

1-17-2019

Minutes, College of Liberal Arts Executive Committee Meeting, Thursday, January 17, 2019

College of Liberal Arts Executive Committe

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

Recommended Citation

College of Liberal Arts Executive Committe, "Minutes, College of Liberal Arts Executive Committee Meeting, Thursday, January 17, 2019" (2019). *Executive Committee Minutes*. 194.
https://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ec/194

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 Executive Committee Minutes by an authorized administrator of Rollins Scholarship Online. For more information, please contact rwalton@rollins.edu.



EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
January 17, 2019
Agenda

12:30 p.m. in CSS 100
Lunch will be served

- I. Approval of Minutes from 12/6/18 EC Meeting

- II. Business
 - a. Tenure and Promotion Review Working Group Final Report
 - b. Academic Calendar AY 2019-2020
 - c. Governance Reform Discussion Debrief
 - d. Endowed Chair Policy
 - e. Set Faculty Meeting Agenda

- III. Reports
 - a. Curriculum Committee
 - b. Faculty Affairs Committee
 - c. Student Government Association



EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
January 17, 2019
Minutes

PRESENT

Ashley Kistler, Christopher Fuse, Laurel Habgood, Emily Russell, Amy Armenia, Susan Singer, Jennifer Cavanaugh, Richard Lewin, Gloria Cook, Dawn, Roe, Pat Brown, Nagina Chaudhry, Jana Mathews.

Guest: Dana Hargrove, Thomas Ouellette, Dexter Boniface, Daniel Crozier, Lisa Tillmann, Joan Davison, John Houston, Tim Pett, Don Rogers.

Excused: Wenxian Zhang.

CALL TO ORDER

Ashley Kistler called the meeting to order at 12:33 PM.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM 12/6/18

Mathews made a motion to approve the minutes from the 12/6/18 EC meeting. Habgood seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

BUSINESS

Academic Calendar

Attachment #1

Ashley Kistler

Cook reported that the Curriculum Committee discussed options to remove intersession and move the commencement date but decided against changes for 2019-20. Habgood asked if CC would host a colloquium in the spring to discuss these topics. Cook will schedule. Cavanaugh said some faculty have asked if we will continue to have convocation on the first day of classes and recommend adding it to the academic calendar.

Armenia made a motion to approve the 2019-20 Academic Calendar. Lewin seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

Tenure and Promotion Review Working Group Final Report

Attachment #2

Dexter Boniface

Boniface gave a report of the second and final phase of the work conducted by the Tenure and Promotion Review Working Group. While phase one focused on research and scholarship, phase two focused on procedural issues in the tenure and review process, including the role of associate professors in the tenure and review process, the composition and duties of the Candidate Evaluation Committee (CEC), standardization of criteria for eligibility for tenure and promotion review, and the (annual) evaluation timeline for untenured faculty members. Some items such as balance of teaching and service were too large to tackle in the timeframe. Boniface will share both reports at the next faculty meeting.

Discussion:

Davison expressed concern for departments whose CEC consists of three faculty with one being from outside the department. It is conceivable that the outside member could be the vote that determines whether someone receives tenure. She asked if anyone has considered having a rule that the majority vote must come from within the department.

Regarding the recommendation to allow associate professors to serve on FEC, Boles said we could conceivably appoint someone who has never served on a CEC in their own department and has concerns about lack of experience. Others express similar concerns. Kistler said we would have to trust EC not to select someone with no experience.

Members discussed the timing of midcourse reviews. Ouellette noted that if someone waits until their fourth year for midcourse and the review is problematic, helping them to understand what they need to do to turn it around before tenure review is an issue. Cavanaugh would like clarity about faculty who are hired at the associate level. Our bylaws are silent on this issue.

Lewin recommended hosting a colloquy to discuss these issues. Habgood noted some stakeholders might not feel comfortable voicing concerns in public. Kistler suggested hosting cohort colloquia.

EC will constitute another working group at the end of this term to continue the work next year.

Faculty Meeting Agenda

Ashley Kistler

The agenda for the January 23 Faculty Meeting will include a final report from the Tenure and Promotion Review Working Group, a vote for changes to the Academic Honor Code, and a vote on continuing the existing divisional structure.

Governance Reform Discussion Debrief

Ashley Kistler

Kistler said that faculty seem to be in favor of separating the workload of the Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) by creating a separate committee that would review grant proposals.

Armenia recommends formalizing communication with the Diversity and Student Life Committees.

Cook said it's problematic for assistant professors to sit on standing committees due to lack of experience. It seems to be difficult for some to hone in on the work of the committee. Kistler said this will be discussed at the January Department Chair Meeting. Chairs will be asked to mentor assistant professors about committee expectations and help them choose committees appropriate for their interests and strength. Cavanaugh said we need to clarify what service is and make sure departments realize there are options for serving besides sitting on standing committees. Kistler said this needs to be part of the work of the next Tenure and Promotion Review Working Group.

ADJOURNMENT

Ashley Kistler

Fuse made a motion to adjourn. Lewin seconded the motion. The meeting adjourned at 1:46 PM.



College of Liberal Arts Academic Calendar 2019-2020

FALL TERM 2019

New International Students Report	Sunday, August 18
New Students Report	Wednesday, August 21
Returning Students Report	Saturday, August 24
First Day of Class	Monday, August 26
Schedule Changes (Drop/Add)	Monday, August 26, through Friday, August 30
Labor Day Holiday (No Classes)	Monday, September 2
Credit/No Credit Deadline	Friday, September 6
Last Day to Drop a Class without notation ('W' Deadline)	Friday, September 6
Fall Break (No Classes for CLA only)	Saturday, October 12, through Tuesday, October 15 <i>Holt classes will meet during Fall break</i>
Last Day to Withdraw without Penalty ('WF' Deadline)	Friday, November 1
Academic Planning for Spring	Monday, October 28, through Saturday, November 2
Spring 2020 Online Registration	Monday, November 4, through Sunday, November 17
Thanksgiving Recess (No Classes)	Wednesday, November 27, to Sunday, December 1 (CLA) <i>Tuesday, November 26, to Sunday, December 1 (Holt)</i>
Classes End	Friday, December 6
Reading Days	Saturday, December 7, and Sunday, December 8
Final Exams	Monday, December 9, and Tuesday, December 10
Reading Day	Wednesday, December 11
Final Exams	Thursday, December 12, and Friday, December 13
(Contingency Days)	Monday, December 16, through Friday, December 20
Count: 69 In-Class/3 Reading/4 Exams/6 Holidays-Days: 13 Monday/14 Tuesday/14 Wednesday/14 Thursday/14 Friday	

SPRING TERM 2020

Winter Intersession	Monday, January 6, through Friday, January 10
New Students Report	Friday, January 10
First Day of Class	Tuesday, January 14 <i>(Holt start Monday, January 13)</i>
M. L. King, Jr. Day (Holiday)	Monday, January 20
Schedule Changes (Drop/Add)	Tuesday, January 14, through Tuesday, January 21
Credit/No Credit Deadline	Tuesday, January 28
Last Day to Withdraw without Notation ('W' Deadline)	Tuesday, January 28
Spring Break (No Classes)	Saturday, March 14, through Sunday, March 22
Academic Planning for Fall	Monday, March 23, through Friday, March 27
Fall 2020 Online Registration	Monday, March 30, through Sunday, April 12
Last Day to Withdraw without Penalty ('WF' Deadline)	Friday, March 27
Classes End	Tuesday, April 28
Reading Day	Wednesday, April 29
Final Exams	Thursday, April 30, and Friday, May 1
Reading Days	Saturday, May 2, and Sunday, May 3
Final Exams	Monday, May 4, and Tuesday, May 5
Commencement	Sunday, May 10 (Mother's Day)
Count: 70 In-Class/3 Reading/4 Exams/6 Holidays · Days: 13 Mon/15 Tues/14 Wed/14 Thurs/14 Fri	

MAYMESTER 2020

Maymester Online Registration	Monday, March 30, through Friday, April 3
First Day of Class	Wednesday, May 11
Memorial Day Holiday (No Classes)	Monday, May 25
Classes End	Thursday, June 4
Final Exams	Friday, June 5

APPROVALS: CC 12/4/2018; EC ??; RLT Group ??; Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost ??.

Tenure and Promotion Review Working Group

Second Preliminary 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 following report represents the second and final 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.

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.

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.² 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 there are 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.³ 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

² Article VIII, Part E., Section 2 (FEC Structure and Evaluation), Part a. (Membership), p. 18.

³ 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.

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.⁴ 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

⁴ 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.

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 bylaws establish a minimum probationary period of five years as an Associate Professor (at least three years of which are at Rollins) such that candidates are eligible to *apply* for promotion in their fourth year. For candidates with prior experience as an Associate Professor this implies that they are eligible to *apply* for promotion after two years at Rollins. The working group suggests that this language could be made clearer perhaps by spelling out both when candidates are eligible to *apply for* tenure and promotion as well as when candidates are eligible to *be awarded* tenure and promotion.

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.⁵ 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

⁵ Article VIII (Faculty Appointments and Evaluations), Part C. (Procedures for Annual Review of Untenured Faculty), p. 15.

- 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).