

9-13-2012

Minutes, Arts and Sciences Executive Committee Meeting, Thursday, September 13, 2012

Arts and Sciences Executive Committee

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

Recommended Citation

Arts and Sciences Executive Committee, "Minutes, Arts and Sciences Executive Committee Meeting, Thursday, September 13, 2012" (2012). *Executive Committee Minutes*. Paper 23.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ec/23

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

Minutes
Executive Committee
September 13, 2012

In attendance: Carol Bresnahan, Bob Moore, Dan Crozier, Joan Davison, Jill Jones, Bob Smither, Dexter Boniface, and Ben Varnum.

- I. Call to Order.

- II. Approve the Minutes from the September 6, 2012 Executive Committee meeting. The minutes are approved.

- III. Old Business
 - a. The Strategic Planning Recommendations. Carol provides details about the forms that were circulated to EC. She notes that there is not yet an umbrella statement in the strategic planning recommendations which is linked to the mission of the college. In other words, the college's priorities are still being determined. How then can this be done? Carol is going to ask President Duncan to convene the Executive Council to discuss these proposals. She hopes that Council will give recommendations for how to get feedback from the faculty and staff at Rollins. Jill asks about the role of the Board of Trustees. Carol responds that strategic planning will be the theme of the Board meeting in October. She hopes that the Board will approve the general direction of the strategic plan even though many of the pieces are still in draft form. Jill says she has received many emails about these priorities from A&S faculty. She states that the 5+1 course-load and move to 128 hours for graduation are high priorities for A&S faculty. The General Education Program is also a high priority. Carol states that we do not have the funding to do all of the things contained in the proposal; some of the proposals are costly, others are not. She notes, for example, that the Academic Excellence proposals could save a lot of money, but that the cost savings may not be as high as projected in the document. Jill expresses her concern that, according to the documents, Areas of Distinction would be used as the basis for hiring and promotion at Rollins. Joan Davison shares this concern. She emphasizes that the language of hiring and promotion comes up in several places in the document on Areas of Distinction. She states that it is ludicrous to add these additional criteria in Rollins' hiring and promotion criteria, as well as merit pay. Jill agrees. She states that for her personally she is doing the job she was hired to do and would be very concerned if new performance criteria such as these were suddenly adopted. Bob Smither states that it would be hard to

identify people that have expertise in these areas directly out of graduate school; the pool of applicants would therefore be significantly restricted. Carol states that Rollins needs to distinguish itself among similar schools and that this document seeks to move Rollins in that direction. She states that the language is not fixed, but the general idea is to look for mechanisms to support this. Ben Varnum states that he never received the documents. Joan states that a broader concern of hers is that these committees were working committees; the expectation was that their recommendations would be brought back before the faculty. She is concerned that the faculty have not had sufficient opportunity to evaluate these recommendations. She is concerned therefore that the Board will be evaluating proposals that do not have faculty endorsement. As an example, she states that the notion of Digital Liberal Arts as an area of distinction was not broadly discussed by the faculty. She states that the faculty trusted that these committees would lead to genuine consultation with the faculty; however, it does not appear to have taken place. Carol states that they will seek affirmation from the Board to continue with the plan, but that consultations will be ongoing. Carol states that there is a three-year window for the implementation of this plan. Furthermore, this is a set of institutional priorities, not a true Strategic Plan. Joan states that she has no problem with two of the three areas of distinction, but she does not see Digital Liberal Arts as being as distinctive as, say, our General Education Program. Carol states that she thinks Joan's idea that our Gen. Ed. Program is an area of distinction has merit. She notes that the recommendations in these documents were formulated before the new General Education system had been approved. Bob Moore asks why this area is viewed as a priority. Jill asks if the faculty will have an opportunity to tweak the priorities. Carol states that, yes, she hopes the Executive Council will create a mechanism to provide faculty feedback. Joan quotes the document's statement that certain priorities and practices are not "hard-wired" into the curriculum. She wonders what the meaning of this term is, and how we know when something is hard-wired and when it is not. Furthermore, she notes that the high-impact practices item has a very large budgetary outlay, more than \$470,000. Dexter expresses his concern that the largest sums of money seem to be allocated to issues that were not strong faculty concerns. Carol states that some things that she did not see as important ultimately pay for other things of importance; lacrosse is an example. [Carol and Bob Smither excuse themselves to attend another meeting] Joan expresses her concern that anything passed by the Board has a certain authority. She notes that the recommendations of the committee on creating a sustainable development model do not seem well thought-out. For example, the proposal to move to Division I athletics does not consider the very considerable costs associated with such a move. Bob Moore states that from his perspective the important thing is that the Board of Trustees should understand that the document represents a draft, not a final plan of action.

IV. New Business

1. Slates and Agenda for Sept 20th meeting. Jill reviews the tentative agenda for the first faculty meeting. The agenda includes:
 - a. Committee Reports.
 - b. Appeals Committees. Jill will announce committee appointments for the appeals committees.
 - c. Division Chairs. Jill states that not all of the Division Chairs are determined, though some are: Science is Pedro Bernal, Humanities is Eric Smaw (unconfirmed), Expressive Arts is undetermined (Rachel Simmons or Dana Hargrove?), and Social Sciences is Claire Strom. It is important that these chairs be established so that the merit pay committee can be formed.
 - d. Middle East and North African studies proposal.
 - e. General Education Neighborhood proposals. Jill asks if this should be discussed as part of AAC or separately?
 - f. Strategic Planning. Joan suggests that we inform the faculty of the strategic planning initiative which will be considered by the Board in October.
 - g. Motion for Faculty to have Board Representation in the form of one, non-voting representative. Jill would like to present such a motion, but asks if someone else should make the motion on her behalf to follow parliamentary procedure. Dan asks what happened to the last proposal put forward, was it turned down? Joan responds that it was indeed turned down by the Board, but it was a different proposal. Jill adds that the context has also changed since that proposal was put forward.
2. Proliferating committees (this issue was not discussed).

V. Committee Reports

AAC. Claire reports (via email) that Bill Boles has been appointed as a rep to the CPS curriculum committee. CPS has not appointed a rep to AAC, but Dean Wellman will be attending future AAC meetings to act as an informal liaison.

F&S. Bob Moore reports that he contacted Dean Smither seeking data on travel expenditures for recent years to support the committee's request for higher levels of allowance for faculty travel. Bob also contacted the Provost about data that might reveal gender inequity and she responded by saying her office was looking into this and would share what they found. Bob also asked her about the various arrangements, directorships, etc., that might also play a role in how faculty are differentially rewarded and she responded that this was a much more complicated question. Bob then sent another note suggesting that perhaps we could make an effort to see what data was available on that issue, understanding that it might be difficult to track accurately in detail. At the Planning & Budget meeting, Bob

reports, Jonathan Miller explained a new budgeting system pertinent to serials and Dave Richards discussed future plans for the Holt School. Most significantly he suggested that Holt, which has been paying in about 6.3 million/year to the general College fund, be allowed to cap that amount and adjust it only with reference to the CPI. Then, he proposed new programs in Holt, a Health-related program and an INB program, which he estimated would bring in large numbers of new students that would benefit Holt and the general fund (at an 80/20 ratio) and would allow Holt to play a role as a center of innovation for the campus.

Student Government Association (SGA). Ben Varnum reports that SGA held the first formal Senate meeting yesterday and has completed elections for Senators. The primary focus at the first meeting was to fill committee seats, so students will be able to fill the open spots on governance committees starting next week. SGA is working to finalize its roadmap for the 2012-2013 academic year as well as understand how the A&S and CPS changes will impact student representation.

VI. Adjournment. The meeting is adjourned at 1:50pm.