

4-20-2017

Minutes, College of Liberal Arts Faculty Meeting, Thursday, April 20, 2017

College of Liberal Arts Faculty, Rollins College

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_fac



Part of the [Educational Administration and Supervision Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

College of Liberal Arts Faculty, Rollins College, "Minutes, College of Liberal Arts Faculty Meeting, Thursday, April 20, 2017" (2017).
The College of Liberal Arts Faculty Minutes. 125.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_fac/125

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Liberal Arts Minutes and Reports at Rollins Scholarship Online. It has been accepted for inclusion in The College of Liberal Arts Faculty Minutes by an authorized administrator of Rollins Scholarship Online. For more information, please contact rwalton@rollins.edu.



ROLLINS

College of Liberal Arts Faculty Meeting

April 20, 2017

Agenda

- I. Call to Order
- II. Approval of Minutes
- III. Announcements
 - a. Update on Strategic Planning
 - b. Election Results: Diversity Council
- IV. New Business
 - a. Approval of Dean of the Faculty candidate
 - b. Approval of Appeals Committee Slate
 - c. Proposed Changes to CLA Bylaws Article VIII
- V. Committee Reports
 - a. Executive Committee (Dexter Boniface)
 - b. Curriculum Committee (Mario D'Amato)
 - c. Faculty Affairs Committee (Eric Smaw)



ROLLINS
Meeting Minutes
April 20, 2017

Present

Agee, Sharon; Allen, Barry; Almond, Josh; Anderson, Mark; Angell, Helena; Archard, Chuck; Armenia, Amy; Baranes, Avraham; Barnes, Melissa; Barreneche, Gabriel; Bernal, Pedro; Biery-Hamilton, Gay; Boles, Bill; Bommelje, Rick; Boniface, Dexter; Boulanger, Michelle; Brown, Shan-Estelle; Brown, Victoria; Carnahan, Sharon; Cavanaugh, Jennifer; Chambliss, Julian; Charles, David; Cheng, Martha; Chong, Dan; Cody-Rapport, Lisa; Cohen, Ed; Cook, Gloria; Coyle, Whitney; Crozier, Dan; D'Amato, Mario; Davison, Joan; Decker, Nancy; Deffler, Samantha; Dennis, Kimberly; DiQuattro, Marianne; Dunn, Stacey; Ewing, Hannah; Fetscherin, Marc; Foglesong, Rick; Forsythe, Matt; Freeman, Sarah; French, Todd; Garcia, Mattea; Gilmore, Zackary; Griffin, Kevin; Gunter, Mike; Habgood, Laurel; Hammonds, Joshua; Harper, Fiona; Harwell, Jonathan; Hewitt, Scott; Homrich, Alicia; Jackson, Karen; Kincaid, Stephanie; Kistler, Ashley; Kline, Nolan; Kodzi, Emmanuel; Kozel, Philip; Kypraios, Harry, N; Lackman, Susan; Libby, Susan; Luchner, Andrew; Maskivker, Julia; Mays, Dorothy; McCall, Patti; McClure, Amy; McLaughlin, Jim; Mesbah, Hesham; Miller, Jonathan; Miller, Robert; Moore, Thomas; Murdaugh, Anne; Musgrave, Ryan; Myers, Dan; Newcomb, Rachel; Niles, Nancy; Nodine, Emily; Norsworthy, Kathryn; O'Sullivan, Maurice; Painter, David; Palladino, Derrick; Park, Ellane; Patrone, James; Peng, Zhaocheng; Pett, Timothy; Pieczynski, Jay; Planck, Carolyn; Prieto-Calixto, Alberto; Queen, Jenny; Reich, Paul; Roe, Dawn; Rubarth, Scott; Russell, Emily; Ryan, MacKenzie Moon; Schoen, Steven; Simmons, Rachel; Smaw, Eric; St. John, Steven; Stephenson, Paul; Stone, Anne; Summet, Valerie; Sutherland, Katie; Tatari, Eren; Tillmann, Lisa; Vander Poppen, Robert; Vidovic, Martina; Vitray, Rick; Voicu, Anca; Walsh, Susan; Walton, Rachel; Warnecke, Tonia; Wellman, Debra; Williams, Michele; Winet, Kristin; Witmer, Sunni; Yao, Yusheng; Yellen, Jay; Yu, Jie; Zhang, Wenxian; Zivot, Eric

Call to Order

Faculty President Dexter Boniface called the meeting to order at 12:35 pm.

Approval of the Minutes

Approval of the CLA faculty meeting minutes from April 6, 2017.
Minutes approved by voice vote.

Announcements

Grant Cornwell: I'm not going to take you through the Strategic Framework today, you've seen these ideas emerge all year. I want to draw your attention to the process. In the fall we did the reflection that formed the basis for planning; 12 task forces were charged with strategic questions; those task forces did excellent and substantive work, producing 64 different recommendations. Next fall when we return we will move from a

phase of planning and thinking to a phase of doing. The framework is a consolidation of the recommendations written in a vernacular that will be legible to our alumni board and our board of trustees. All of the 64 recommendations are included either explicitly or implicitly.

What my trustees will tell me is that you cannot possibly manage a strategic plan with 64 recommendations. And I will say, this is a college not a corporation. And, yes, it's a bit messier, but it is more inclusive. Many of these recommendations are already underway, some are already done. It is my job this May to make the board understand how the process of strategic planning works at a college. I should also say that some of these items are funding contingent; they will happen when we are able to raise the funds to make them happen. As soon as we launch this strategic plan, parts of it will be transformed into a campaign plan, a plan that I believe hasn't yet existed.

I want to offer some framing remarks on the question of faculty salaries. First of all, notice that faculty compensation is one of the twelve strategic questions. Why did I lift up and charge a task force specifically around compensation? First: I did not find here at Rollins a strategic commitment to stewarding faculty salaries over the long run. I will say, I was disconcerted by the years you went with stipends as opposed to increases to base salary. That has an erosive effect over time and we have seen how that happens.

We have begun the work of discussing faculty compensation this year. It has been difficult. It hasn't gone as fast as we might have wanted, but it has been well done.

I come from a place where faculty compensation is a measure of respect for the profession. None of you have gone into the profession to become wealthy. But having spent 25 years as a professor myself, compensation matters. You have ambitions for your life that call for a basic stability of income over your career. As opposed to the business community, where you might move from place to place, you have made a commitment to the institution, often, with tenure, for life. The institution should make a similar commitment to you.

The strategic plan must think about how we deliver our mission and our place in the market. There's nothing less strategic than an alienated faculty. And nothing produces alienation like the feeling that one's professional contribution is not being respected and valued. You give everything to this place and it is simply unstrategic to disrespect that work. That's why I made it one of the strategic questions.

We need to attend to this.

College budgets are complicated. They don't move easily and they don't move in big jumps happily. This has to be a long project. It won't be a quick fix. We've gotten our house in order in terms of data, but we haven't had the big conversation about compensation philosophy.

Allocation of the faculty salary pool largely falls to the provost. It is among the biggest jobs she has. We are lucky in Susan Singer in that she comes from a place, Carleton, where there has been a strategic approach to faculty salary stewardship over time. I did similar work at St. Lawrence.

Next year there is a 2% increase in the faculty salary pool. It is an open question how that will be allocated. I am also working with Jeff Eisenbarth to determine an additional \$100,000 pool, tantamount to another .67% of the faculty salary pool. The total proposed salary pool for next year amounts to 2.67%. Susan has a big job because she has to figure out how to allocate that pool.

Boniface: I am pleased to announce the following elections to the Diversity Council: Martha Cheng (humanities), John Grau (art), Nolan Kline (social sciences), David Caban (business), Jie Yu (social sciences, applied), Alice Davidson (sciences)

New Business

Approval of Dean of the Faculty Candidate: Jennifer Cavanaugh

Rachel Simmons: I move that we approve Jennifer Cavanaugh as Dean of the Faculty. Seconded by David Charles.

Boniface: By the Bylaws of the faculty, we need to approve this recommendation by majority vote. A quick review of the process: there was an open call for applicants, a search committee was formed, and they recommended Jennifer Cavanaugh.

Kathryn Norsworthy: Call for acclamation.

Emily Russell: Call for clicker ballot.

Approved by 95% vote. Cheers and standing ovation.

Boniface: My thanks to the members of the dean's search committee, consisting of Marc Fetscherin, Laurel Habgood, Ashley Kistler, Jim McLaughlin, Robert Vander Poppen, Mamta Accapadi, Bill Short, Deborah Crown, and Matt Cassidy. And thank you to Jennifer for her willingness to serve in this important position.

Approval of Appeals Committee Slate

Boniface: I circulated these names this morning. Just as a refresher to the body, we moved to a single appeals committee for the college during the governance reform process of the past year and a half. The committee is composed of four professors, three from our body and one from Crummer. The Bylaws also encourage the selection of alternates and a staggering principle. Since this committee meets rarely, it has historically been difficult to determine membership and sometimes a committee has had to form in the event of an appeal. Currently there is no pending appeal. Membership must be full professors. The committee typically will hear appeals of tenure decisions and grievances.

Robert Vander Poppen: I move the approval of the slate. Seconded.

Members

Rick Vitray	(one year)	2017-2018
Jill Jones	(two years)	2017-2019
Rachel Simmons	(three years)	2017-2020

Alternates

Derrick Paladino	(two years)	2017-2019
Rick Bommelje	(three years)	2017-2020

Sharon Carnahan: How were these members chosen?

Boniface: The executive committee brings this slate. We sought to achieve a balance of gender, division, and people who would exercise good judgment in the cases brought before them.

Emily Russell: Call for approval by acclamation.

Approved by acclamation.

Lisa Tillmann: Resolved, we support a model of distributing the 2% pool that does not exacerbate existing salary inequities.

Rick Foglesong: Second.

Tillmann: From information presented at the April 7 faculty compensation forum attended by Grant and at the April 13 department chairs meeting, we understand that a 2% compensation increase pool has been funded. The administration also is seeking a second pool for equity adjustments, but this has not yet been funded.

What we heard from Grant today is a change from what we heard at the chairs meeting, that the mechanism of distributing the increase has not been determined. We feel this makes the resolution even more important.

This is coming from the floor because we are simply running out of meetings. Faculty Affairs committee is swamped with information from the meetings, from the survey, and the business of the end of the semester. There is no way for that committee to bring recommendations to the floor before the end of the year or that can impact the distribution of this coming year's salary pool.

Kathryn Norsworthy: We bring to you a concern that an across the board increase exacerbates existing inequities. We also have anecdotal data about outliers, particularly on the low end. We thought that it would be helpful for this body to have a conversation to help give guidance to the provost and the president on how we'd like to see the process unfold.

Tillmann: What do we mean by inequities? An immediate need to rectify the salaries of low outliers, compression, inversion, and a principle that salaries should stay in a range by rank and years in rank.

Boniface: You've heard a motion from the floor. This hasn't gone through committee, but it is certainly the faculty's right to bring a resolution to the floor. They've divided the question in two parts and we are voting on the first part.

Cornwell: I don't rise to speak in favor or opposition to this resolution, but I want to say what I hope is obvious. We don't have guidelines to give us further guidance. Everyone in this room should understand that your raise will either be more than 2% or less than 2%. No one can sit here and do a back of the envelope calculation to determine what their salary for next year will be. "Exacerbating existing salary inequities" is a rich intellectual claim. "Exacerbating inequalities" would be somewhat clearer. I want to hear this body have a robust debate about how we understand the term "inequity" as opposed to simply "inequality."

Tillmann: I will speak to your first point. Kathryn and I have discussed that we don't know how we will come out in a distribution model that is not a flat two percent. We are willing to concede some of our 2% or even all of our 2% to redress glaring inequalities.

Harry Kypraios: I have one clear image of one inequity and that is when market rates for incoming faculty are higher than rates for those who have been here for some years.

Tillmann: So you're talking about inversion.

Kypraios: Yes.

Julia Maskivker: Inequities can also be a case in which income in younger faculty is offered at compensation rates lower than is offered at competing institutions.

Carnahan: I hesitate to leap into this fray, but I want to make two quick points. For those of us that were here in the 1990s, for some years we went to no raises, hiring freezes, and no staff raises. The first year that faculty were granted a raise, we voted to give that raise to staff and defer our own higher compensation. There is precedence to say, let's make sure the lowest paid among us gets their fair share.

It's much easier to define an inequality than an inequity. I would support using this resolution to lift up professors who are greater than 1.5 standard deviations below their peers by rank.

Kim Dennis: I want to bring up the issue of disparities between disciplines. We are all professors. We argue to students that it shouldn't matter what they major in, but we don't practice what we preach in terms of our own compensation.

Boniface: I want to speak not as president, but as a faculty member. I am ambivalent about this resolution. I know that we are doing a survey right now, but I would want to see the results of that survey for guidance in how to proceed. I'm not sure that this language by itself captures the specific measures that would provide guidance in how to act.

Joan Davison: I am assuming first of all that this resolution applies to the 2% pool available for 2017-18 only. Part of the reason that we cannot wait for the results of the survey is that it's not going to be available to give us any guidance for how the provost should distribute the pool. Additionally, I do concur that there are many types of inequities. What this resolution does is trust the provost with a limited amount of discretion in defining that term. We were told the raise had been determined to be across the board. We had been told there was no additional pool. Now we're told there may be a small pool and that the distribution model may be other than across the board. I see two or three glaring inequities:

- 1) Inversion: people coming in at higher amounts than those already here.
- 2) In looking at the data, I was seeing people \$10,000 below the regression line and to me that's just an inequity. Or at the associate professor rank, one person makes twice as much as another professor at the same time at rank.
- 3) I understand that adjustments have to be long term. We've never had a strategic faculty salary plan. We've had policies, but those policies are irrelevant when there are years of no increases. Full professors are 8K below the benchmark. If we're 8k below now, this is a cumulative negative situation. I understand Grant's point about college budgets, but if this is a 5-10 year plan, a large proportion of the full professors will be retired before a plan can be enacted.

I for one am simply prepared to trust the provost to enact a distribution model for the coming year.

Mario D'Amato: One way to address the concern about the specificity of this motion would be to take the 2%, which is an aggregate amount, and divide it by the number of faculty. It would bring the scatterplot dots up a bit, but preserve the basic pattern the way it is without exacerbating the positions of the outliers.

Tillmann: That would be one solution for the provost, but that level of specificity is

something that the group proposing the resolution wanted to avoid.

D'Amato: But that would be a specific model we might agree to.

Emmanuel Kodzi: I do understand the discussions so far, and there have been several references to market forces. Wherever we are in regard to our compensation, everyone aspires to do better. I know that generally business professors tend to make more. Even among the business professors, however, many of us feel underpaid compared to our colleagues at other institutions. If we distribute in such a way those that have a little more should not get more, to let those who earn less get more, we risk disregarding the real concerns of some colleagues. At this point, we should encourage the president to consider how we can use the proposed 2% increase to encourage all of our good work, while using the extra \$100,000 available to make the adjustments the resolution is targeting. All of us should feel that we have benefited from an increased pool.

Socky O'Sullivan: I, for one, would love to see a conversation about the relationship between inequities and inequalities. Many of us fought the decisions that led to the current budget. We had leadership that screwed Rollins. People are now working to redress that. There was a time when the faculty had a hand in the budget. We both made policy and were able to recommend specific amounts. At one time, faculty were able to recommend an increase of 6%. When we did that, the treasurer came in and said that if the faculty took 6% there would be no money for staff raises. Faculty held the line at 6% and lo and behold, the college found the money to increase staff salaries by 6% as well. I know that that's impossible to go to 6% now, but we should keep that example in mind.

Josh Hammonds: Mario said what I was going to say more eloquently.

Maskivker: I wanted to briefly address the comment that I thought was quite sensible. Even people in the business department feel undercompensated compared to peers. But that's the problem for everyone else. We feel undercompensated compared to peers outside the institution, and also inside the institution. I understand the grievance, but in a condition of scarcity, action needs to be taken. We also need to consider this in the context that the college has frequently hired administrative positions at the highest rate of pay without any sense of financial ruin. The statement that the college would love to redress these issues but cannot has no purchase when we continue to hire upper level administrators at these rates.

Cornwell: The idea of "across the board" was there as a shorthand way of saying, we're not intending to take merit into account in the distribution of salary this year. I understand that was not a very accurate shorthand. I want to point out the difficulty of the provost's job. Joan's suggestion has merit, but so does Mario's. But they are mutually exclusive. How can these both be applied as guidance?

Norsworthy: I have gotten focused on the low outliers. I am uncomfortable being part of a system in which colleagues are struggling to make ends meet. I would like to see us come up with something that directly addresses that piece of it. Especially since we don't have certainty that we will have another pool to work with in the future.

Alicia Homrich: I'm going to make a comment and a motion. This is like the Affordable Care Act. We need to start somewhere. I'm going to call the question.

Motion passes with 59% of the vote.

Norsworthy: Resolved, in anticipation of salary cycles beginning in 2018-19, we support a salary distribution model informed by the benchmarks and developed and enacted by the provost in consultation with faculty representatives. Due to time constraints, we entrust the provost to develop such a model for the 2017-18 salary cycle.

Tillmann: In the first resolution, the key word was “inequity.” Here, the key words are “using benchmark data” and “consultation.”

Jonathan Miller: By “the benchmark data,” you mean that group of 30 institutions? In the data that has been presented so far, that group has not been able to include the librarians.

Anne Murdaugh: To clarify, the AAUP data that was presented in aggregate included librarians because it included everyone that any school, including us, reports. For the College of Liberal Arts slides and the scatterplots, they do not include librarians.

Miller: Then more work needs to be done.

Boniface: I’d like to speak in favor of resolution 2. It’s a statement of what we have planned all along, which is to locate this responsibility in the hands of the Faculty Affairs Committee. It’s regretful that they haven’t achieved it so far, but this is an endorsement of the process we intend to move forward.

Jim McLaughlin: I am uncertain about entrusting the provost to develop a model for the current salary cycle—a model requires time to make and should not be done without faculty input. When our first paycheck comes at the end of Sept, which is way too late, by the way, I don’t want there to be uncertainty. I don’t know what that model looks like. My problem is not with the first part, it’s with the second part.

Davison: I’m wondering if, given that the first resolution passed, if a friendly amendment is to drop the second sentence since it’s what’s going to happen? We’re primarily focused on what will happen in future salary cycles with this resolution.

Tillmann: So, you’re suggesting that we drop the second sentence. What do people think?

Jennifer Cavanaugh: I’m wondering if it would be the will of the body to amend the statement to include “all full time faculty”? I’m concerned that our lecturers and artists-in-residence tend to get left out of these conversations. I’m curious for those who came up with this resolution, if we fold in these so-called contingent faculty, it brings in a whole additional level of complexity, but I think it’s appropriate that we think of the salaries of all of our colleagues.

Tillmann: I don’t think the current language would preclude that.

Vander Poppen: I oppose this motion not because of its content, but because it’s what we’re already doing. It’s redundant to the work that is already in place.

Norsworthy: What we’ve been hearing is that there are concerns with faculty participation in the development of the model because of concerns around revealing confidential information. We felt invited to authorize meaningful faculty participation.

Davison: This also seems to me to be driven by frustration that this is the first time we’ve had this conversation all year. Often times we have resolutions that include “report back to the faculty by x date. . . .” We haven’t done that so far with the Faculty Affairs committee.

Marc Fetscherin: I second what Rob said. I think we’ve jumped the gun here. I don’t think we’ve done all the analysis. We’re talking about 18-19. I would propose to table this for fall.

Davison: If it's not tabled time specific, it never has to be removed from the table.

Maskivker: What would be the harm that would come from voting on this now?

Fetscherin: I move to table to the first faculty meeting of the fall.

Seconded

Vote to table passed by 58%.

Boniface: I want to thank the group for bringing these resolutions to the faculty and for their attention to this issue.

The next item on the agenda is a change to the bylaws, but noting the time, I don't believe we can move to that business. If I could introduce it, however: at the last meeting of the semester, we will bring the change to the Bylaws that changes the due date for CEC letters from Nov 1 to Oct 1. It would entail something of a burden on departments to conduct their reviews for candidates going up for full at the same time that they are reviewing their tenure cases. We feel this change is necessary to allow FEC some flexibility in getting done all of the work that is before them.

Adjournment

Dexter Boniface adjourned the meeting at 1:45 pm.