

4-19-2012

Minutes, Arts and Sciences Executive Committee Meeting, Thursday, April 19, 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, April 19, 2012" (2012). *Executive Committee Minutes*. Paper 25.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ec/25

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
April 19, 2012

In attendance: Alexandria Mozzicato, Joan Davison, Gloria Cook, Joe Siry, Jenny Queen, Jill Jones, Bob Smither, and Dexter Boniface.

1. Approval of Minutes. The minutes from March 15 and April 5 are approved.

2. Committee Reports

SLC. Jenny Queen reports that SLC has not met since the last EC meeting so has nothing new to report. Knowing that there is a lot on the plate of the faculty at the last faculty meeting and that the policy is not a high priority for the faculty, SLC would like to have the EC discuss whether not a pilot program on the student travel funds might be possible in the fall. The current draft of the policy is attached and SLC looks forward to discussing it. Jenny notes that Dan Chong and the HIP committee have endorsed this policy. Carol Bresnahan states that she sees the need for this policy and endorses the pilot proposal. Dexter Boniface asks about the rationale for requiring the students to write blog entries. Jenny Queen states that Jennifer Cavanagh hoped that there would be some follow-up with the students after the travel; historically, the money has simply been handed out without any post-travel requirements. Jenny notes that a blog creates a follow-up mechanism after the students travel. Carol Bresnahan states that such follow-up mechanisms could be useful in terms of assessment, especially if students travel abroad. Bob Smither states that the Dean's Office enthusiastically endorses the proposal. He notes that the total pool of funds is fairly limited, around \$5800. Joan Davison asks how we can assess students' financial need when distributing this money. She suggests that we consider gathering relevant student data to inform decisions. Jenny Queen notes that the draft policy includes language about financial need. She states that perhaps SLC could gather data on financial aid from the Rollins' financial aid office. Joe Siry motions that we approve the pilot. The motion is seconded. The pilot program is unanimously approved.

AAC. Gloria Cook reports that AAC met with members of the Curriculum Review Committee II (CRCII), a subcommittee of the AAC, and discussed the following items in their document: 1) that the teaching load of faculty at Rollins be reduced to a 3-2 plan; 2) that the number of hours for graduation be reduced to 128; and 3) support for Rachel Simmons to gather more data for her report. Joan Davison asks if this committee is still active. She states that many of these recommendations appear to have been adopted by the Dean of A&S and the committee on Academic Excellence. Bob Smither suggests that perhaps we should wait until the planning process reaches a conclusion (and, perhaps, the Board of Trustees makes a decision) and then, if need be, reconstitute this committee. Jill notes that between Rachel's committee and the Dean's committee, there appears to be a strong consensus behind this initiative. Joe Siry asks what the process is whereby strategic planning initiatives go before the Board of Trustees. Carol Bresnahan states that this will be part of a broader process of the Board approving a basic Strategic Plan (presumably in the fall). Gloria asks how long this process of planning will go on. Carol replies that planning is an on-going process. She suggests that perhaps the Budget committee could provide oversight once the committee's job is done. Jill notes that the committees have made uneven progress, some of them have developed full-blown proposals (e.g., Academic Excellence) and others have not communicated progress. Jenny asks whether we need to go to the Board before moving ahead with certain initiatives. For example, would we need Board approval to change the course load at Rollins? Carol states that such a change does have fiduciary ramifications and, therefore, would in all likelihood need to go before the Board. Joan recalls that the move from the previous system to the current one did go before the Board. She states, furthermore, that certainly a change from 140 hours to 128 hours would need to go before the Board. Gloria states that although the proposals for a 3-2 course load and 5+1 course load are different, there is a rough consensus that the 5+1 would be a logical first change since it is closer our current system. Joan states that one reason that so many faculty are on release currently (roughly 2/3) is that the financial incentives are so limited and so faculty naturally prefer the time to the money.

General Education Implementation Committee. Gloria notes that the charge for the Implementation Committee should include the

following: 1) Work with the Provost to solicit nominations, conduct interviews and appoint a director of general education curriculum. Carol Bresnahan states that she would be happy to make the appointment but would want to have the input of a broad constituency of faculty and students etc. to make such a decision. 2) Solicit faculty input and decide on a new title for the general education curriculum. 3) Solicit faculty input and decide on new themes; create a new AAC subcommittee to do this. 4) Work on course scheduling, 3/2, study abroad and dual enrollment programs – subcommittee. Carol Bresnahan states that she has discussed the dual enrollment proposal that has come from Reutlingen University in Germany. Reutlingen University already has a relationship with Elon University. Gloria questions what the appropriate process would be for approving such a program and whether it would go through the ACC. Carol states that the proposal is still being reviewed and no agreement has been signed yet. 5) Work on assessment – subcommittee.

Gloria states that the general education implementation committee should have a representative from the following:

- AAC
- PR Steering Committee
- RCC (Gabriel Barreneche)
- RP Coordinators (Judy S. and Thom Moore)
- Mark Anderson
- Each Division and CPS (e.g., Tonia Wernicke)
- James Zimmerman?
- Robin Mateo
- Library
- Two students

Jenny Queen notes that someone on the Honors Program should be on this committee as well. Joan concurs. Gloria states that this committee needs to be formed right away. She states that we are already one semester late. She states that, most critically, there needs to be a director appointed who can then spearhead this initiative. She states that the ideal director should be able to work with multiple constituencies and not be pushing a personal agenda. She states that we need to think long and hard about who is on this committee.

Gloria brings up the issue of Maymester. She notes that there was a problem with the registration system and this has been corrected. Carol Bresnahan states that Maymester enrollments are down this year and there has been a loss of revenue; something on the order of \$400,000 difference. This money is now part of the budget, so this is significant. She states that one reason for the lower enrollment is that

this is the first time that the one-class only rule was enforced. Jill states that this issue needs to be addressed again next year. Joan notes that Maymester will end in another year anyway, unless it is altered or built into the new general education requirements, because only gen ed courses are permitted to be offered during Maymester. Carol asks why the A&S faculty voted to make this one-course only requirement. Joan explains that the decision was made because faculty did not believe students could take two rigorous courses in such a short amount of time (now four weeks instead of three last year); there simply is not enough time to run a 15-week course to accomplish this. Carol asks about the numbers. Is it really impossible to teach this amount of content—two courses—in the course of four weeks? Carol asks if there is any reason why we would not consider a “Junemester.” Joan states that there is no reason why we could not consider a June-term or full-fledged A&S summer school.

F&S. Joe reports that there were several motions made by the F&S committee. Motion 1: Ask EC to change the order of business at the faculty meeting so that the merit pay proposal is put ahead of bylaw changes on the agenda. This motion passed F&S unanimously. Motion 2: Joe Siry goes to the Executive Council for the ‘go ahead’ to talk to Brent Turner to work to find ways to educate and empower students who sit on faculty governance committees. This motion passed F&S unanimously. The committee also briefly discussed the draft of the new FSAR that Dean Bob Smither sent; it is still too cumbersome. Joe states that after the EC discussed the merit pay proposal, he went back to the F&S committee with our feedback. He reports that the F&S committee felt that the document should go directly to the faculty for consideration (and be amended by the faculty if need be) — rather than go through another round of revisions based on EC’s feedback. Joan asks if the FSAR issue needs to be worked out prior to vote on the merit pay proposal. She asks how urgent this is, noting that recent salary increases have happened in January rather than in September like in the past. Dexter Boniface states that he believes, with all due respect to the work done by F&S, that a discussion of the revision of the A&S bylaws is a more urgent issue than the merit pay proposal. Joe furthermore reports that the committee believes that there should be a policy for staff development and travel. Jenny Queen states that there is a budget for staff, although the process is a little different. Joan states that the athletic

department has such a budget, as does Information Technology. Carol states that it should be up to the department supervisor to allocate such budgets. For example, some staff need certain certifications and so need to travel for this purpose. Joe adds, finally, that the budgets are set for next year, contingent on enrollment. He states that he hopes that F&S can make budget recommendations sooner rather than later in the coming years in order to incorporate new recommendations.

PSC. Joan reports that PSC has not met since our last EC meeting so will not have a report except to state that “at the upcoming last PSC meeting, the committee will review the new merit pay and FSAR forms which F&S already considered.”

SGA. Allie reports that SGA is having elections.

3. Business

- a. FEC slate. Jill presents the FEC slate:
 - Socky O'Sullivan will continue on and chair the committee.
 - John Sinclair will continue on the committee.
 - Bob Sherry (after his sabbatical) will continue on the committee
 - Steve Klemann has agreed to serve as the one year alternate.
 - Sharon Carnahan has agreed to serve as the Social Science representative.
 - Lee Lines has agreed to serve as the Mathematics and Science representative.
 - Eileen Gregory has agreed to serve an extra semester to cover for Bob Sherry's one-semester sabbatical.
- b. INB accreditation. Carol Bresnahan clarifies that INB was not up for accreditation. It has not failed to meet accreditation.
- c. *General Education Implementation Committee. Discussed above (see AAC committee report).*
- d. *Strategic Planning. Discussed above (see AAC committee report).*
- e. *Maymester. Discussed above (see AAC committee report).*

4. Adjourn

Owing to time constraints, the following issues were not discussed:

- f. CPS/tenure clock etc.
- g. Parking.
- h. Next A&S Faculty Meeting