

Rollins College

## Rollins Scholarship Online

---

Executive Committee Minutes

College of Liberal Arts Minutes and Reports

---

Fall 10-28-2021

### **Minutes, College of Liberal Arts Executive Committee Meeting, Thursday, October 28, 2021**

College of Liberal Arts Executive Committe

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholarship.rollins.edu/as\\_ec](https://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ec)

---



## **EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING**

**October 28, 2021  
Agenda**

12:30 p.m. in KWR 330

- I. Approval of Minutes from October 14, 2021, Meeting
- II. Announcements
- III. Business
  - a. FAC's motion to allow associate professors to serve on FEC
- IV. Committee Reports
  - a. Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC)
  - b. Curriculum Committee (CC)



**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING**  
**October 28, 2021**  
**Minutes**

**PRESENT**

---

Missy Barnes, Jennifer Cavanaugh, Rosana Diaz-Zambrana, Daniel Elliott, Hannah Ewing, Jill Jones, Ashley Kistler, Karla Knight, Richard Lewin, Julia Maskivker, Jana Mathews, Jennifer Queen, Jamey Ray, Rob Sanders, Anne Stone

Excused: Grant Cornwell, Susan Singer

**CALL TO ORDER**

---

Jana Mathews called the meeting to order at 12:30 P.M.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM OCTOBER 14, 2021, EC MEETING**

---

Jones made a motion to amend the minutes from October 14, 2021, to attribute comments in the College Budget section to the President. Motion passed unanimously.

Jones made a motion to add an addendum to the minutes from the September 30, 2021, EC meeting to reflect that the President said our budget is flat and include that a priority was to rebuild the faculty professional development travel budget which had been cut from \$202,000 in FY20 to \$22,000 in FY21. Ray seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

**BUSINESS**

**FAC's Motion to Allow Associate Professors to Serve on FEC**

**ATTACHMENT #1**

Jana Mathews

---

In 2018, a faculty working group recommended that Rollins amend the bylaws to allow associate professors to serve on the Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC). Due to COVID, the motion was never discussed by the Executive Committee (EC).

Discussion:

Q: Would associate professors be part of the committee for full professor reviews or just associate and midcourse reviews?

A: There is no distinction in the proposal.

A: A straw poll showed the will of the faculty was to not have two separate FEC's, so the proposal reflected that.

- Each year we struggle to staff FEC, so widening the pool is a good idea. The proposal should be as broad as possible.
- From a DEI perspective, this could help broaden the diversity of FEC.

EC tabled the discussion and sent it back to FAC for endorsement of the current motion. FAC will discuss and bring it back to EC for a vote.

## **COMMITTEE REPORTS**

### **Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC)**

Missy Barnes

---

FAC discussed adjusting the tenure and promotion process so a negative review from the Candidate Evaluation Committee (CEC) would not stop a case from moving forward. There should be some path forward before it goes to appeals.

Discussion:

- The original intent was for the home department to have the last word on tenure and promotion cases.
- If the CEC is not following their own criteria, that is a problem.
- The Dean, FEC, and Provost should all look at the case, so a dean alone cannot overturn a departmental decision.
- The Tenure and Promotion Working Group pointed out that some departments had inconsistency in their criteria.
- FEC addressed that and asked those departments to resolve the issue.
- We want a system that gives a fair hearing. If there is a procedural error and the review goes through to the appeal process, the case is returned to the point where the error occurred.

### **Curriculum Committee (CC)**

Jill Jones

---

CC will bring to EC a master's in strategic communications major and a leadership minor.

CC conducted a straw poll regarding 128 credit hours. The vote indicated the committee would only approve the proposal that states the curriculum for majors should not make up more than 50% of the credit hours.

Discussion:

- Rollins appears to have an identity problem with no sense of ourselves as a liberal arts college. We don't understand or talk about it anymore. The Curricular Optimization Task Force (COTF) is bringing forward suggestions when we have a bigger problem understanding our mission. It would serve us well to review our mission statement to see if we really are a liberal arts college anymore.
- Several issues will come to a head in spring. We have asked administration to ask the COTF to continue their work and to take input from the faculty before coming back to us.

- This is a collaborative process that will require administration to be transparent and forthright with funding and budgeting goals and aspirations. We don't want them to come back and say our work is not financially feasible.
- Susan and Meghal are putting together proposals based on resources. We should hold off until those proposals come forward.

Q: What do other liberal arts colleges do?

A: The first two years are a general introduction to the liberal arts. Not being more than 50% of the major is more in line with Research 1 and business schools. Liberal arts school majors are typically significantly less than 50% of total credits

Q: How many of our benchmark schools identify as liberal arts colleges? Some require every student to also take a business minor.

A: There have been radical changes in the past couple of years. It would be useful for CC to put together an overview of their curriculum.

A: We noted last year that we should update the list post-COVID.

- Endowed chairs are concerned that course releases have been retracted. They also have broader philosophical concerns. Mathews volunteered to meet with them individually or as a group.
- Endowed chairs raise a good point about the Faculty Handbook. We do not have a structured mechanism for amendments.
- The Handbook cannot be policy because it is changed at will by the administration.
- If we feel it is a priority, we can ask FAC to discuss.
- Since Crummer is involved, this is an Executive Council issue.

Mathews will meet with the Crummer faculty president to see if they are interested in helping address this Handbook issue.

Queen made a motion to move into a committee of the whole. Lewin seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

Lewin made a motion to move out of a committee of the whole. Barnes seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

Queen made a motion to adjourn. Lewin seconded the motion. Meeting adjourned at 1:47 p.m.

## **ATTACHMENT #1**

### **Article VIII/ E./ Section 2. Faculty Evaluation Committee Structure and Evaluation**

#### a. Membership

This committee is constituted of six members and one alternate. The membership is preferred to hold the rank of full professor but up to two members may be tenured, associate professors. All members except the alternate are voting members. When the number of faculty to be reviewed by Faculty Evaluation Committee in a given year exceeds eighteen faculty, the alternate becomes a full voting member of the committee for that year. No more than five committee members will participate in the evaluation of any given candidate. Members of the Faculty Evaluation Committee are nominated by the Executive Committee of the Faculty and ratified by the Faculty by simple majority vote. Membership will normally include one tenured professor from each division of the College of Liberal Arts with consideration given to issues of diversity. Members will serve staggered three-year terms and may not serve consecutive terms. Members of the FEC receive one course-released time every year they serve on the Committee.

## 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)<sup>1</sup>; 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.

---

<sup>1</sup> 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).<sup>2</sup> However, in a minority of departments, just one article (or equivalent) can fulfill the minimal criteria.<sup>3</sup>

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.<sup>4</sup> 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.<sup>5</sup> 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.

---

<sup>2</sup> A few departments, including Business, English and Health Professions, require at least three articles for tenure.

<sup>3</sup> I.e., Economics, Chemistry, Biology, Environmental Studies, and Art History.

<sup>4</sup> Same: Economics, Math, Education, and Music. Less: Communication.

<sup>5</sup> 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.<sup>6</sup> 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.<sup>7</sup> 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.<sup>8</sup>

*Recommendations.* It is important that departments at Rollins develop methods to evaluate both the quantity and quality of research and scholarship.<sup>9</sup> 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.

---

<sup>6</sup> See Gina Kolata, "Many Academics Are Eager to Publish in Worthless Journals," *New York Times* Oct. 30, 2017.

<sup>7</sup> The only departments where external review is required for tenure or promotion are Counseling, Mathematics, Physics, Studio Art, and Theater.

<sup>8</sup> 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."

<sup>9</sup> 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.<sup>10</sup> 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.<sup>11</sup> 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.

---

<sup>10</sup> Article VIII, Part E., Section 2 (FEC Structure and Evaluation), Part a. (Membership), p. 18.

<sup>11</sup> 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.

- 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.<sup>12</sup> 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

---

<sup>12</sup> 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.

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.<sup>13</sup> 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).

---

<sup>13</sup> Article VIII (Faculty Appointments and Evaluations), Part C. (Procedures for Annual Review of Untenured Faculty), p. 15.

**Annual Report from the Faculty Affairs Committee  
Academic Year 2019 – 2020**

**Committee Membership:**

**Dr. David Caban**

**Dr. Ashley Cannaday**

**Dr. Leigh DiLorenzi**

**Dr. Benjamin Hudson**

**Dr. John Grau**

**Dr. Leslie Poole**

**Dr. Samuel Sanabria**

**Dr. Rachelle Yankelevitz**

**Dr. Jennifer Cavanaugh, Dean of Faculty (ex officio)**

**Dr. Donald Davison, Chair**

## **Part I Actions by the Faculty Affairs Committee**

### **I.1 Recommendations regarding Senior Lecturers**

The Faculty Affairs Committee forwarded to the Executive Committee in the Spring 2019 recommendations regarding the lecturer position. The recommendations concerned the desired percentage of the faculty that should be represented by lecturers, improved compensation, the possibility of multiyear contracts, and creating a new senior lecturer title. In September 2019 the FAC endorsed the recommendations from the previous spring.

1. The College commit to a policy stating that lecturers, and other faculty at that rank, constitute no more than 15% of the full-time faculty.
2. The minimum lecturer salary be set at \$55,000/yr.
3. Any lecturers participating in service activities (advising, program directorship, etc.) must be compensated accordingly. The rate of compensation must be commensurate with compensation practices used for tenure and tenure-track faculty.
4. After six years of satisfactory performance meeting departmental expectations, lecturers should receive a base-pay increase commensurate with raises from assistant to associate.
5. Establish a date by which contracts renewals are given.

### **I.2 Course Instructor Evaluation (CIE)**

The FAC continued its review of potential bias in the current Course Instructor Evaluation instrument used to assess all courses. The Committee discussed the role and reliability of course evaluations in the academy and at Rollins College with Dr. Susan Singer, Provost and Vice-President for Academic Affairs, Dr. Nancy Chick, Director of the Endeavor Center, and Dr. Jennifer Cavanaugh, Dean of the Faculty and ex officio member of FAC. The members of the FAC agreed to produce a White Paper that summarizes the current state of the literature in teaching and learning regarding best practices for utilizing course evaluation. The FAC will develop recommendations, if appropriate, to improve the current course evaluation system at Rollins. The White Paper (see Appendix 1) is complete and has been sent to the Executive Committee for review and dissemination among the faculty. In Fall, 2020, it is the intention of the FAC to begin to develop appropriate recommendations regarding best practices for assessing teaching.

### **I.3 Endowed Chairs**

The Executive Committee of the College of Liberal Arts tabled the proposed recommendations from the FAC in April 2019. In the Fall, 2019, the Executive Committee instructed the FAC to continue working on the tabled endowed chairs proposal and report back to the EC its recommendations. The FAC reviewed the minutes from all meetings of the CLA Faculty, the Executive Committee, and FAC meetings since February 08, 2018 to determine the original charge to the Committee. In addition, the FAC invited current endowed chair holders to meet

with the Committee to provide their input regarding previous proposals. Based upon the FAC's review of the historical record the Committee concluded that the original charge is to make the current endowed chair policy as reported in the *Faculty Handbook Section II - All-Faculty Policies and Procedures - Updated 7/1/19*, (page 9) consistent with the goals of "transparency and openness" as adopted in the "Rollins College Philosophy of Faculty Compensation, College of Liberal Arts." Accordingly, the FAC reported recommendations regarding the criteria for the selection of candidates for endowed chairs and required that the timetable for the review process is public.

**Original Policy: Faculty Handbook Section II - All-Faculty Policies and Procedures - Updated 7/1/19, (page 9)**  
**FAC Recommendations regarding Endowed Chairs, 04-13-2020**

**ENDOWED CHAIRS**

**I. Appointments**

- a. Appointments appropriate to the conditions of the chair will be made by the President upon recommendation from the VPAA|Provost and the appropriate Dean.
- b. Appointments are typically made for a five-year duration and are renewed at the pleasure of the President.

**II. Rights and Responsibilities**

- a. Each chair shall have at its disposal a standard discretionary fund to be used for support of professional activities of the chair holder.
- b. The holder of the chair shall receive one course reduction per year to be used to pursue professional activities such as research, writing, or performance and a stipend with benefits. A written report outlining professional activities and research in progress must be submitted annually to the appropriate Dean and the VPAA|Provost.
- c. It is the annual responsibility of each chair holder to share the results of their professional activity with the College community and community at large. This may take the form of lectures, performances, workshops, or other appropriate community activities.

**III. Qualifications**

Holders of endowed chairs should be distinguished for their outstanding scholarship and teaching excellence. Normally, a candidate for an endowed chair should be a full professor but may include tenured associate professors with exceptional records.

Candidates for an endowed chair have the option of submitting two (2) external letters of review from experts, selected by the candidate, in their scholarship area.

Minimally, candidates for endowed chairs must exceed the requirements for promotion to full professor in their department in teaching and one other category of review; the candidate must meet expectations in the third area of evaluation.

Faculty and academic administrators may nominate candidates; faculty may self-nominate.

The application and review/renewal schedule is public and begins on December 1. The announcement of recipients is made at the last faculty meeting of the academic year.

The recommending committee for the awarding of endowed chairs is made up of seven members. The committee includes the chair of the Faculty Affairs Committee, one tenured faculty member appointed by the FAC, three current holders of endowed chairs, the Dean of the

Faculty, and the Provost. To the degree possible, the membership of the recommending committee reflects the diversity of the faculty and strives for divisional representation. By December 1, the provost distributes a call for applications for open endowed chairs and Cornell Distinguished Faculty Awards. All tenured and tenure-track faculty in the College of Liberal Arts are eligible to submit applications.

An application consists of a current vita, a letter addressing evidence of excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service, and a one-page statement that sets forth the goals over the period the endowed position is held. Applicants should also submit supporting documentation, such as syllabi and other instructional material, and any other evidence of excellence in teaching, scholarship, and service. By February 15, all applicants should submit their materials to the Dean of the Faculty. The recommending committee makes its recommendations based on the applicant's submitted materials.

The committee forwards its recommendations to the Provost for presentation to the President. Final approval and awarding of persons to endowed chairs are made by the President consistent with gift requirements.

#### **IV. List of Endowed Chairs**

A complete listing and details for all endowed chairs at Rollins, along with current faculty chair holders, may be found at <http://www.rollins.edu/about-rollins/our-people/endowed-chairs.html>.

#### **I.4 Special Course Feedback Instrument for Spring Semester, 2020**

In response to the coronavirus, all courses were converted to online instruction beginning March 23, 2020. The FAC developed a course feedback instrument designed only for the Spring 2020 semester. Faculty have the option of including the results from the course feedback instrument in their evaluation portfolios. (See Appendix 2).

#### **I.5 Disruptive Student Behavior Policy**

The FAC was asked to review a revised Disruptive Student Behavior policy developed by the Division of Student Affairs and intended to be inserted into the Student Code of Conduct. The FAC offered several suggestions which resulted in a revised version. The revised version is pending per endorsement by the CLA faculty.

#### **DISRUPTIVE CLASSROOM BEHAVIOR POLICY**

**Disruptive behavior prohibited:** Disruptive behavior in the classroom or during an educational experience is prohibited. The classroom and educational experience includes both the in-person educational experience as well as the on-line educational experience. Disruptive behavior includes conduct that interferes with or obstructs the teaching and learning process. This behavior can occur in front of an entire class, it could take place within a small group, or it could be one-on-one communication between the course instructor and the student. Civil expression of disagreement

or views opposing those of the course instructor during the times and using the means permitted by the instructor is not itself disruptive behavior and is not prohibited.

**Course instructor – authority and responsibility:** The course instructor is authorized to establish rules and other parameters for student behavior and participation during the course or other educational experiences that are supervised by the course instructor.

**Temporary removal from class or other educational experience:** If a student or students, acting individually or as a group, disrupt or attempt to disrupt the course or another educational experience, the course instructor is authorized to follow several options, depending on the severity and/or frequency of the offending behavior. The course instructor is authorized to instruct the offending student(s) to stop the disruptive behavior or to instruct the offending student(s) to leave the class or educational experience. The course instructor may contact Campus Safety if the student(s) fails to follow the instructor's instruction. The course instructor must immediately call Campus Safety if presented with an unsafe situation, threatening behavior, violence, knowledge of a crime, or similar circumstances.

**Interim measure:** In the case of severe and frequent offending behavior, the applicable academic dean may, in consultation with the Behavioral Evaluation and Threat Assessment team (BETA), temporarily remove the student(s) from the educational experience pending determination of responsibility under the College's Code of Community Standards.

More information about Rollins' BETA team can be found [here](#).

**Code of Community Standards:** Violation of this Disruptive Classroom Behavior Policy also constitutes a violation of the Disruptive Behavior policy in the Code of Community Standards.

**Referral to Community Standards & Responsibility:** Depending on the severity and/or frequency of the offending behavior, the course instructor may refer the student(s) to the Office of Community Standards & Responsibility for further action and possible sanctions under the College's Code of Community Standards.

**Withdrawal of student from class or other educational experience:** The sanctions which may be imposed on the student(s) who violate this Disruptive Classroom Behavior Policy include, in addition to those sanctions published in the Code of Community Standards, involuntary withdrawal of the student(s) from the course or other educational experience. The applicable academic dean of the college in which the course or educational experience is located shall work in consultation with the Director of Community Standards & Responsibility, the instructor, and the Dean of Student Affairs to determine whether to involuntarily withdraw the student(s) from the course or other educational experience. This determination will be made only after the published process under the Code of Community Standards has been completed and resulted in a determination of responsibility, including any appeals provided under that process. Students who are withdrawn from a class or other educational experience are not subject to a refund.

**Grade following withdrawal from course or other educational experience:** The course instructor retains responsibility to award the grade for the course or other educational experience to the student who is involuntarily withdrawn from the course or other educational experience. The grade shall be determined by the course instructor based on the student's academic

performance at the point of involuntary withdrawal. Any appeal of the grade awarded by the course instructor shall be through the College's published policy on grade appeals. The student may be permitted to complete the course remotely for a grade, but this would be at the discretion of the academic dean and the instructor.

**Appeals under this policy:** Any appeal of the determination under the College's Code of Community Standards shall be as stated in the published policy for such appeals. The determination of the applicable academic dean to involuntarily withdraw a student from a course or other educational experience shall be made in writing to the Provost within 3 calendar days following decision by the academic dean. The appeal shall be limited to the determination by the academic dean and shall be based on excessiveness of involuntary withdrawal as a penalty. The Provost's decision on appeal is limited to review of the academic dean's decision to involuntarily withdraw the student from the course or other educational experience. The Provost's decision on appeal is the final decision regarding involuntary withdrawal from the course or other educational experience.

## Part II Bylaws

### II.1 Amendment to the All College Bylaws

The FAC was asked by President Cornwell to clarify Article VI, Section 3 to the All College Bylaws regarding the appeals process. Specifically, the FAC was asked to clarify the process for conducting “a new evaluation” if ordered by the Appeals Committee. The amendment was adopted by the Faculty of the College.

#### All Faculty Bylaws, Article VI, Section 3

#### Section 3. Recommendations and Authority in Appeals Cases

After reviewing the case, the All-Faculty Appeals Committee makes a recommendation to the President either to uphold the original decision or, in the event of a majority vote in favor of the appeal, to recommend a new evaluation. It does not rule on the substance of a case. To win an appeal, the candidate must demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Committee that the evaluation process has been flawed. In the absence of convincing evidence that the procedure has been flawed, the All-Faculty Appeals Committee affirms the original decision to deny tenure or promotion.

If the Appeals Committee recommends a new evaluation then it must submit a written report clarifying the procedural error which is sent with the original decision for reconsideration back to the point where the error occurred. Only the evaluation materials submitted with the original file may be considered in the new evaluation.

### II.2 Revision to the Membership of the Faculty Evaluation Committee

The FAC held hearings to consider proposed changes to Article VIII, Faculty Evaluation. Several of the proposed changes are from the Task Force Report on Tenure and Promotion. The FAC invited current and previous members of the Faculty Evaluation Committee to discuss the proposed changes. The FAC at this time, agreeing with the advice of the FEC, does not recommend enlarging the membership of the FEC.

The majority of the membership of FEC opposes changing the membership of the FEC to include associate professors. Nevertheless, the FAC recommends that the membership of the FEC is preferred to be full professors but it is possible to include 1 to 2 tenured, associate professors. The proposed bylaw amendment has been forwarded to the Executive Committee, pending action by the full faculty.

#### Article VIII/ E./ Section 2. Faculty Evaluation Committee Structure and Evaluation

##### a. Membership

This committee is constituted of six members and one alternate. The membership is preferred to hold the rank of full professor **but up to two members may be tenured, associate professors.** ~~and all of whom must hold the rank of full professor.~~ All members except the alternate are voting members. When the number of faculty to be reviewed by Faculty Evaluation Committee in a given year exceeds eighteen faculty, the alternate becomes a full voting member of the

committee for that year. No more than five committee members will participate in the evaluation of any given candidate. Members of the Faculty Evaluation Committee are nominated by the Executive Committee of the Faculty and ratified by the Faculty by simple majority vote. Membership will normally include one tenured professor from each division of the College of Liberal Arts with consideration given to issues of diversity. Members will serve staggered three-year terms and may not serve consecutive terms. Members of the FEC receive one course-released time every year they serve on the Committee.

### **II.3 Optional Fifth Year Review of Untenured Faculty**

The FAC discussed with the FEC the desirability of changing the mandatory fifth-year review of untenured faculty to optional status with the agreement by the candidate and their department review committee. Candidates for tenure must submit their portfolios to the Dean of Faculty by June 30. The fifth-year review only adds only one new semester of materials to the candidates' tenure files and therefore some might consider to be unnecessary. The members of FEC concurred that it is reasonable to make the fifth-year review optional. The FAC adopted a proposed bylaw allowing for optional fifth-year review. The FAC tabled final consideration until the Fall 2020 to ensure it is consistent with the extension of the tenure clock due to the coronavirus.

## **Article VIII**

### **C. PROCEDURES FOR ANNUAL REVIEW OF UNTENURED FACULTY**

The Candidate Evaluation Committee (CEC) (formed by December 1) will conduct annual evaluations of all tenure-track faculty. The candidate will submit materials for review, including a professional assessment statement, to the CEC by January 1. The evaluation will be documented in a report addressed to the Dean of the Faculty and placed in the candidate's permanent file by February 15. The report should include an analysis and evaluation of the candidate's progress toward tenure, based on the criteria set forth in the bylaws and in individual departmental criteria.

These annual evaluations are to be conducted for every year in which neither a tenure evaluation nor a comprehensive mid-course evaluation takes place. **The fifth-year evaluation is optional dependent upon the agreement by both the candidate and the department.**

### **II.4 Extension of the Tenure Clock Due to Coronavirus**

In response to the threats posed by the novel coronavirus, the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) recommended strict social distancing and the lock down of campus and eventually the country. Following the advice of the CDC the College closed the campus and all course instruction was converted to online teaching. Consequently, the research programs for faculty are seriously disrupted. In response to these delays, the FAC recommended that the tenure clock for any pre-tenure faculty member may be delayed by one year with the written request by the faculty member to the Dean of Faculty. The bylaw recommendation was approved by the Executive Committee and the CLA faculty.

## ARTICLE VIII

### FACULTY APPOINTMENTS AND EVALUATIONS

#### A. FACULTY APPOINTMENTS

Faculty members shall be appointed to and reviewed by a single academic department, but teaching and service responsibilities may be distributed among different programs. In such cases, more than one Dean may be involved in the evaluation of a candidate, and so all statements in Article VIII pertaining to a Dean or Dean of the Faculty should be interpreted as applying to "Deans" when this is the case. Likewise, in programs headed by a Director rather than a Dean, all statements in Article VIII pertaining to a Dean should be interpreted as applying to a "Director." All reports and recommendations and any responses by candidates will be in writing. Recommendations regarding candidacy for tenure or promotion must clearly support or not support the candidate. Notices of reappointments and non-reappointments are the responsibility of the President and will be in writing. These letters are sent out by the Provost on behalf of the President.

##### **Section 1. New Appointments**

No tenure-track appointment may last beyond seven years without the faculty member being granted tenure, with the exception of faculty members on parental leave for childbirth or adoption who accept an extension in accordance with Rollins College Policy. **Faculty beginning the tenure track between Fall 2015 through Fall 2019, may, by no later than June 30 of the year prior to their tenure review year, declare in writing to the Dean of the Faculty that they wish a one-year extension of their tenure clock. The extension will convert the faculty member's fifth year on the tenure track to one non-counting year. The timeline for pre-tenure evaluation and course release in years one through four is unchanged. This provision automatically expires once these faculty have been accommodated, as described in this bylaw.** No visiting faculty appointment may last beyond six consecutive years. Initial appointments of tenure-track faculty shall normally be for a two-year period. All faculty appointments shall be made by the President with the advice of the Provost, who may act as the President's agent, and the Dean of the Faculty.

# **Appendix 1**

## **WHITE PAPER**

### **Identifying Some Sources of Bias in Course and Instructor Evaluations (CIEs)**

**February 5, 2020**

**Prepared by the Faculty Affairs Committee**

**DRAFT REPORT<sup>1</sup>**

---

<sup>1</sup> This informational report is the work of the members of the Faculty Affairs Committee and is not the official policy of Rollins College.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Faculty Affairs Committee wishes to extend its appreciation to Professor Benjamin Hudson for his work preparing an earlier draft of this document. Also, the Committee wishes to thank Dr. Nancy Chick for supplying important references used in the preparation of this report.

## FACULTY AFFAIRS MEMBERSHIP

Dr. David Caban

Dr. Ashley Cannaday

Dr. Leigh DiLorenzi

Dr. John Grau

Dr. Benjamin Hudson

Dr. Leslie Poole

Dr. Samuel Sanabria

Dr. Rachelle Yankelevitz

Dr. Donald Davison, chair

Dean Jennifer Cavanaugh, Ex Officio

## PREFACE

The Rollins College Faculty Affairs Committee (FAC) was requested by several faculty members and academic administrators to re-examine the efficacy of the current online course instructor evaluation (CIE) method. There is a prolific literature examining the reliability and validity of student evaluations of teaching (SET) in higher education. Generally, the literature reports the robust conclusion that online course evaluations are vulnerable to biases correlated with gender, race, and sexual orientation of the instructor. In addition, the literature generally finds that many course evaluations are poor measures of student learning. Instead, the instruments tend to capture student satisfaction with the course, their perception of learning, and their grade expectations. Course Instructor Evaluations (CIEs) can reflect students' (frequently implicit) biases and as such may often be impoverished sources of data about minority faculty in administrative review of teaching effectiveness.

This White Paper provides an overview of the literature regarding gender, race, and sexual orientation-related biases in course evaluation. Next, we plan to offer general descriptive results regarding the outcomes from the CIEs at Rollins as they compare to the trends found in the literature. Finally, the goal of the FAC is to prepare recommendations that will be discussed with the faculty during the spring, 2020.

## ABSTRACT

Course instructor evaluations (CIEs) play a significant role in career trajectories, in both personnel and awards decisions for faculty at many institutions, including Rollins. A chorus of recent inquiries into the efficacy of CIEs across various institutions suggests that CIEs may be an invalid source of information about teaching effectiveness generally, and they frequently reflect the unconscious biases of students. They are particularly dubious indicators of quality of instruction of minority faculty. This paper examines gender, racial, and sexual biases, although sources of bias exist. It is the hope of the Faculty Affairs Committee that this White Paper contributes to a beneficial discussion of ways to best evaluate excellence in teaching.

## INVALIDITY OF TEACHING EVALUATIONS GENERALLY

Since the 1990s, when CIEs began to take on outsized importance in hiring, retention, and promotion decisions at American universities, scholars have sounded the alarm on their efficacy.<sup>2</sup> In a recent 2017 review of the literature, and which includes some strong suggestions for rethinking CIEs, Henry Hornstein notes several problems with standardizing the evaluation of teaching. From These problems include: (1) considerable disagreement about what qualities mark “teaching effectiveness” and the problem of measurement generally; to (2) a reminder that CIEs are objectively suspect since because they measure students’ subjective perceptions of a course and instructor rather than the actual course and instructor herself; and (3) the problem of limited response rates; and (4) how student satisfaction does not necessarily correlate necessarily with learning. Hornstein surveys the ways in which CIEs do not offer a solid ground on which instruction can be measured objectively. In response, he suggests that “the persistent practice of using student evaluations as summative measures to determine decisions for retention, promotion, and pay for faculty members is improper and depending on circumstances could be argued to be illegal.”<sup>3</sup>

Many studies conclude that student evaluations of teaching (SET) are inaccurate measures of teaching effectiveness.<sup>4</sup> Instead, Boring, et. al., find that student evaluations are more strongly related to the instructor’s gender and to students’ grade expectations than objective indicators of learning. “On the whole, high SET (student evaluations of teaching) seem to be a reward students give instructors who make them anticipate getting a good grade. . . .”<sup>5</sup> Boring and her colleagues also find gender disparities in student teaching evaluations. Overall, male instructors receive higher scores than female instructors. However, they also find gender concordance—male students give male instructors higher evaluation scores than they give female instructors, and vice versa. Therefore, gender effects may be heightened depending on the composition of

---

<sup>2</sup> See, for example, J.V. Adams, “Student Evaluations: The Ratings Game.” *Inquiry* 1 (1997): 10-16.

<sup>3</sup> Hornstein, Henry, “Student evaluations of teaching are an inadequate assessment tool for evaluating faculty performance.” *Cogent Education* 4 (2017): 1-8, 2.

<sup>4</sup> Boring, Anne, Kellie Ottoboni, and Philip Start, “Student evaluations of teaching (mostly) do not measure teaching effectiveness,” *ScienceOpen Research*, January 7, 2016.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid*, p. 1.

the instructor's class. For instance, a female instructor with a largely male student class might expect to receive statistically significant lower evaluations regardless of how much learning occurred in the course. Indeed, Deslauriers and colleagues found little relationship between perceived learning and objective learning in introductory physics classes.<sup>6</sup> The authors found that students who are engaged in active learning—while more difficult than passive learning—demonstrate objectively greater knowledge on end of the year exams. However, students perceive themselves to learn more under passive learning approaches. Finally, Esarey and Valdes use computational simulation that assumes the SETs are valid, reliable, and unbiased. They find that even under these ideal assumptions student evaluations of teaching can not reliably identify good teaching. Instead, they recommend using SETs in combination with multiple measures of teaching effectiveness is can produce better results.<sup>7</sup>

The FAC would like to add that CIEs for courses that involve controversial, emotionally triggering, or political content should be considered doubly suspect.

## GENDER BIAS IN TEACHING EVALUATIONS

A robust scholarship over the last thirty years indicates that student evaluations unfairly critique the teaching effectiveness of female instructors due not to “gendered behavior” on behalf of the instructors but to “actual bias on the part of the students.”<sup>8</sup> In a 2015 study from MacNell, Driscoll, and Hunt, the authors emphasize that student gender biases reflect a broader trend of “the pervasive devaluation of women, relative to men, that occurs in professional settings in the United States” (293). The authors show that gender bias in course evaluations is a significant source of inequality facing female faculty and “systematically disadvantages women in academia” (301).

---

<sup>6</sup> Deslauriers, Louis, Logan McCarty, Kelly Miller, Kristina Callaghan, and Greg Kestin, “Measuring actual learning versus feeling of learning in response to being actively engaged in the classroom,” *PNAS Latest Articles*, August 13, 2019.

<sup>7</sup> Esarey, Justin and Natalie Valdes, “Unbiased, reliable, and valid student evaluations can still be unfair,” *Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, February 20, 2020.

<sup>8</sup> MacNell, Lillian, Adam Driscoll, and Andrea Hunt, “What’s in a Name: Exposing Gender Bias in Student Ratings of Teaching.” *Innovative Higher Education* 40 (2015): 291-303, 301. Subsequent references appear parenthetically within the text.

Ben Schmidt, professor of history at Northwestern University, has compiled data from over 14 million RateMyProfessor.com reviews in interactive graphs on his professional website that reveal the unconscious bias of student evaluations. According to Claire Cain Miller, Schmidt's data reveals "that people tend to think more highly of men than women in professional settings, praise men for the same things they criticize women for, and are more likely to focus on a woman's appearance or personality and on a man's skills and intelligence."<sup>9</sup> Schmidt's visualizations of his data, available on his professional website, [personal website](#), show significant discrepancies along gender lines in student evaluations of teaching: male instructors are more likely to be rated "smart," "genius," or "funny," while female professors are more frequently labeled "strict" or "bossy."

More recently, scholars Kristina Mitchell and Jonathan Martin demonstrate the differences in language students use to evaluate male and female faculty. They show that a male instructor "administering an identical course as a female instructor receives higher ordinal scores in teaching evaluations, even when questions are not instructor-specific."<sup>10</sup> Mitchell and Martin demonstrate that student evaluations of female faculty often demean their professional accomplishments, critique their attire and personality, and generally document "that students have less professional respect for their female professors" (652). This data encourages Mitchell and Martin to argue against CIEs in administrative or promotional decisions altogether because "the use of evaluations in employment decisions is discriminatory against women" (648).

## RACIAL AND ETHNIC BIAS IN TEACHING EVALUATIONS

Although CIEs have existed in higher education for nearly a century, it is no surprise that education researchers have historically "overlooked the classroom experiences of teachers and professors of color."<sup>11</sup> Over the last several decades, this lacuna has begun to be addressed as

---

<sup>9</sup> Miller, Claire Cain, "Is the Professor Bossy or Brilliant? Much Depends on Gender.," *New York Times*, 6 Feb. 2015.

<sup>10</sup> Mitchell, Kristina M. and Jonathan Martin, "Gender Bias in Student Evaluations." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 51, 3 (July 2018): 648-652, 648. Subsequent references appear parenthetically within the text.

<sup>11</sup> Hendrix, Katherine Grace, "Student Perceptions of the Influence of Race on Professor Credibility." *Journal of Black Studies* 28, 6 (1998): 738-763, 739. Subsequent references appear parenthetically within the text.

education researchers have investigated the challenges facing professors of color in regards to the validity of CIEs and the instrument's tendency to reflect prejudices. Thirty years ago, textile and clothing scholar Usha Chowdhary conducted two different sections of the same course in different garb—one in traditional Indian clothing and the other in Western clothing; she discovered that the CIEs from the section in which she wore traditional Indian clothing were more negative.<sup>12</sup> Ten years later, Heidi Nast surveyed “student resistances to multicultural teaching and faculty diversity [and] the risks that derive from problematic institutional deployment of student evaluations as a means of judging multicultural curricular and faculty success.”<sup>13</sup> Nast surveys several incidents when CIEs were used to harass faculty of color and/or LGBTQ faculty and “to register anger and disapproval at having to negotiate topics and issues in a scholarly way which conflict with heretofore learned social values and assumptions” (104). A contemporaneous study by Katherine Hendrix similarly determines that “race influences student perceptions of professor credibility” (740) and that “the competence of Black professors was more likely to be questioned” (758). Scratching only the surface of a robust scholarship from the end of the twentieth century, Chowdhary, Nast, and Hendrix help us understand how course evaluations for classes taught by faculty of color frequently reflect larger social biases and are invalid measures of success in the classroom.<sup>14</sup>

While Chowdhary, Nast, and Hendrix relied on anecdotal data from restricted sample sizes, more recently scholars have broadened the scope of their investigations. In a robust review of evaluations from students at 25 liberal arts colleges on the website *RateMyProfessor.com*, Landon Reid determined that “racial minority faculty, particularly Black faculty, were evaluated more negatively than White faculty in terms of Overall Quality, Helpfulness, and Clarity.”<sup>15</sup> Reid cautions that “both race and gender have an interactive effect on [CIEs] that should be

---

<sup>12</sup> Chowdhary, Usha, “Instructor’s Attire as a Biasing Factor in Students’ Ratings of an Instructor.” *Clothing & Textiles Research Journal* 6 (1988): 17-22.

<sup>13</sup> Nast, Heidi J, “‘Sex’, ‘Race’ and Multiculturalism: Critical Consumption and the Politics of Course Evaluations.” *Journal of Geography in Higher Education* 23, 1 (03, 1999): 102-115, 103. Subsequent references appear parenthetically within the text.

<sup>14</sup> A more recent study confirms their findings: Arnold K Ho, Lotte Thomsen, and Jim Sidanius, “Perceived Academic Competence and Overall Job Evaluations: Students’ Evaluations of African American and European American Professors.” *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 39.2 (2009): 389-406.

<sup>15</sup> Reid, Landon, “The Role of Perceived Race and Gender in the Evaluation of College Teaching on RateMyProfessors.com.” *Journal of Diversity in Higher Education* 3, 3 (2010): 137-152, 145. Subsequent references appear parenthetically within the text.

considered in the tenure and promotion cases of racial minority faculty” (145). Importantly, Reid points out that students “are unlikely to assert that a racial minority faculty member is a bad instructor because of their race” and that “instead, prejudicial biases are more likely to be expressed as principled, and therefore socially defensible, evaluations of an instructor’s teaching” (146). Reid noted particularly that at institutions like Rollins, which “demand excellent, not merely good, teaching for promotion and tenure” the problem of racial minority faculty’s evaluative disadvantage may be “compounded” (148).

Similarly, Bettye Smith and Billy Hawkins contribute to the discussion with a large-scale quantitative, empirical study which determined that “race does matter in how students evaluate both faculty and the value of the courses faculty teach [...] and therefore matters when examining faculty effectiveness.”<sup>16</sup> Smith and Hawkins’s study demonstrates that Black faculty’s “mean scores were the lowest” among Black, White, and a third racial category of Other (159). Smith and Hawkins find that this phenomenon was “especially troublesome because these ratings have the power to affect merit increases and careers” (159). Other studies have addressed this evaluative disadvantage shouldered by minority faculty, with similar findings that Hispanic and Asian American faculty similarly receive lower ratings than White faculty.<sup>17</sup>

## SEXUAL ORIENTATION BIAS IN TEACHING EVALUATIONS

There is a growing literature investigating whether students’ evaluations of professors are influenced by their perception of the faculty member’s sexual orientation. Generally, conclusions about students’ racial and gender biases extend to biases about sexual orientation of instructors. For instance, Melanie Moore and Richard Trahan find that women who teach

---

<sup>16</sup> Smith, Bettye P. and Billy Hawkins, “Examining Student Evaluations of Black College Faculty: Does Race Matter?” *The Journal of Negro Education* 80, 2 (2011): 149-162, 160. Subsequent references appear parenthetically within the text.

<sup>17</sup> Anderson, K.J. and Smith, G. “Students’ preconceptions of professors: Benefits and barriers according to ethnicity and gender.” *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 2 (2005):184-201; and G. Smith, G and Anderson, K.J., “Students’ Ratings of Professors: The Teaching Style Contingency for Latino/a Professors.” *Journal of Latinos and Education* 4 (2005): 115-136.

courses on gender often experience resistance and skepticism because students perceive them as advancing their personal political agenda.<sup>18</sup> By extension, Russ, Simonds, and Hunt (2002) examine whether instructor sexual orientation influences students' perceptions of teacher credibility, character, and students' personal assessment of how much they are learning.<sup>19</sup> Their results suggest that perceptions of credibility, character, and student learning are strongly influenced by the sexual orientation of the instructor. In comparing student ratings of a guest instructor who indicated he was either gay or straight, "Students perceived the gay instructor to be significantly less credible in terms of competence and character" compared to their evaluations of the straight instructor (316). Similarly, analyzing qualitative information such as written comments revealed that the gay instructor vignette received four-times more negative comments by students compared to the straight instructor. Russ and Simonds also explore the connection between students' perception of how much they learn and the credibility of the guest speaker, and if those are related to the sexual orientation of the instructor. First, they find that students perceive themselves to learn more from teachers who are seen as credible. Second, their results show that "students perceive they learn almost twice as much from a heterosexual teacher compared to a gay teacher (319)." In summary, students rate a gay instructor as less credible and therefore perceive themselves as learning less than from a heterosexual instructor.

In addition to perceived learning perceptions, Kristin Anderson and Melinda Kanner report that "Lesbian and gay professors were rated as having a political agenda, compared to heterosexual professors with the same syllabus (1538).<sup>20</sup> These results suggest that students' course evaluation criteria differ when evaluating courses taught by lesbian or gay professors versus heterosexual professors. Based on the expanding body of literature, there seem to be biases regarding the sexual orientation of instructors.

---

<sup>18</sup> Moore, Melanie and Richard Trahan, "Biased and political: Student perceptions of females teaching about gender." *College Student Journal*, 31, 4, (1997).

<sup>19</sup> Russ, Travis L. Cheri J. Simonds, and Stephen K. Hunt, "Coming Out in the Classroom . . . An Occupational Hazard?: The Influence of Sexual Orientation on Teacher Credibility and Perceived Student Learning," *Communication Education*, 51, 3, (2002).

<sup>20</sup> Anderson, K. J., & Kanner, M., Inventing a gay agenda: Students' perceptions of lesbian and gay professors. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 41(6), 1538–1564, (2011). <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2011.00757.x>

## BIAS AT ROLLINS

Based on preliminary data gathered by the Office of the Provost at Rollins College, results from course and instructor evaluations at Rollins demonstrate bias in congruence with the national trends discussed above. Full data and analysis can be found through the Office of the Provost.

## Appendix 2

# Spring 2020 Course and Instructor Evaluation - Final Draft

---

Start of Block: Default Question Block

---

*Display This Question:*

*If Select the course subject from the list below: = ANT*

3 Part 1

*Spring 2020 has been an unusual semester. You spent the first half of the semester in face-to-face classes with your professors and classmates, and then COVID-19 necessitated a shift to virtual learning environments for the second half of the semester. Amid these extraordinary circumstances, your professors still want your feedback and are hopeful that this form will help you share some thoughts on what went well and what might use some improvement.*

---

4 How many hours per week did you spend on this class while in-person (pre spring break)?

---

5 How many hours per week did you spend on this class while online (post spring break)?

---

7 Part 2

---

8 What about this class facilitated your learning about the course topic?

---

---

---

---

---

---

9 What did the course professor do well to facilitate your learning?

---

---

---

---

---

---

10 What, if anything, could the course professor have done to better facilitate your learning?

---

---

---

---

---

---

11 Did the course challenge your thinking?

---

---

---

---

---

16 Part 3

17 How did the following aspects of the class affect your learning?

	Beneficial to my learning (1)	Neutral (2)	Needs improvement to help my learning (3)	N/A (4)
The instructional approach taken in this class (1)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
How the class topics, activities, reading and assignments fit together (2)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
The organization of the class (3)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

18 Optional Explanation of the Above: What would you like your professor to know about your experience in this course?

---

---

---

---

---

---

19 Part 4

---

20 Overall, how would you rate this course?

- Excellent (2)
  - Very Good (3)
  - Good (4)
  - Fair (5)
  - Poor (7)
  - Don't Know (8)
- 

21 Overall, how would you rate this professor?

- Excellent (2)
- Very Good (3)
- Good (4)
- Fair (5)
- Poor (8)
- Don't Know (9)

End of Block: Default Question Block

---