

10-6-2011

## Minutes, Arts and Sciences Executive Committee Meeting, Thursday, October 6, 2011

Arts and Sciences Executive Committee

Follow this and additional works at: [http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as\\_ec](http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ec)

---

### Recommended Citation

Arts and Sciences Executive Committee, "Minutes, Arts and Sciences Executive Committee Meeting, Thursday, October 6, 2011" (2011). *Executive Committee Minutes*. Paper 35.  
[http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as\\_ec/35](http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ec/35)

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](mailto:wzhang@rollins.edu).

**Approved Revised Minutes  
Executive Committee Meeting  
October 6, 2011**

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

I Call to Order. Called to order at 12:42pm.

II Approve the Minutes from the Sept. 15 EC meeting. The minutes are approved.

III Committee Reports

1. AAC (Gloria Cook). The AAC committee is looking at whether or not the Banner system can accommodate a request from Anthropology to give priority for majors. It is believed that Banner should be able to do this. But this might require a programmer and hence additional resources. Gloria asks if this issue should go to the Dean of the College. Bob Smither replies that registration is not a Dean of the College issue and asks whether we know what Banner can and cannot do. Joan Davison notes that you can limit who gets in by having students add courses by consent. Carol Bresnahan notes that Information Technology needs to be involved in this discussion. Gloria next notes that the Rollins Plan (RP) pilot program is also on the AAC agenda. She notes that the RP Steering Committee believes that administering the California Critical Thinking skills test may no longer be possible because of the low number of students in the program and financial constraints. Gloria proposes that the decision of what to do about the RP program should be postponed until the spring before it is brought to a faculty vote. She notes that we need to understand why the pilot program failed to retain students. Joe Siry remarks that he would like to see the skills test done; the more information, the better. Jenny notes that even with a small-N you could still get meaningful results if you can use matched controls. Jill states that we need broader measures to assess the RP program. Gloria asks whether or not James Zimmerman might help with assessment efforts. Carol notes that Sharon Carnahan has been spearheading assessment efforts and that James Zimmerman has been assisting this effort. Jill states that students like having options and that this is one of the reasons the RP program did not take off. Joan notes that this problem reflects the pilot nature of the RP program. Jill notes that choices would still be restricted to the theme of the RP. Joe asks what happens when students switch themes. Jenny advocates that we move ahead with assessment. Bob states that the RP committee is going to issue its recommendations soon and that perhaps we could delay a decision until after the committee's report comes out. He notes that the cost in time and resources for completing the assessment is significant. Joan notes that this process has moved very slowly, and consumed a lot of time, and we should

- see the pilot through to the end. She notes that the RP pilot had a sound pedagogical rationale. Bob adds that the RP pilot is a tremendous burden on the faculty load because many of the classes are so small, so something needs to be done sooner rather than later. The committee recommends the PR steering committee proceed with the assessment survey and that they delay a final decision on the program until the spring.
2. PSC (Joan Davison). PSC made recommendations to Chris Fuse about the student-faculty collaborative research program. The committee believes it is an academic issue, not strictly an issue of student success and retention. They made several recommendations to Chris regarding limits on travel funds, limits on the number of years a student could receive a grant, and elimination of the Type 1 and 2 distinctions. Student members of PSC felt particularly strongly about spreading the opportunity for grants. However, Joan is not confident that Chris Fuse will necessarily implement the recommendations because some trade-offs do exist and the program no longer falls under academics but rather student success and retention.
  3. SLC (Jenny Queen). Jenny discusses the high-impact processes committee co-chaired by Micki Meyer and Dan Chong. The goal of this advisory board is to identify areas of overlap between the various student affairs offices and increase communication. SLC requested a representative on this advisory board; this idea was welcomed by those on the committee. This year's rep is Dan Chong. Joan asks how many students are on the advisory committee. Jenny responds that she does not believe there are any students on the committee. However, she believes that they (i.e. student affairs staff in general) include students a lot in their discussions. Moving on to the next point, Jenny notes that the SLC hopes to discuss and pass the attendance policy at the next faculty meeting (the motion was tabled at the last faculty meeting). The committee's goal is to better explain the policy to the faculty. Jenny states that the reason we need this policy is because some faculty have overly rigid attendance policies. Jill defends the notion of a rigid attendance policy, including failing students who miss a significant number of classes. Joan states that she likes the fact that the policy requires students to notify faculty of religious observances before the fact. The last piece of business for the A&S Faculty meeting is the posthumous degree policy.
  4. F&S (Joe Siry). The committee is evaluating what to do about the available merit funds (commonly referred to as the "escrow" money). The committee believes it should be spent rapidly. However, a few issues have hampered the committee's decision-making. The committee lacks data on how many faculty received merit and what aspects of FSAR are used for determining merit, and which are not; for example, how much merit is accorded for leading a faculty trip. Furthermore, the committee is wondering how administrators compare small and large departments when some professors have large classes and others have small class sizes. Bob asks what the goal of merit pay and is it succeeding? Joan states that we have only had merit pay twice. In the first round, many of those who did not receive merit were older faculty who had come to Rollins in a different era. Laurie Joyner met with such faculty and

- explained the rationale for the merit system and encouraged them to continue to develop and play to their strengths. Jill states that this is a lot of work for a few hundred dollars. Joe states that merit should ultimately be geared to teaching success, but that we also need outstanding scholars as well.
5. SGA (Alexandria Mozzicato). SGA approved legislation to approve a football team for Rollins. The main issue SGA discussed at the last Senate meeting is the censure motion against President Duncan. She states that students are concerned about student representation in the College of Professional Studies (CPS). Jenny states that according to Scott Hewitt, there is currently no student representation in CPS, but they hope to change that in the near future when CPS revises its bylaws. Alexandria notes that there is a question as to whether or not there is a need for a CPS student government, or whether or not there should be one student government for all undergraduates. Jill asks if any further response is needed from the President to the A&S faculty about the resolution of censure. Joan states that she thinks we do not need to ask this of the President; it is his decision. The committee concurs with Joan.
  6. The committee concurs with Joan. Campus security is another issue of concern for SGA. They plan to meet with Ken Miller. They do not know who to report their concerns to, and whether they should address their concerns to the Dean of the College. Carol states that security does not report to the Dean of the College.

## V New Business

1. The Invitation from the Board of Trustees (reception invite list). A few issues have been raised regarding the representation of senior and un-tenured faculty in the Board of Trustees' reception invite list. The committee recognizes these concerns as legitimate but decides to endorse the proposed list on pragmatic grounds.
2. Tenure clock considerations for science faculty affected by the Bush Science Building Renovation. Joan notes that this issue came before PSC from Pedro Bernal in Chemistry. The Chemistry department had difficulty in trying to hire new faculty in part because of this issue. If new faculty members are not going to have science labs, this is going to delay their research. PSC passed a resolution to try to accommodate this fact, giving new faculty the right to make a determination if they need another year on their tenure clock; the decision would be made at the time of the mid-course evaluation. However, the problem is that tenure and promotion policies are part of the bylaws and so a resolution is not a sufficient solution. PSC likes their resolution, but is unclear if this change can be implemented without changing the bylaws. Jill asks if there is an AAUP issue here in that the tenure clock is typically no more than seven years. Carol states that she disagrees with AAUP's strict seven year policy; she notes that there is nothing

- magical about seven years. Jenny concurs, citing maternity leave as an example. Carol states that there should be a way to handle this; we need to be flexible for faculty who are severely affected by the lack of laboratory space. Joan states that the policy needs to be non-discriminatory and limited strictly to severely affected faculty.
3. Mapworks. Some issues relating to the Rollins College Conference (RCC) have come before PSC regarding "Mapworks." Joan notes that there is a concern about who is qualified to implement the Mapworks program and, in particular, to perform student counseling. Jenny notes that those in charge of the Mapworks program claim to be following FERPA laws. Joan states *PSC heard* that Peer Mentors have been given a mandate to do these Mapworks (not a voluntary program); however, these students do not necessarily have any training or experience to do this. Carol states that her concern with the program is FERPA; the program appears to be in compliance. Joan states that faculty members express concern that having the Peer Mentors report to a non-academic office (the student success office headed by Megan Harte) creates a potential conflict with the academic goals of the RCC program. She states that the Peer Mentors and faculty are upset that Peer Mentors are being graded on Map Works. Carol states that the impetus behind Mapworks is retention."
  4. FEC Letters. Bob notes that letters to Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) from the Dean will now be no more than two pages long.

*THE FOLLOWING AGENDA ITEMS WERE NOT DISCUSSED*

*IV Old Business*

- a. A & S Bylaws committee (still on hold)*
- b. Curriculum Review Committee*
- c. Strategic Planning*
- d. SACS*
- e. Liberal Arts in the 21<sup>st</sup> century*
- f. Dean Search*

*V New Business*

- A. Grant Awards including the Student-Faculty Collaborative Grant*
- B. Merit Pay?*