that reach beyond the confines of campus to include engagement with the local and global community.
II. Principles

A diverse and inclusive Rollins College community:

1. starts with the recruitment, retention, and support of a diverse group of faculty, staff, and students from underrepresented groups, and strives to ensure that these groups thrive, feel respected, and have voice;
2. aims to create a collaborative environment that promotes the robust exchange of ideas and the ability to respect disagreement;
3. seeks to foster a campus environment that feels secure, welcoming, and accessible for the entire community and, thus, promotes a sense of belonging;
4. supports individuals with diverse perspectives, socio-economic class, and life experiences, and individuals with multiple and intersecting identities;
5. understands that diverse environments may be challenging because they invite, and even compel, individuals to move beyond what is familiar to them;
6. requires a commitment to public engagement in the larger community and world that aligns with the institutional mission.

III. Procedure or Application

Not Applicable.

IV. Related Policies

College Policy 030.00 Nondiscrimination Policy Statement

V. Appendices/Supplemental Materials

Not Applicable.

VI. Effective Date

This policy is effective upon approval and supersedes all previously issued versions.

VII. Rationale for Revision

Not Applicable.
Tenure and Promotion Review Working Group

Final Report

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. The Tenure and Promotion Review Working Group consists of seven members, six divisional representatives and one associate professor representative. The members are Tim Pett (Business), Dan Crozier (Expressive Arts), Margaret McLaren (Humanities), Stacey Dunn (Natural Sciences and Mathematics), Dexter Boniface (Social Sciences); Jonathan Harwell (Social Sciences-Applied), and Nancy Decker (Associate Representative). The committee is chaired by Dexter Boniface.

Given the wide range of topics contained in the committee’s charge, the working group elected to conduct its review in two phases. The first phase of our investigation examines a range of issues relating to research and scholarship. In particular, it addresses the following topics: inequities across departments in the amount of scholarship required; the role of community-engaged scholarship and/or public scholarship; digital publishing and other changes in scholarly publications; and the potential of external evaluation of scholarship in assessing the overall quality of scholarly work (including an evaluation of processes at our benchmark schools). The findings are based on a systematic division-by-division review of departmental criteria in the College of Liberal Arts conducted in the spring of 2018.

The second phase of our investigation and examines a range of issues relating to procedural issues in the tenure and promotion review process. In particular, it addresses the following topics: the role of associate professors in the tenure and review process; the composition of the Candidate Evaluation Committee (CEC)\(^1\); standardization of criteria for eligibility for tenure and promotion review; and the (annual) evaluation timeline for untenured faculty members. This research was conducted in the fall of 2018. The findings are based on a systematic review of the College of Liberal Arts bylaws as well as data on tenure and evaluation processes at Rollins’ benchmark schools graciously compiled by the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts conducted in the fall of 2018.

Based on consultation with the Executive Committee and given workload constraints, the working group opted not to investigate two issues in our original charge, namely (item b.) “assessment of teaching quality” and (item c.) “the balance of teaching, scholarship, and service, including advising.” It is recommended that these issues be examined by another working group or committee (such as the Faculty Affairs Committee) in consultation with other relevant bodies.

\(^1\) The decision to focus specifically on the composition and duties of the CEC was based on consultations with the Executive Committee and the Faculty Evaluation Committee in the fall of 2018.
Phase One: Research and Scholarship

Inequities across departments in the amount of scholarship required

*Findings.* The working group found evidence of inequities across departments in terms of the amount of scholarship required for tenure and promotion (to full professor). For the most part the committee did not find wide discrepancies across divisions; rather, most inequities resulted from outliers within particular divisions. When looking at tenure criteria, a common minimal standard at Rollins is that candidates must publish either one book or two peer-reviewed articles (or two equivalent scholarly accomplishments such as a peer-reviewed book chapter or creative work).\(^2\) However, in a minority of departments, just one article (or equivalent) can fulfill the minimal criteria.\(^3\)

When looking at promotion criteria, most departments require more scholarly output than was required for tenure; a common but far from universal standard is one new book or three to five additional articles. However, a handful of departments require the same amount of output for promotion as for tenure and, in one case, the requirement for promotion is actually less than that for tenure.\(^4\) This is problematic given that the bylaws of the College of Liberal Arts explicitly state that “a stronger record of scholarly accomplishment” is required for promotion when compared to tenure.\(^5\) An additional consequence is that the scope of inequities across departments is greater with respect to promotion from Associate to Full Professor than for tenure.

*Recommendations.* The committee recognizes that every discipline has unique features. Given the observed inequities, the working group therefore recommends that those departments on the low end of scholarly output conduct a review of peer departments (utilizing our benchmark list) to determine if their criteria are consistent with peers in the discipline. Second, given our bylaws, the committee urges all departments that have not done so already to establish “stronger” criteria of scholarly accomplishment for promotion from Associate to Full Professor than those required for tenure.

The role of community-engaged scholarship/public scholarship

*Findings.* Most departments do not specifically address the role of community-engaged scholarship and/or public scholarship. Furthermore, in departments such as Business and Chemistry where it is addressed and indeed valued, this type of scholarship is considered a form of service. The History department is one of the few at Rollins that does recognize community-engaged and public scholarship. In particular, the department includes “Scholarly production for a more public audience” encompassing “non-peer-reviewed books and articles, museum exhibits, web pages, public presentations, and documentaries” as equivalent to other scholarly accomplishments such as peer-reviewed books and articles.

\(^2\) A few departments, including Business, English and Health Professions, require at least three articles for tenure.

\(^3\) I.e., Economics, Chemistry, Biology, Environmental Studies, and Art History.


\(^5\) Per the CLA bylaws (Article VIII, B., Section 1), “the College has higher [research and scholarship] expectations for candidates for promotion to Professor” [than tenure] including “a stronger record of scholarly accomplishment.”
Recommendations. To the extent that the production of community-engaged and public scholarship is a strategic priority at Rollins, departments have an obligation to consider how to promote this type of work. The committee recommends that departments 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, though certainly not all, departments recognize online or electronic journals though most do not specifically address digital publishing and other changes in scholarly publications.

Recommendations. While peer review is practiced by reputable scholarly publishers, both in paywalled and open-access sources, 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. Open-access publications in reputable scholarly sources, including journals and books, should be addressed in the criteria.

The potential of external evaluation of scholarship in assessing the overall quality of scholarly work, including tenure and evaluation processes at our benchmark schools

Findings. Most departments at Rollins do not require external evaluation of scholarship as part of the tenure and promotion process. A survey conducted by the Dean’s office reveals that Rollins is not exceptional when compared to our benchmark institutions 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.

---

7 The only departments where external review is required for tenure or promotion are Counseling, Mathematics, Physics, Studio Art, and Theater.
8 The Dean’s office was able to gather data on twenty-three of twenty-five benchmark institutions. Twelve did not require external review. Nine utilized both internal and external review and two others indicated they used external review “where appropriate.”
9 Business and Physics are among the few departments that make explicit distinctions among article publications. Business utilizes a list of peer reviewed journals that is widely accepted by AACSB for accreditation purposes and Physics requires that articles be published in professional society journals.
Phase Two: Procedural Issues

The role of Associate Professors in the tenure and review process

Findings. The College of Liberal Arts bylaws establish that membership in the Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) is limited to faculty who hold the rank of Full Professor.\footnote{Article VIII, Part E., Section 2 (FEC Structure and Evaluation), Part a. (Membership), p. 18.} During the governance reform process (AY 2015-2016), the question of whether Associate Professors should serve on FEC was contemplated but rejected in a straw poll by a majority of faculty. However, a review of Rollins’ benchmark schools reveals that Rollins is an anomaly in excluding Associate Professors. In fact, based on data from twenty-six of our peers, 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 believes that a number of reasons, both practical and philosophical, for including Associate Professors on the FEC. For example, expanding eligibility to include Associate Professors will make it easier for the Executive Committee to staff the committee with a slate of faculty that is appropriately representative as well as provide new service opportunities for Associate Professors. At the same time, the committee recognizes that some faculty prefer that the FEC be composed primarily by Full Professors. Therefore, 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.

The composition and duties of the Candidate Evaluation Committee (CEC)

Findings. The Candidate Evaluation Committee (CEC) is perhaps the most important body in tenure and promotion decisions and is the only body involved in annual reviews. The College of Liberal Arts bylaws outline the membership and procedures of the CEC.\footnote{Article VIII (Faculty Appointments and Evaluations), Part E. (Procedures for Mid-Course, Tenure and Promotion Reviews), Section 1 (CEC Structure and Evaluation), pp. 16-18.} Specifically, the bylaws state, “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 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 members may be appointed. If non-tenured members are unavailable, 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.” The working group offers the following observations and recommendations.
- The bylaws permit CEC members to participate in decisions above their rank. As noted above, non-tenured members may participate on the CEC when insufficient tenured members are available. Similarly, in cases where there are sufficient tenured members available, there is no requirement that any member of the CEC be a Full Professor when evaluating a candidate seeking promotion to Full Professor. The working group was divided on whether this was a good practice or not and therefore offers no recommendation. Indeed, the issue of whether or not faculty should evaluate professors above their rank is complex and requires thoughtful deliberation on the part of faculty governance.

- The bylaws indicate that any “full-time” member of a department can participate on a CEC when insufficient tenured members are not available. This would seem to include Lecturers and Visiting Professors, among others. **Recommendation:** The working group recommends a bylaw change such that participation on the CEC be limited to the tenured and tenure-track members of a department.

- The bylaws indicate that members from outside the department should only be appointed to the CEC when department members (regardless of rank) are unavailable. In situations where there are fewer than three tenured members available to serve on the CEC (not uncommon at Rollins), the bylaws stipulate that non-tenured members of the department “may” be appointed. Furthermore, the bylaws specify that, “If non-tenured members are unavailable (emphasis added), 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.” While the use of the word “may” does create ambiguity, the bylaws clearly state that members should only be appointed from outside the department when non-tenured members are unavailable. However, in practice, it appears that many department chairs appoint members to the CEC who are outside the department even when (non-tenured) members in the department are available. This appears to be motivated by a desire to create a more rigorous review than might otherwise be possible. For example, in the case where a candidate is being evaluated for promotion to Full Professor, it might be advantageous to have a Full Professor from another department serve on the CEC rather than a new Assistant Professor in the department. **Recommendation:** If the bylaws do not align with optimal practices they should be changed.

- The bylaws state that the CEC chair is responsible for collecting certain materials, including student evaluations, and making them available to the rest of the committee. However, now that teaching evaluations are distributed digitally, this no longer seems to be the case. **Recommendation:** The bylaws should be updated to reflect current practices.
• An additional concern of the working group is that candidates for Mid-Course Evaluation must submit their materials by December 15. However, based on recent changes to the academic calendar, this deadline often conflicts with the final exam period and, furthermore, does not provide the candidate with an opportunity to reflect on their fall semester teaching evaluations. Recommendation: The deadline should be moved to later in December or possibly January 1.

Standardization of criteria for eligibility for tenure and promotion review

Findings. The Bylaws of the Faculty of the College of Liberal Arts provide standardized criteria for eligibility for tenure and promotion review. For the most part, the criteria are clear and straight-forward. The working group offers the following observations and recommendations.

• Regarding eligibility for tenure, the statement that candidates “may utilize up to the full seven-year tenure-track probationary period” applies to candidates with visiting experience at Rollins. Presumably this statement would also apply to candidates with prior experience at other institutions as well, since the criteria state that such candidates “may” be awarded tenure sooner without stipulating that they “must” do so. A revision to the bylaws could establish that all candidates with prior experience may utilize up to the full seven-year probationary period (if desired).

• A related question is whether candidates with prior experience should be required to set their tenure clock in advance or be given the flexibility to decide later whether or not to count their prior experience. The working group found merit in taking a flexible approach and therefore recommends that candidates not be required to set their tenure clock in advance.

• Furthermore, a question arises as to whether a candidate who is eligible for tenure sooner than their seventh year would be eligible to apply for tenure more than once if they are denied for tenure before their seventh year. The presumption of the working group is that any and all tenure decisions are final; the working group recommends that the bylaws be revised to make this explicit.

• One potentially confusing aspect of the bylaws is that they set the clock for when faculty are eligible for the “awarding of” tenure and promotion. Candidates apply for tenure one year before they are awarded tenure. This language can be particularly confusing in the case of candidates for Promotion to Full Professor. The

---

12 Article VIII (Faculty Appointments and Evaluations), Part E. (Procedures for Mid-Course, Tenure and Promotion Reviews): Section 4. (Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor Evaluation), Part a. (Eligibility), p. 21 and Section 5. (Promotion to Professor), Part a. (Eligibility), pp. 23-24.
The (annual) evaluation timeline for untenured faculty members

Findings. The CLA bylaws establish that untenured faculty members, specifically “all tenure-track faculty” and “Visiting Professors of any rank,” will undergo an annual departmental review.\(^\text{13}\) For example, an Assistant Professor with no prior experience would undergo a departmental review in their first and second years, a midcourse and departmental review in their third and fourth years (the midcourse typically occurs in the third year but might occur in the fourth year instead), a departmental review in their fifth year, and a tenure review in their sixth year.

A review of Rollins’ benchmark schools reveals that many institutions (11 of 25) follow the Rollins model (i.e., conduct reviews every year of probation) but more than half (14 of 25) conduct reviews less frequently. Looking more closely at the fourteen schools that do not follow Rollins’ practice, none of them conducts a first year review and a firm majority (10 of 14) do not conduct a fifth year review. Two schools conduct only one mandatory review (in year three) and five schools conduct two mandatory reviews (typically in years two and four) before the tenure review in year six.

Recommendations

- The committee recommends that Rollins retain the practice of conducting a review during a faculty member’s first year. Although such reviews operate with limited information and increase the workload for candidates and departments alike, there are also important benefits to addressing potential concerns early in a faculty member’s career.

- The committee recommends that Rollins reduce the total number of mandatory annual evaluations by making optional the annual review which follows a faculty member’s successful midcourse (typically year four or five depending on the timing of the midcourse).

\(^{13}\) Article VIII (Faculty Appointments and Evaluations), Part C. (Procedures for Annual Review of Untenured Faculty), p. 15.