

Rollins College

Rollins Scholarship Online

The College of Liberal Arts Faculty Minutes

College of Liberal Arts Minutes and Reports

11-18-2021

Minutes, College of Liberal Arts Faculty Meeting, Thursday, November 18, 2021

College of Liberal Arts Faculty, Rollins College

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



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

Rollins College

Rollins Scholarship Online

The College of Liberal Arts Faculty Minutes

College of Liberal Arts Minutes and Reports

11-18-2021

Minutes, College of Liberal Arts Faculty Meeting, Thursday, November 18th, 2021

College of Liberal Arts Faculty, Rollins College

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



Part of the Educational Administration and Supervision Commons

Minutes of the Regular Meeting of the Faculty of the College of Liberal
Arts November 18th, 2021
12:30pm Bush Auditorium

Presiding: Jana Mathews, President of the Faculty

Recording minutes: Richard Lewin, Vice President of the Faculty/Secretary

Parliamentarian: Julia Maskivker

Members in attendance: 111821

Alaya Seghair; Al-Haddad; Althuis; Anderson; Archard; Balzac; Barnes; Bernal; Bommelje; Boniface; Brannock; J. Cavanaugh; Chong; Cody-Rapport; Cornwell; D. Davison; Diaz-Zambrana; M. DiQuattro; Douguet; Dunn; Elva; Ewing; Fetscherin; Flick; Fokidis; Forsythe; French; C. Fuse; Garcia; Gerchman; Gilmore; Grau; Greenberg; Griffin; Guerrier; Hammonds; Hope; Houston; Hudson; Jamir; Kiefer; Kistler; Kodzi; Lewin; Lines; Luchner; Maskivker; Mathews; Mesbah; Miller; Montgomery; Moore; Mosby; Murdaugh; Myers; Newcomb; Nichter; Nodine; Ouellette; Parsloe; Pett; Philips; Pieczynski; Queen; Ray; Reich; Riley; Robertson; Robinson; Roos; Russell; Ryan; Sahn; Savala; Sinclair; Singer; Smaw; P. Stephenson; Summet; Svitavsky; Tanner; Vander Poppen; Vierrether; Wang; Warnecke; Wunderlich; Yao; Yeager; Yu; Zhang;

Guests: Karla Knight; Lorrie Kyle; Rob Sanders; Janette Smith; Student Government

CLA Byelaws: Those eligible to vote in CLA: all full-time faculty, including artists-in-residence, visiting appointments, lecturers, and instructors.

Quorum: We are at 202 voting faculty in 2021-2; thus **68** present meets quorum

Questions & Comments are not annotated by name, in line with abbreviated Roberts Rules

Meeting called to order at 12:32pm.

I. Approval of Minutes from October 21st, 2021 CLA Faculty Meeting:

- a. Jana Mathews, *President of CLA Faculty*, asked for any changes to the minutes as circulated. None being proffered. Proposed by Missy Barnes & seconded by Wenxian Zhang.
- b. Mathews asked for approval of the minutes from the October 21st CLA faculty meeting. Minutes were approved by those voting *via clickers*: 54 yes votes, 1 no vote & 6 abstentions, **but without achieving quorum**. Quorum of 68 required; only 61 voted. *Item eligible for resubmission for approval at the December 8th CLA Faculty Meeting.*

II. Announcements:

- I. Phishing & Cybersecurity: Today is the day of implementation; so thank you all for your cooperation in this.
- II. Fox Feast Today on Mills Lawn 3-6pm (*Skillman Hall is the wet weather venue*)
- III. Food Drive at the Faculty Meeting – arranged by Jeanette Smith and Karla Knight – so thank to you both – donations are also welcomed via Venmo and PayPal as shown.
- IV. Happy Thanksgiving Tribute – Hall of Fame - Student dedications to Faculty

III. Business:

a. Motion to allow Associate Professors to serve on Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC):

Don Davison, *former FAC Chair*:

- Concept from FAC 2018-9, one issue from working group on Tenure & Promotion
- In fall 2019-20 extensive discussion of Associates serving on FEC.
- *Process*: Current membership of FEC, plus 2 proceeding FECs all shared insights on the proposal
- Results were mixed, with the majority of FEC members opposed to adding Associate Professors, voting 5-2 against, with dissenters recognizing a few practical challenges to be worked out.
- FEC unanimously opposed Associates, validating Full Professors only to serve.
- FEC said if Associates were placed on, then a supermajority of members must still be Full professors.
- 2019-20 deliberations continued - majority of FAC still favoured Associates serving on the FEC, as the FAC unanimously believed in Associates being allowed on FEC, yet recognized then there must be a permanent majority who are Full Professors.
- Mixed views on Associates being placed on Full Professor Evaluations. On the one the hand it was suggested that only a Full Professor would truly understand the nuances; on other hand concerns were expressed of a two-tier hierarchy on the FEC, when continuity and consistency where paramount goals for all FEC members.
- Developed this bylaw when a clear division still existed, noting that the responsibility of this committee (FAC) remains clear; we are the agents of the Faculty; so we develop a bylaw for approval whilst presenting you with sufficient contextual information, hopefully thus promoting a tool for deliberative discussion.
- Any questions on substantive content are welcome by the committee, although preference for those on those committees to speak for themselves.

Missy Barnes, *FAC chair*:

- Current FAC relooked at this proposal – one thing we talked about was inclusion and a matter of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion - that is very important to this Committee.
- By eliminating service of Associates on FEC, we are out of alignment with **all** 26 benchmark institutions for Tenure & Promotion.

FAC (*and EC*) thus moved the motion to amend Article 8 of the byelaws, to allow up to two Associate Professors to serve on FEC. Jenny Queen seconded the motion.

Discussion:

- *FEC composition*: The number of committee members was greater due to large waves of new hires, which caused a very high workload in more recent years. The future FEC may not need these extra alternates.

- Allows the FEC slate, *as determined by the EC*, to **allow** Associates to be added to that pool - noting that EC still selects, endorses and checks all applicants.
- Shocked to discover that we are the only school in a benchmark group to not do this. D
- Difficulty to fill all FEC slots – we are straightjacketed due to a small pool of Full Professors willing to serve. Need to find a compromise, this is a baby step in the direction of a supermajority of Full Professors, but at least we are opening the door towards inclusion.
- No reason ‘*in principle*’ to prevent Associates from this important service; we should act on the basis of principles. Conflicts (*internal*) in every single committee, yet these are adjudicated within those committees – the FEC is no different in this regard.
- Serious DEI issues, noting that no African American has ever served on the FEC.
- FAC told us diversity issues matter, and that those affected are more likely to argue vigorously regarding them; hence we need to allow Associates to serve.
- Hannah Ewing, *on behalf of the FEC members*: The FEC states that it is preferable to have Full Professors, and preferred an Associate as an alternate, and only as the Alternate. This FEC suggestion solves the problem, whilst addressing the tension of lower rank evaluation of senior colleagues. FEC notes that Faculty did not support including Associates previously, during 2018-20
- Our resident faculty are diverse, if you are serious about our mission to reward the work of such colleagues, then we should put them on FEC.
- Concerns remain in evaluating Full Professors by a lower rank; however there is protection within the system; those that cannot accept this are required to make themselves available as Full Professors to serve; but also in the body a voting group; no one knows or understands an uneven vote. We already serve as peer reviewers, admittedly evaluation is not quite double blind, but it is insidious to thrive on a system of privilege, where you need 20 years of service, simply to review work in another rank. This is a longtime coming and is wholeheartedly supported.
- **Grant Cornwell, President**: I wholeheartedly support this based on fairness – enfranchisement versus disenfranchisement, of Associates. FEC’s work is stewarding the guidelines and criteria for the professoriate for the next generation. Why then disenfranchise them from that process; the very standard bearers of professional standards at Rollins. If tenured, then you have already been evaluated and found sound; so you appear to be fully qualified in terms of teaching, scholarship and service. I do not see a structural power shift between them in reproducing the professoriate.
- **Susan Singer, Provost**: From an equity prospective, we are working hard to increase diversity of the faculty and a system including Associates provides a perspective we need to hear, a sense of belonging within our community, added to include those wise voices and those Associate Professors fall within our traditional majority. Our professoriate is changing rapidly, early career faculty are not the same as those 20-30 years in. They are able to make judgements and to provide a broader context.
- Call the question:
- Motion proposed by Lee Lines; seconded John Sinclair.
- Voting via clickers: for 64, against 11, abstain 3 - 78 total voting, which meets quorum and over 2/3rds as required to approve a motion authorizing a byelaw revision.

b. Holt Leadership Minor:

- Rob Sanders, *Dean of Holt* – Tuition revenue is down, so we are responding to the needs of our community in Central Florida. They are interested in coming to Rollins at a different point in their life, but we need a distinct value proposition, relevant to where they are in that cycle.
- Hanover Research has provided undergraduate market analysis to identify proposals

- that bring value to and resonate with those adult learner populations.
- Holt can expand access to populations excluded, either by virtue of being older or a range of underrepresented groups.
- Identified a number of programs; so expect me multiple times this year to share my endorsement.
- Today's proposal is for a Leadership Minor in the Holt School. The Minor is already inserted or combined with other areas of our curriculum, as a part of our mission institutionally we want to address it that this way.

Emily Russell proposed; Stacy Dunn seconded the motion

Sponsoring Faculty Discussion:

- John Houston: Complex social phenomenon being addressed by Liberal Arts Holt students, who desire formal training to create an elective to book end with the formal structure and capstone courses, to create and build upon leadership courses, to provide a coherent curriculum, essentially a small investment for a larger advantage to our students.
- Rick Bommelje: Exciting opportunities lie ahead. So many upsides and essentially no downside. Building upon our existing courses on leadership, which are related across 12 courses already in the Catalogue, spanning 5 different departments (as electives), alongside 3 new core course development - Foundation, Leadership and Citizenship - with a final Capstone.

Q&A conducted by Rob Sanders, *Dean of Holt*:

Qu: Does the research indicate that this will attract new students into Holt?

- Great question - Holt is building out the portfolio, based on expressed interest in new program areas by new students.
- Might say, if I go to Rollins, I can minor in Leadership too.
- Thus a recruiting tool, as this develops an opportunity for the demand we already have, and the spin-off advantage of growing something different by type of program. So this is necessarily a bit of both; some other programs under consideration will be far more explicitly about enrollment generation.

Qu: Increasing instructional programs is adjusting costs by addition; are we also thinking about subtracting programs?

- This proposal is primarily about different bundling of curriculum at the forefront of developing an attractive knowledge base in this area, to make students more marketable in the workforce.
- Any kind of new program has a cost, but Holt is very much revenue positive and generation of any program has to be self-sufficient.
- It should be noted that we do not draw on resources of CLA; Holt generates net revenue for the larger college. When we identify a potential program, we develop a budget to identify revenue; 20 new students taking 3 courses a semester, from the data we already have and the associated costs.
- These are the reasons we can operate in Holt to keep instructional costs affordable and to make these areas accessible to a population of our community who would otherwise be excluded. This includes Adjunct faculty, overloads of CLA faculty, and also through the strategic use of lecturers and VAPs to reinforce, support and direct programs.
- The combination of the above allows new programs to generate additional revenue

from the outset. Not the same budget model as there is no single pot of money. Enrollment cap: enrollments are based on need, and demand to gain additional revenue.

Qu: Perhaps a misunderstanding from the Town hall meeting that presented the budget; CLA generated surplus revenue, Crummer is breaking even, but Holt losing revenue?

- Holt generates \$3-4m more net a year, than we expend to support our Holt Program. This surplus goes back directly to the larger institution to support all sorts of things.
- The issue is that the Budget expectation of X was included in our model; but we have been hitting only X minus a number, certainly not at the level we would want to contribute based on previous budgets. We are therefore identifying new areas to keep, build and strengthen our programs.
- We have to adjust our program for what a 29 year old wants now, and shape our portfolio around those needs. Keeping a Liberal Arts ethos, but via different delivery.
- We are not 'CLA at night', similar yes, but a different identity in creating new course opportunities.

- Grant Cornwell, *President*: Crummer, CLA & Holt have different revenue assumptions; CLA is exceeding, Holt is underperforming and on a downward trajectory and has missed its goals built into our budgets.
- Susan Singer, *Provost*: Gross versus Net revenue; Holt already pays for all its costs and still contributes net income out of Holt tuition revenue. The Net tuition comes back, but that has been falling from 5 – 6m towards 3 - 4m, net to the College. It is a separate cost centre; so we are not using CLA money directly to operate Holt – indeed the reality is quite the reverse!

Qu: This appears rather less ambitious, creating a minor versus a major in Holt - why?

- Agreed, this is not even one of the most ambitious proposals, but this was simple to put together. In terms of others a Masters program proposal, a Major, that we hope to bring forward to a future meeting, and a certificate program are all going through the review process, with 1 or 2 other program proposals also in the pipeline. Now at a process of working on, 4 to 5 or 5 to 6 new programs in total ; honestly I love this program; but really the others will address your point and have the most potential for driving higher enrollment. This was long overdue and our first proposal.

Qu, For the Holt model of new courses, are we sticking with adjuncts and contingent faculty only?

- Rob Sanders, *Dean of Holt* - A mix realistically; as it is not sustainable to hire full time CLA faculty to teach these, but by cross-listing with CLA it provides a combination of classes, and a mix that is nice to operate. Most courses are designated as Holt, but we do enroll CLA students - at no additional cost to CLA - via such cross listing.
- Admittedly CLA do the same for Holt, but a net positive contribution is made to

CLA.

- Moreover the folks hired in these programs are all selected by all of you in this room, who make those critical decisions, and look around and beyond Central Orlando to support the teaching of those specific classes.

Question called:

- Voting *taken by clicker*: Yes - 56; No - 15; 8 - Abstain – motion was approved

Motion to Adjourn: Moved by Mattea Garcia and seconded by Susan Montgomery.

CLA Faculty Meeting was adjourned at 1:23pm.

CLA Faculty Bylaws Change Motion to Allow Associate Professors to Serve on the Faculty Evaluation Committee

The following motion, produced by the Faculty Affairs Committee in 2020, was put on hiatus due to COVID. It has since received unanimous endorsement by the current Faculty Affairs Committee (November 9, 2021) and Executive Committee (November 11, 2021). The rationale for allowing associate professors to serve on the Faculty Affairs Committee is as follows:

- It will align Rollins with our peer and benchmark institutions. The 2018 Tenure and Promotion working group's final report revealed that "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" (see separate attachment).
- It will expand the pool of individuals who are eligible to serve, thus enabling the Executive Committee to nominate a slate of faculty members who are appropriately representative of the whole.

Red= proposed new language

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

a. Membership

This committee is constituted of six members and one alternate. ~~all of whom must hold the rank of full professor.~~ **The majority of faculty members will hold the rank of full professor, although 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 the 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.

Proposal to Create a Holt Leadership Minor

Rick Bommelje, John Houston, Susan Bach, Edye McNickle, and Rob Sanders

Rationale

The mission of Rollins College is to educate students to be responsible leaders. While this part of the mission manifests in myriad courses throughout the curriculum and through the co-curricular offerings of the College, there are no credit-bearing programs at the College explicitly focused on the theory, skills, and applications of leadership. Holt students, who often arrive with work experience, are seeking to not only earn a baccalaureate degree but also leverage this degree to assume leadership or supervisory roles within an organization. They have anecdotal experience with leadership but lack the systematic analysis of the scholarship and application of leadership to position them for taking on such a role themselves. We contend that to be educated for global citizenship and responsible leadership, students need to inquire/explore their own style and behavior and analyze how to apply their strengths and address their weaknesses.

The minor in Leadership is available to all Holt majors and is designed to introduce and guide students through the personal development of leadership skills, behaviors, and dispositions, and how these influence and are influenced by the group or organizational contexts in which they might find themselves as leaders. Starting with a focus on students' awareness of their own personal identity as a leaders and followers, students will explore the theoretical models of leadership, examine how different models of leadership manifest themselves in different types of groups and organizations, and engage in practices of leadership in the context of the students' major or anticipated profession. Elective courses provide an interdisciplinary examination of leadership in the context of facets of leadership, including: organizational development, the psychology of work, ethics, servant leadership, and conflict leadership.

As a minor, the program isn't likely to result in new students enrolled in the Holt School. Rather, it will serve to further expand the Holt portfolio of programs available to Holt students and at least two of the INT courses offered can be proposed as HLCK options for other Holt students to use to fulfil General Education requirements.

Learning Outcomes

Students enrolled in the minor in Leadership will be able to:

1. demonstrate personal introspection and awareness to design, evaluate and implement leadership strategies to facilitate problem solving, and critical analysis in the context of organizational needs and goals.
2. reason about right and wrong human conduct, assess their own ethical values and the social context of problems, recognize ethical issues in a variety of settings, think about how different ethical perspectives might be applied to ethical dilemmas, and consider the ramifications of alternative actions.

3. make a difference as leaders in professional, civic, and community life, and develop the combination of knowledge, skills, values and motivation to make that difference in their respective communities of practice.

Budget and Resources

The three INT courses will be taught as CLA faculty overloads or by adjunct faculty. While the relevant electives are open to Holt students, additional sections may be added to accommodate enrollment in the minor.

Adjunct Faculty (Increase Holt undergraduate Adjunct Faculty Salaries-Instruction (61041)) 2 courses	\$8000
Faculty Overloads (Increase Holt undergraduate O/L Fac. Sal-Instruction (61045)) 2 courses	\$8000
Director Stipend	\$1000
Total costs per year	\$17,000

Holt undergraduate tuition for 2021-2022: \$2048 per course

Enrollment of only ten (10) students would generate \$20,480 per required course or \$40,960 per year (assuming two required courses per year).

Curriculum Plan

- 6 courses/24 Credits
- Three Required Courses (all three currently in catalog)
 - INT 260 Foundations in Leadership
 - INT 261 Leadership and Citizenship in Action
 - INT 390 Capstone in Leadership
- Three Interdisciplinary Electives
 - Electives may include courses provided by Departments or Programs such as Psychology, Communication Studies, Health Services Leadership and Administration, Business Management, and International Affairs
 - Possible interdisciplinary electives may include (list would NOT be included in catalog):
 - PSY 316 Ethics
 - PSY 317 Group Dynamics
 - PSY 330 Organizational Behavior
 - PSY 337 Organizational Dysfunction
 - PSY 343 Psychology of Relationships
 - PSY 407 Organization Development
 - COM 210 Public Speaking
 - COM 212 Persuasion Theory

- COM 230 Listening
- COM 301 Designing Effective Organizations
- COM 316 Training and Development
- COM 319 Leadership and Effective Communication
- COM 321 Organizational Communication
- COM 324 Self-Leadership and Communication
- COM 327 Servant Leadership
- COM 345 Leadership, Film, and Communication
- HSL 315 Health Services Management, Organizational Behavior, and Leadership
- HSL 400 Health Strategic Management and Leadership
- EDU 496B Leadership Skills
- MGT 101 - Introduction to Responsible Business Management
- MGT 312 - Responsible Business Leadership
- MGT 316 - Critical Thinking & Problem Solving
- INAF 302 - Leadership and Public Policy in the Emerging Nations

Course Availability

Fall	Spring
INT 260 Foundations in Leadership	INT 260 Foundations in Leadership
INT 261 Leadership and Citizenship in Action	INT 261 Leadership and Citizenship in Action
Interdisciplinary Leadership Elective(s)	Interdisciplinary Leadership Elective(s)
INT 390 Capstone in Leadership (final term – on demand)	INT 390 Capstone in Leadership (final term – on demand)

Intended Sequence

Semester One: INT 260 Foundations in Leadership Interdisciplinary Leadership Elective	Semester Two: Interdisciplinary Leadership Elective(s)
Semester Three: INT 261 Leadership and Citizenship in Action Interdisciplinary Leadership Elective	Semester Four: Interdisciplinary Leadership Elective INT 390 Capstone in Leadership (final term)

Note: Students are permitted to use one course from their major course of study to fulfill the Interdisciplinary elective requirements. At least two elective courses must be taken outside the major.

Demonstration of Learning Outcomes Assessment Plan

LEAP Outcome	Learning Outcome	Ways of Demonstrating Learning	Outcome Benchmark
<p><i>Select an AAC&U LEAP Learning Outcome, if appropriate, using the pull-down menu.</i></p>	<p><i>Specific and measureable statement of what students will know and be able to do at degree completion.</i></p>	<p><i>In what courses, assignments, or projects will the department/program provide students with opportunities to demonstrate what they are learning? How will faculty members assess student learning? At least one direct and one indirect measure* must be included in the overall demonstration of learning plan.</i></p>	<p><i>How will the department know students have met expectations? Ex: 90% of students will demonstrate mastery of the ability to synthesize material from multiple viewpoints based on a departmental rubric.</i></p>
<p>Problem Solving</p>	<p>Students enrolled in the Leadership minor will demonstrate personal introspection and awareness to design, evaluate and implement leadership strategies to facilitate problem solving, and critical analysis in the context of organizational needs and goals.</p>	<p>Assessed in INT 261 Leadership and Citizenship in Action</p> <p>Direct: Course and homework assignments, case study analysis</p> <p>Indirect: student reflections</p>	<p>90% of students will demonstrate the ability to design, evaluate, and implement leadership strategies as assessed by a departmental rubric.</p> <p>Students will spend at least 25% of class time engaged in active learning assignments that require reflection and introspection.</p>

<p>Ethical Reasoning</p>	<p>Students enrolled in the Leadership minor will be able to reason about right and wrong human conduct, assess their own ethical values and the social context of problems, recognize ethical issues in a variety of settings, think about how different ethical perspectives might be applied to ethical dilemmas, and consider the ramifications of alternative actions.</p>	<p>Assessed in INT 260 Foundations in Leadership</p> <p>Direct: class discussion participation, case study analysis</p> <p>Indirect: reflective journals and outcomes of self-report efforts and improvements in relationships based on goals that were set.</p>	<p>90% of students will be able to recognize ethical issues in leadership and demonstrate the ability to resolve ethical dilemmas as assessed by a departmental rubric.</p> <p>Students will spend at least 25% of class time engaged in active learning assignments and activities that require reflection and self-reporting of different ethical perspectives and respective ramifications.</p>
<p>Civic Engagement</p>	<p>Students enrolled in the Leadership minor will be able to make a difference in professional, civic, and community life and develop the combination of knowledge, skills, values and motivation to make that difference in their respective communities of practice.</p>	<p>Assessed in INT 390 Capstone in Leadership</p> <p>Direct: Observation of students' participation in fieldwork</p> <p>Indirect: # of hours engaged in activities related to civic engagement</p>	<p>90% of students will demonstrate mastery of the ability to synthesize, analyze, and evaluate activities that address leadership issues as assessed by a departmental rubric.</p> <p>Students will spend at least 25% of class time engaged in applied learning and at least 20 hours per</p>

			term engaged in leadership activities in their organization.
--	--	--	--