

10-20-2011

Minutes, Arts and Sciences Executive Committee Meeting, Thursday, October 20, 2011

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, October 20, 2011" (2011). *Executive Committee Minutes*. Paper 34.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ec/34

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.

**Approved Minutes
Executive Committee Meeting
October 20, 2011**

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

I Call to Order. The meeting was called to order at 12:38pm.

II Approve the Minutes from the Oct. 6 Executive Committee meeting. The minutes are approved.

III Committee Reports

Academic Affairs (AAC). Gloria Cook defers the AAC report.

Professional Standards (PSC). Joan Davison defers the PSC report.

Finance & Services (F&S). Joe Siry reports that Steve Neilson's committee is a sub-committee of F&S. Dean Joyner will be at the next meeting to present data on student success and retention. She has presented some of this data already but the committee has sought more specific information. The committee wants to know how much money Rollins loses because of the students that leave. Joe adds that a master sustainability plan is going to be presented to the Board of Trustees meeting in February. It is not clear who is spearheading this plan. Joan Davison asks why no one on the F&S committee is serving on relevant sub-committees. She notes that serving on such committees is part of service. Joan also asks whether or not it is true that the solar panels are working in Rex Beach. Joe responds that he will look into it. He notes that Rex Beach has a solar-thermal device. He has not been informed that it is not working.

Student Life (SLC). Jenny Queen reports that the committee wishes to bring two motions to the faculty on the attendance policy and the posthumous policy. Joan notes that some faculty will oppose the attendance policy because it does not make a distinction between on-campus activities that are externally set (sports events, academic conferences at Rollins) and those that could be easily be rescheduled and could be held at other times of the day (e.g., Greek events). Jenny replies that this should not be a problem because the policy pertains to "official" college business. Joe asks if it this would include student hearings such as those of the Honors Council. Joan states that the Honors Council usually meets during the common hour to avoid such scheduling conflicts. Jill Jones believes faculty may oppose the policy because it seems to remove professor's discretion. Jenny replies that she does not believe this is the case. She states that the idea of the policy is have a conversation between adults. There is no automatic excuse just because a student has a note. But

the policy does empower students to make an appeal (to AAC, for instance) in cases where college business or religious observances result in the student being failed in the course. However, the faculty still have the ultimate authority to decide if the absences interfere with gaining the competencies of the class. Joan states that many faculty do not distinguish between religious observances and other absences. Jenny believes that this policy is necessary to give affected students a mechanism to appeal a faculty member's decision. Jenny states that college policy does not permit faculty and staff to take off work for religious observances. Joan adds that college policy only permits three days off from work in the case of a spousal death. Jill believes most faculty believe in religious tolerance. Jenny states that students do not see things the same way as the faculty.

Student Government (SGA). Allie Mozzicato reports that students are trying to figure out how to distribute Fox funds. They have a preference to give money for events that are open to the whole college rather than select groups. She reports that students are concerned that health plan costs are high for students. Ken Miller addressed SGA about campus security. One of the main questions discussed was whether there should be cameras at strategic locations on campus. SGA intends to pass a resolution supporting the cameras. The student body does not seem to be overly concerned about privacy concerns. She reports that some students have proposed having a midterms week like finals week. However, it is not clear if there is broad support for this proposal. Finally, students have asked if there could be a red box facility to show movies on campus. Jenny Queen recommends that the committee should start with Brent Turner as Director of the Campus Center. Bob Smither asks what the next step is regarding the campus pub. Allie Mozzicato responds that she does not know where things stand but they are looking forward to it moving forward. Jill asks about the renovation of the campus center. Jenny responds that Alice Davidson is on the committee so there is faculty input in the discussion. She adds that they have discussed the idea of a movie theater. However, there is no budget that has been approved. There is also discussion of making the first floor of the library open 24 hours.

IV Old Business

- a. Dean of A&S Search. Jill Jones asks if Bob Smither has any information about the Dean of A&S Search. Bob replies that he has not heard anything. He states that Provost Bresnahan has been focusing on the bylaws and has not made any announcements about this issue and that it is difficult to organize a search before the bylaws are approved. Joan states that schools are doing interviews now and the pool is becoming weaker as time passes. Joan recommends that we pressure Carol to begin the search immediately. Jill states that she will do so.
- b. Merit Pay (F&S). Joe Siry states that one question remains as to what we should do with the "escrow" money. There is a consensus to disperse it quickly. A second issue is *how* to disperse it. Bob Smither states that it would time-consuming to review 150 faculty for such a

small amount of money. Joan moves that we divide the money equally among the A&S faculty. The motion is seconded. Jenny asks if this is consistent with the policy that was approved by the faculty. Joan states that the policy should be in the faculty handbook. Bob notes that President Duncan already implemented what Joan is proposing. Joan recalls that merit was supposed to occur only *after* cost-of-living raises and only when there was sufficient money to make the award meaningful. The EC endorses a motion to direct Dean Smither to bring this proposal (that we divide the money equally among A&S faculty) to the Provost.

- c. A&S Bylaws committee. *This agenda item is on hold pending the outcome of the next all-college faculty meeting to approve amendments to the all-college bylaws.*

New Business:

- a. Proposed amendment to the Bylaws (from PSC). Joan Davison reports that Carol Bresnahan was informed by the college attorney that tenure clocks can be legally extended. However, the current A&S bylaws do not permit this. Consequently a new passage will need to be added to the bylaws to allow this to happen. Joan notes that there was a policy approved for “maternity” leave (the policy also includes paternity leave) and adoptive parent leave that provides such an exception; however, this policy (while on the HR website) is not reflected in the bylaws. So eventually this should be changed as well. The EC endorses this proposed change to the bylaws.
- b. The Policy on Research and Scholarly Misconduct (PSC). PSC drafted a new policy on scholarly conduct. Joan states that PSC has given serious consideration to this policy and made several meaningful changes to the policy that empower faculty. Joan reviews the policy. Jill asks if this is an urgent issue for consideration. Joan and Bob reply that Carol believes this is an urgent priority to be in legal compliance. Joan argues that this revised policy is better than the existing one. The EC endorses the proposed policy.
- c. RCC and the grading of peer mentors (AAC). Gloria Cook seeks input on this issue. She does not know whether or not AAC can take any action beyond make a recommendation because changing the grading procedures would require changes beyond the committee’s purview (e.g., administrative structure). Bob Smither reviews the policy. Under current policy, the faculty director has ultimate discretion over the student’s grade. Allie Mozzicato states that she is an experienced peer mentor and that she was under the impression that the grade was an average (of the professor’s grade and that assigned by Explorations), not simply the director’s decision. Allie states that she does more work for Explorations than she does for her faculty member but peer mentor experiences vary. She states that work for Explorations is often “busy work” that may or may not be related to the student’s

academic program though, again, experiences vary. Joan states that it is school policy that faculty limit non-faculty to teaching one credit courses. Jenny asks if this course could be graded credit/no-credit. Allie responds that students do a lot of work as Peer Mentors and they want to receive graded credit and Peer Mentoring would be less attractive if it was not graded credit. Gloria states that many faculty feel as if they cannot give students additional work because Explorations requires so much. Joan asks if it would make more sense to split the Peer Mentor grade into two grades, a 4-hour faculty-assigned grade and a one-hour grade assigned by Explorations. Jenny states that this will be perceived as diminishing student success initiatives and devaluing their work if we reduce the role of Explorations in the grading process. Jenny notes that the goals of RCC are not the same as ordinary classes. She asks Allie what is more important for students and what they get the most out of, the academic work or the non-academic component. Allie responds that both are very important. It is a mixture of both. It may be the non-academic component that is ultimately the more important. Joan notes that the policy must be in compliance with our rules.

The following issues were moved off the agenda and will be taken up by other offices:

1. SACS (Department Chairs)
2. The following items will be reviewed by the Dean's Office
 - Curriculum Review Committee
 - Strategic Planning
 - Liberal Arts in the 21st century