

Rollins College

Rollins Scholarship Online

Executive Committee Minutes

College of Liberal Arts Minutes and Reports

2-10-2022

Minutes, Executive Committee Meeting, Thursday, February 10, 2022

College of Liberal Arts Executive Committe

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



EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

February 10, 2022
Agenda

12:30 p.m. in Orlando 105

- I. Approve minutes from January 27, 2022 meeting
- II. Announcements
 - a. Update on faculty support initiatives
 - b. DEI Strategic Planning
- III. Business
 - a. Proposal to close Organizational Behavior Program
 - b. Decide medium (in-person or virtual) for EC review of faculty line requests
 - c. Executive Council Budget Meeting Debrief
 - d. Proposed change to the Bylaws regarding the role and authority of CECs in the faculty T&P review process
 - e. Proposed second stop-the-clock option for pre-tenured faculty
 - f. Proposed faculty governance endorsement of 2021 CIE White Paper
- IV. Committee Reports
 - i. FAC
 - ii. CC



**EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING
February 10, 2022
Minutes**

PRESENT

Missy Barnes, Jennifer Cavanaugh, Rosana Diaz-Zambrana, Daniel Elliot, Hannah Ewing, Jill Jones, Ashley Kistler, Karla Knight, Richard Lewin, Julia Maskivker, Jana Mathews, Dan Myers, Rob Sanders, Susan Singer, Anne Stone

Excused: Grant Cornwell, Jamey Ray

CALL TO ORDER

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM January 27, 2022, EC MEETING

Barnes made a motion to approve the January 27, 2022, EC meeting minutes. Ewing seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

Update on faculty support initiatives

Jennifer Cavanaugh and Nancy Chick will offer meetings for untenured, tenure-track faculty to explain resources for compiling their evaluation materials. They will discuss how to read CEC letters and use examples from sample CEC letters to point out different issues.

Messaging from the most recent department chair meeting was about teaching, flexibility, and support. Chairs were reminded to give faculty space and grace if they have children quarantined or elder care responsibilities.

Because we've been unable to gather and have food at meetings, we are repurposing those funds to encourage people to have time together. Once the positivity rate reaches 5%, we will load up to two lunches per week on r-cards of faculty who are currently teaching. Faculty will be encouraged to take a colleague or staff member to lunch.

DEI Strategic Planning

Students have been invited to apply to participate. The President is very involved in the umbrella group which is made up of many moving parts and task forces to address them.

Q: Is someone from the Diversity Council involved?

A: This group is independent of other campus committees. It's intentionally set up without specific committee representation.

BUSINESS

Proposal to close Organizational Behavior Program

ATTACHMENT #1

Rob Sanders

The Organizational Behavior Program no longer has any students and is technically already closed. The program and students did not go away; they have been rolled into the Psychology degree, which we feel makes more sense.

Myers made a motion to approve the proposal to close the Organizational Behavior Program. Lewin seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

Executive Council Budget Meeting Debrief

Jana Mathews

Jana asked if there is anything else we want from the Executive Council budget meetings.

Discussion:

- It's helpful to have these meetings on a regular basis. If faculty are not engaged in that process and you miss one part of the year, it takes a long time for the opportunity to come again.
- The information felt repetitive. We are missing the middle piece where the cabinet looks at the budget and how decisions are made.
- Is there a middle ground where the provost shares the priorities she will be taking to Cabinet and the reasons she is elevating them?
- There are different steps when people have input. We should think about who and when, perhaps quarterly gatherings. Departments should have conversations about needs in August/September and send that information to Deans.

Q: Who is on the Cabinet?

A: Susan Singer, Laurie Houck, Donna Lee, Faye Tydlaska, Ed Kania, Sam Stark, and Lorrie Kyle.

Q: Can we have a faculty rep on the Cabinet? It's important to have multiple touchpoints.

Additionally, it's important to have someone represent students up through the final budget meeting.

- In summary, transparency of the process is useful, but transparency within the process is also important and that is where we do not have a faculty representative. This has left us in an uncertain realm. Students echo this sentiment.
- In 2020 when 16 million was cut from the budget we had a group meeting and 90% of the conversation was monopolized by faculty. Being in the room doesn't mean you have a voice. In the end, we decreased staff positions by 15% and protected faculty positions. If you think of that from a staff perspective, would it be helpful for staff/faculty to listen to vice presidents have that conversation? There was already so much pain. If that conversation had been too public, I'm not convinced it would have helped anyone. How we make the process visible is important, but there is a fine line

at the end where you must be sensitive to harming relationships among groups (staff, faculty, and students).

Proposed change to the Bylaws regarding the role and authority of CECs in the faculty T&P review process

ATTACHMENT #2

Missy Barnes

FAC has had conversations about problems in the tenure and promotion process. One problem occurs when a CEC is particularly dysfunctional and not following their own criteria. FAC proposes to strike the sentence in section d. that says, "Should the CEC make a negative recommendation, the candidacy cannot go forward except on appeal" and in section e. strike "...a positive recommendation of the candidacy by the CEC...".

Discussion:

- I have heard from several faculty across departments who are not happy about this proposed change. The top reasons include, 1. the goal of ensuring greater oversight does disempower the faculty of the CEC. Removing the ability of a CEC to stop the process makes it an administrative process and not a faculty process, 2. Don't we currently have an appeals process and FEC liaison to ensure this works? If that isn't working, why don't we try to make it work? 3. Is this a widespread problem or a problem with a particular department? Shouldn't the Dean work to fix those cultural problems? 4. It appears to be creating more work and trying to solve a problem in an inefficient way.
- My understanding of the appeals process is that it looks at procedural violations only. Under the current rules you can appeal on the grounds that procedure was not followed at some point in the process, you cannot appeal on the grounds that the committee did not evaluate you correctly.
- FEC is still involved, but they are not a final decision maker. Currently, decision makers are departments, provost, president, and the board. Faculty are not involved in the decision, only administrators are involved.
- If the concern of faculty is to preserve faculty as decision makers, are there other levels where we can get to that? Perhaps change the authority of the Appeals Committee to be able to advise.
- With the existing policy, our legal counsel could not identify a clear path forward if a department acts in crazy ways. Other schools do not give departments this level of power.
- The solution is to move the case forward to FEC, so we have a second body of faculty weigh in on the evaluation.

A motion was made to table the discussion to the next EC Meeting. Motion passed unanimously.

Proposed second stop-the-clock option for pre-tenured faculty

ATTACHMENT #3

Missy Barnes

FAC discussed the continuing stress of pre-tenured faculty where classes are not able to function as normal. FAC proposes we once again offer pre-tenured faculty the option to stop their tenure clock to give them more opportunities to do their best teaching and engage in scholarship.

Barnes made a motion to approve the proposed second stop-the-clock option for pre-tenured faculty. Jones seconded the motion.

Discussion:

- Last time we verified that the cohort doesn't extend beyond their 7th year.
- Offering this option does not violate AAUP.
- It's confusing if faculty stop the clock but their performance still counts in that year.
- Department chairs cannot force someone to take the option but should mentor faculty if it should be helpful.

Q: How does this affect sabbatical schedules?

A: It pushes back the first sabbatical but does not change the next one.

Motion passed unanimously.

Proposed faculty governance endorsement of 2021 CIE White Paper

ATTACHMENT #4

Missy Barnes

FAC discussed the ways CIEs are used in the evaluation process and the stress it has produced over the years. Last year's White Paper was discussed at a faculty meeting but there was distress, and it was never actually endorsed.

A member of FAC discovered an inconsistency in the numeric percentile value where if a certain number of candidates score the correct aggregate, if you're in the top group and 10 people received that score, instead of saying you're at 100% percentile, it puts you at the lower parameter of the percentile.

Barnes made a motion to endorse the 2021 CIE White Paper. Myers seconded the motion.

Discussion:

- I'm surprised we use averages and not medians. Medians do not suffer from extreme highs and lows.
- We know CIEs need to be revised and hope to tackle that next year. If the proposal to endorse the White Paper passes, we can put out a letter recommending CECs look at CIEs from this angle.
- CIEs have no credibility, and we cannot use them to justify retention and tenure decisions.
- There is an excellent online tutorial that specifically reminds us of the problems and limitations in using these scores.

Motion to endorse the 2021 CIE White Paper passed unanimously.

Decide medium (in-person or virtual) for EC review of faculty line requests

Jana Mathews

Due to time constraints, this item was tabled.

Meeting adjourned at 1:47 p.m.



Academic Program Hiatus | Closure Information Sheet

Programs being placed on enrollment hiatus (not accepting new students) or discontinued.
A Teach-Out Plan must be completed and attached to this information sheet.

Program Name	Organizational Behavior Major and Minor
College	Hamilton Holt School
Department or Program	Psychology
Contact(s), E-mail, Phone	Stacey Dunn, Program Director, stdunn@rollins.edu . 407-399-7930
Type of Program	Major/minor offered in Holt by Psychology Department
Level	Undergraduate
Credit or Non-Credit	Credit
Total Program Credit Hours	12 courses (48 credits) for major; 8 courses (32 credits) for minor
Effective Date	Effective immediately upon approval
Location(s) of Instruction	Hamilton Holt, face-to-face and blended classes. Most courses taught in Bush.
Enrollment History (Most recent 10 Years)	2011: 49 majors/5 minors; 2012: 59/6; 2013: 61/2; 2014: 50/4; 2015: 44/4; 2016: 41/12; 2017: 34/8; 2018: 19/3; 2019: 11/3; 2020: 9/1
Rationale for Hiatus Closure	This is more of a renaming of the major than a program closure. The organizational behavior (OB) major was designed to attract working individuals whose employers might be willing to support further education to better serve their businesses. The notion was that the OB major might appeal to employers more than the traditional psychology degree. The OB major thrived for many years, but enrollments have steadily decreased, particularly after the addition of the business major. Several factors led the Psychology Department to shift the OB Major to the Industrial/Organizational concentration area within the psychology major. First, the two majors overlapped a great deal and it is more efficient and organized to streamline the majors. Second, in our field the focus on understanding people in the workplace is known as Industrial/Organizational psychology. It makes sense to identify the major, housed within the Psychology Department, with more accurate terminology. Third, with the addition of the business major in Holt, students have the option to focus on organizational behavior within the business context. The overlapping courses and terminology were confusing to students and diminished the uniqueness of the OB major. Since enrollments in OB were low and we were conducting a substantial curriculum revision for the psychology major, it was the appropriate time to make a change that better serves students interested in industrial/organizational psychology.

Number of Enrolled Students Subject to Teach-Out	9 majors and 1 minor
Resource Requirements for Teach-Out and/or Faculty Reassignment Plans	No additional resources are needed, and no faculty reassignments are necessary to accommodate the change from the OB major to the industrial/organizational concentration within the psychology major.

REVIEWS – APPROVALS

Department Chair	Signature	<i>Alice Davidson</i> <i>Jay PD</i>	Date	10-27-2020
Dean	Signature	<i>Robert Sander</i>	Date	10-29-2020
VPAA Provost	Signature	<i>Susan Rundell Singer</i>	Date	10-29-2020
Faculty Governance				
Curriculum Comm	Signature		Date	
Executive Comm	Signature		Date	
Other	Signature		Date	
Administrative Council (if financial resources required; completed by VPAA/Provost)	Signature		Date	
President	Signature		Date	
Board of Trustees (Notification Only)	Signature		Date	



Teach-Out Plan for Academic Programs on Hiatus | Discontinued

The College's regional accreditor, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC), requires preparation of a teach-out plan that provides for the equitable treatment of students in completion of their program. The teach-out plan can include an external agreement with another institution, but must address the following.

1) Date of hiatus/closure (date when new students will no longer be admitted).

To take effect immediately upon approval.

2) Explain how all affected parties (students, faculty, staff) will be/have been informed of the impending closure.

Students have been informed that the organizational behavior major will now be the industrial/organizational concentration area of the psychology major.
Faculty were involved in the development of the I/O concentration area, the Psychology Department approved the new curriculum, and the new psychology curriculum and concentration areas were approved by the Curriculum Committee in Feb. 2020. There will be no changes in teaching assignments/load as a result of the shift in curriculum.
Staff will be unaffected since there was no staff person dedicated to the organizational behavior major. The Administrative Assistant in the Psychology Dept. is aware of the change.
Other members of college community have been informed via approval by the curriculum committee of the I/O concentration area in psychology and will be informed of the change in organizational behavior major when approved.

3) How will all affected students will be helped to complete their programs of study with minimal disruption.

Students maintain the option to complete their organizational behavior major if they completed the required statistics and research methods courses. All students were given ample warning that the separate research methods and statistics courses previously required would no longer be offered as of fall 2020. Students were given the opportunity to complete the series in spring 2020 or switch to the I/O concentration of the psychology major which requires the new 2-course Statistics and Research Methods sequence. Since the new concentration area is far more flexible than the OB major, no students have been inconvenienced or slowed in their progress toward graduation.

4) Will the teach-out plan incur additional charges/expenses to the students and, if so, how the students will be notified.

Students will not incur any additional charges or expenses.

5) Attach copies of signed teach-out agreements with other institutions, if any.

Copy Attached Not Applicable

6) How will faculty and staff be redeployed or helped to find new employment, if needed?

There will be no impact on faculty (including adjuncts) since we will be offering the same courses that were part of the OB major, just under the industrial/organizational concentration area within the psychology major.

7) What are the arrangement for storage of student records, disposition of final financial resources, and other assets, as applicable.

All student records will be retained as part of the Psychology Department which housed the OB major.

Department Chair	Signature		Date	
-------------------------	-----------	--	------	--

ATTACHMENT #2

From the Rollins College of Liberal Arts Faculty Bylaws amended 8/13/2021

Article VIII

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

Current:

Section 4. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor Evaluation (p 23)

d. Evaluation by the Candidate Evaluation Committee

Having reviewed the candidate's file and deliberated, the CEC writes a report and recommendation, which makes a case for or against the candidate and sends it, along with the letters from the outside evaluators if applicable, to the FEC, with copies to the Dean of the Faculty and candidate, by October 1. (The CEC letter is due by October 23, 2020 for AY2020-2021). The candidate may choose to write a response to the report and recommendation, and should send this response electronically to the CEC, the Dean of the Faculty, and the FEC within one week. Should the CEC make a negative recommendation, the candidacy cannot go forward except on appeal.

e. Evaluation by Dean of the Faculty

Having received a positive recommendation of the candidacy by the CEC, the Dean of the Faculty will conduct a separate evaluation.

Section 5. Promotion to Professor (p 26)

d. Evaluation by the Candidate Evaluation Committee

Having reviewed the candidate's file and deliberated, the CEC writes a report and recommendation, which makes a case for or against the candidate and sends it, along with the letters from the outside evaluators if applicable, to the FEC, with copies to the Dean of the Faculty and candidate, by October 15. (The CEC letter is due October 30, 2020 for AY2020-2021). The candidate may choose to write a response to the report and recommendation, and this response will be sent to the CEC, the Dean of the Faculty, and the FEC within one week. Should the CEC make a negative recommendation, the candidacy cannot go forward except on appeal.

e. Evaluation by Dean of the Faculty

Having received a positive recommendation of the candidacy by the CEC, the Dean of the Faculty will conduct a separate evaluation

Proposed:

Section 4. Tenure and Promotion to Associate Professor Evaluation

d. Evaluation by the Candidate Evaluation Committee

Having reviewed the candidate's file and deliberated, the CEC writes a report and recommendation, which makes a case for or against the candidate and sends it, along with the letters from the outside evaluators if applicable, to the FEC, with copies to the Dean of the Faculty and candidate, by October 1. (The CEC letter is due by October 23, 2020 for AY2020-2021). The candidate may choose to write a response to the report and recommendation, and should send this response electronically to the CEC, the Dean of the Faculty, and the FEC within one week. ~~Should the CEC make a negative recommendation, the candidacy cannot go forward except on appeal.~~

e. Evaluation by Dean of the Faculty

Having received ~~a positive recommendation of the candidacy by the CEC~~ **the CEC's recommendation**, the Dean of the Faculty will conduct a separate evaluation.

Section 5. Promotion to Professor (p 26)

d. Evaluation by the Candidate Evaluation Committee

Having reviewed the candidate's file and deliberated, the CEC writes a report and recommendation, which makes a case for or against the candidate and sends it, along with the letters from the outside evaluators if applicable, to the FEC, with copies to the Dean of the Faculty and candidate, by October 15. (The CEC letter is due October 30, 2020 for AY2020-2021). The candidate may choose to write a response to the report and recommendation, and this response will be sent to the CEC, the Dean of the Faculty, and the FEC within one week. ~~Should the CEC make a negative recommendation, the candidacy cannot go forward except on appeal.~~

e. Evaluation by Dean of the Faculty

Having received ~~a positive recommendation of the candidacy by the CEC~~ **the CEC's recommendation**, the Dean of the Faculty will conduct a separate evaluation.

Rationale:

This proposed change would lead to greater oversight and allow for a more equitable tenure and promotion process. In addition, the change will bring our bylaws into alignment with our benchmark institutions.

Clarification:

The following bylaw would remain in effect under the proposed change:

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

Section 2. Faculty Evaluation Committee Structure and Evaluation

e. Review by the FEC

Upon completion of its review of its candidates, the FEC writes a report and recommendation. The recommendation of the FEC may agree or disagree with that of the CEC or of the Dean of the Faculty. In the event of a negative evaluation by the FEC, the FEC will consult with the CEC on points of disagreement. If the FEC is still not satisfied with the arguments of the CEC, it submits its negative recommendation to the Provost for their report and recommendation.

ATTACHMENT #3

FAC endorsement from meeting on 2/8/2022

- 1) The FAC recommends offering pre-tenured faculty a second opportunity to “stop the clock” on their tenure process due to the challenges related to COVID.

ATTACHMENT #4

The current members of FAC endorse the recommendations made in the CIE White Paper Final Report developed by the FAC of academic year 2020-2021, which was updated March 6, 2021.

The faculty of Rollins College strive to be excellent teachers. Faculty value the information they receive from their course evaluations each semester as they reflect on and fine-tune their classes. The Faculty Affairs Committee offers several recommendations designed to heighten awareness of the subtle ways bias influences course evaluations as well as ways to best use the information contained in the CIEs. The FAC hopes these suggestions will increase awareness of the potential forms of bias and contribute to a discussion of how to effectively evaluate teaching in liberal arts colleges.

1. The Office of Institutional Analytics should conduct the Race and Gender Bias Study every four years and report the results to the Faculty Affairs Committee. We recommend that the next study also include an analysis of student comments. This enables an analysis of both quantitative and qualitative information contained in the evaluations. Regular reporting of this information allows faculty and administrators to monitor the institution's progress regarding resisting bias in teaching evaluations and aids in effectively using the information contained in the CIEs.
2. The FAC recommends that the text box for faculty comments on the CIE is made a permanent feature on Course Instructor Evaluations.
3. The FAC recommends that the name of the instrument be changed from Course Instructor Evaluation to "Student Perceptions of the Course and Instruction."
4. The FAC encourages faculty to view the [online tutorial](#) available for using the CIE. The instructional tutorial is very thorough and provides useful contextual information for properly interpreting course evaluations, possible biases in raw scores and comments, and interpretation of the comparison percentiles.
5. CIEs can provide useful longitudinal information by identifying trends and patterns in faculty instruction. The strategy for interpreting CIEs is combining the quantitative measures (raw scores) with the qualitative information available in students' comments. The FAC affirms that a holistic approach to evaluation is preferable in which CIEs are combined with other sources of information about teaching quality and development.
6. The FAC recommends that evaluators avoid relying on the percentiles except when they reveal a consistent pattern below the 10th percentile. The overall distribution of teaching scores at Rollins is very high. Therefore, small changes in raw scores can produce large changes in the corresponding percentile score.

Addendum from members of the 2021-2022 FAC:

The FAC notes that when a numerical value is shared between numerous instructors, only the lowest percentile range is indicated in the CIEs.

The current FAC also offer this reminder from the Rollins College Faculty Handbook, Section III, CLA Policies and Procedures (p 17).

Informed Use of Course and Instructor Evaluations. Results from Course and Instructor Evaluations (CIE) should be used only as they were designed to be used. Evaluators should review both narrative and numeric results available in CIE reports. The level to which comments indicate a legitimate concern about a candidate can be confirmed or contradicted by the numeric data. Likewise, numeric data often depends on narrative responses to provide clarification and aid in interpretation. If evaluators ignore either narrative or numeric results, they risk making faulty decisions about the candidate.