

Rollins College

Rollins Scholarship Online

Executive Committee Minutes

College of Liberal Arts Minutes and Reports

4-7-2022

Minutes, Executive Committee Meeting, Thursday, April 7, 2022

College of Liberal Arts Executive Committe

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



EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

April 7, 2022
Agenda

12:30 p.m. in Orlando 105

- I. Approval of March 24, 2022 Minutes
- II. FRDC Proposed Bylaw Revisions
- III. Proposal for Standardized PTR Process
- IV. Proposal for Revised Midcourse, Tenure, and Promotion Review Process
- V. Set April 14 CLA Faculty Meeting Agenda



EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING

April 7, 2022

Minutes

PRESENT

Missy Barnes, Jennifer Cavanaugh, Grant Cornwell, Hannah Ewing, Jill Jones, Ashley Kistler, Karla Knight, Richard Lewin, Julia Maskivker, Jana Mathews, Dan Myers, Jamey Ray, Rob Sanders, Susan Singer, Anne Stone

Excused: Jennifer Cavanaugh, Grant Cornwell, Rob Sanders, Susan Singer

Guests: Sindy Sejourne, Kara Wright, Eric Smaw

CALL TO ORDER

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

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM March 24, 2022, EC MEETING

Jones made a motion to approve the minutes from the March 24, 2022, EC Meeting. Ewing seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

BUSINESS

FRDC Proposed Bylaw Revisions

ATTACHMENT #1

Eric Smaw

This year FRDC reviewed Bylaws for consistency and to explicitly state the parameters of FRDC. They recommend all grants and awards specific to CLA faculty be reviewed by FRDC. This would ensure divisional representation during the review process, something the awards don't currently have. Additionally, this move would provide clarity about eligibility and application timelines. FRDC created a rubric for grants, so everyone is thinking about the same things as they review proposals. They plan to create a separate rubric for evaluating awards.

Discussion:

- It's important to have McKean Grant recipients evaluated by alumni because it gives additional credibility. Maybe FRDC could establish who those alumni are.

- Other grants should be reviewed by an all-college grant review committee.
- Executive Council can advocate for an all-college committee, but it's okay for the rationale to exist in the CLA Bylaws.
- A suggestion was made to have the Student Life Committee (SLC) have governance over Student-Faculty Collaborative Scholarships (SFCS), but others noted that the committee does not have divisional representation.
- For the sciences, the SFCS is more serious than a student award. Many departments have expectations and standards that part of your scholarship should be organized through SFCS, so these need to come from people with scholarly expertise. They are judged on scholarly merit and reflect on the sponsoring faculty member's program.
- FRDC does not have the time to review SFCS proposals with the given timeline. One solution would be for FRDC to have authority to review awards, and the program administrators continue with the administrative work.

EC will continue this discussion at their next meeting.

Proposal for Standardized PTR Process

ATTACHMENT #2

Missy Barnes

We do not have a formalized process for post-tenure reviews. They tend to be open-ended, and departments handle them in a way they deem appropriate. FAC was asked to offer a proposal for a formal process that would be used by departments.

Stone made a motion to approve the proposal for standardized PTR Process. Myers seconded the motion.

Discussion:

- We need procedures, but less is more. I recommend cutting the language in the second paragraph that refers to "correction of deficiencies."
- FAC only added things at the bottom of the document. Everything else already exists in the Bylaws.
- We should change the date candidate's materials are due from January 1st to the first day the College is open for business in January to align with other reviews.
- The Professional Assessment Statement should be limited to 3000 words.
- Asking for a few syllabi and examples of assignments and a reflection on CIE's is fine, but we don't need letters from students.
- I would prefer minimal language about required additional documents.
- The focus should be on continued professional development and growth, not stagnation. The portfolio should show development since the last review.
- Faculty should only be asked to provide an updated CV, a letter discussing pedagogy, and plans for research.

EC voted on the revised proposal. Motion passed unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 1:47 p.m.

ATTACHMENT #1

ARTICLE VII

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE FACULTY OF THE COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS

Section 3. Faculty Research and Development Committee (FRDC)

Responsibilities and Duties

The Faculty Research and Development Committee reviews all internal grant and award **proposals and nominations for funds set aside for** the Faculty of the College of Liberal Arts and makes recommendations of these grants and awards to the appropriate administrator. Grants to be reviewed by the Faculty Research and Development Committee include, but are not limited to, FYRST, Critchfield, Ashforth, Cornell Research, Individual Development, and Course Development grants. Awards to be reviewed by the Faculty Research and Development Committee include, but are not limited to, the Cornell Distinguished Faculty Award and Arthur Vining Davis Fellowship. This committee oversees and makes necessary revisions to grant and award proposal forms and receives and reviews mid-year and final grant and award reports submitted by faculty grant recipients.

Membership

Membership of the Faculty Research and Development Committee consists of seven voting members and three nonvoting members. The voting membership shall be one faculty representative from each division of the College of Liberal Arts (elected by division) and one faculty representative elected by the Faculty at-large. The non-voting membership includes the Dean of the Faculty, the Director of the Endeavor Center, and the Director of Grants and Sponsored Research.

Meetings

The meetings of the Faculty Research and Development Committee are only open to the Faculty when the meeting agenda is not the review or allocation of grants.

ATTACHMENT #2

Proposal for a post-tenure review process
From the CLA Faculty bylaws 8/13/2021

ARTICLE VIII

FACULTY APPOINTMENTS AND EVALUATIONS

D. PROCEDURES FOR POST-TENURE EVALUATIONS

The CEC, with the support of the Dean of the Faculty, is charged with the responsibility of encouraging improved teaching and professional development for all members of the Faculty. Tenured faculty will normally be evaluated every seven years, two years before their eligibility for a sabbatical. Exceptions may be recommended by the Dean of the Faculty, with the approval of the Faculty Affairs Committee.

While the primary purpose of continued assessment is to promote improved teaching and professional development, it also assists tenured faculty in the identification of strengths and **correction of any deficiencies**. Should the CEC or the Dean of the Faculty detect deficiencies which are particularly significant, the evaluation proceedings may be initiated at any time.

The faculty member's professional assessment statements play a primary role in these seven- year evaluations. The faculty member creates a professional assessment statement called the Faculty Development Plan. This plan, with supporting documents, goes to the members of the CEC to review by January 1. The CEC then meets with the faculty member to discuss the professional assessment statement and writes a brief letter of evaluation in response to it, noting their developmental assessment of the faculty member and how the plans fit into the department's goals. This letter is sent to the Dean of the Faculty by April 15 of the penultimate year before the faculty member is eligible for a sabbatical.

Deans play a central role in providing ongoing encouragement and support for faculty efforts at professional development. The Dean of the Faculty meets with the faculty member separately to discuss the professional assessment statement, and supporting documents, and the letter of the CEC. The Dean of the Faculty then writes a brief letter of evaluation, stating points of concurrence or disagreement. The faculty member receives a copy of this letter by August 15 of the evaluation year. Both letters, along with the Faculty Development Plan, and other supporting materials, are placed in a file for the faculty member that is kept in the office of the Dean of the Faculty. While a faculty member has reasonable latitude for changes of professional direction, this file is then used in decisions about release time, requests for funding, and merit awards.

Timeline for **Annual and** Post-Tenure Review:

| | Annual | Post-Tenure |
|--|---|---|
| Notification by Dean's office of eligibility | N/A | April 15 |
| CEC formed by: | December 1 | December 1 |
| Candidate materials submitted to CEC and (post-tenure only) the Dean | January 1 (January 19 for AY 2020- 2021) | January 1 (January 19 for AY 2020- 2021) |
| CEC's letter to Dean and candidate by: | February 15 | April 15 |
| Dean's letter to candidate and CEC by: | N/A | August 15 |

**Recommended addition to the bylaws (proposed process for post-tenure review):

The Post-tenure review process will include teaching observations arranged between the CEC and the faculty member under review.

Collection of Materials for Review

The faculty member undergoing post-tenure review will upload the following materials to Canvas by **first business day of College in January**.

1. CV
2. Professional Assessment Statement, **up to 3,000 words** including:
 - All relevant professional activities are addressed: teaching, research and scholarship, and College service.
 - How the faculty member has developed professionally since the last formal evaluation.
 - How the faculty member's research interests and professional activities constitute a coherent path of development connected to their work on campus and to the **larger wider** community
 - The statement includes **a reflection on student evaluations** & the assessment of her/his successes and failures, as well as a plan for future development.

Bunch of Busy Work that is already available

~~3. CEC may request additional materials—Prior departmental evaluations~~

~~4. Teaching Portfolio—including a selection of relevant materials such as:~~

~~a. Sample Syllabi~~

~~b. Sample Assignments~~

~~c. Examples of Student Work~~

~~d. Reflection on Student Evaluations~~

~~e. Letters from former students~~

~~5. Examples of research or creative activity~~

Rationale:

At this time there is no process in place for the Post-tenure review. This proposal would offer some structure to the process for all departments.