

9-24-2009

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Faculty Meeting, Thursday, Sept. 24, 2009

Arts & Sciences Faculty
Rollins College

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



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

Recommended Citation

Arts & Sciences Faculty, "Minutes, Arts & Sciences Faculty Meeting, Thursday, Sept. 24, 2009" (2009). *College of Arts and Sciences Faculty Minutes*. Paper 24.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_fac/24

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

Approved Minutes
Arts and Sciences Faculty Meeting
Thursday, September 24, 2009
12:30 – 1:45pm
Galloway Room

Members present: Vidhu Aggarwal, Joshua Almond, Anna Alon, Mark Anderson, Pedro Bernal, Erich Blossey, Bill Boles, Rick Bommelje, Wendy Brandon, Sharon Carnahan, Roger Casey, Jennifer Cavanaugh, Julian Chambliss, Daniel Chong, Gloria Cook, Tom Cook, Daniel Crozier, Denise Cummings, Alice Davidson, Don Davison, Joan Davison, Kimberly Dennis, Lewis Duncan, Hoyt Edge, Larry Eng-Wilmot, Richard Foglesong, Christopher Fuse, Greg Gardner, Laurel Goj, Kevin Gray, Yudit Greenberg, Mike Gunter, Fiona Harper, Scott Hewit, Alicia Homrich, John Houston, Gordie Howell, Peg Jarnigan, Laurie Joyner, Ashley Kistler, Madeline Kovarik, Philip Kozel, Harry Kypraios, Tom Lairson, Carol Lauer, Barry Levis, Richard Lewin, Susan Libby, Julia Maskivker, Jonathan Miller, Bob Moore, Thom Moore, Ryan Musgrave-Bonomo, Steve Neilson, Rachel Newcomb, Marvin Newman, David Noe, Alan Nordstrom, Kathryn Norsworthy, Socky O’Sullivan, Derrick Paladino, Twila Papay, Kenneth Pestka, Roger Ray, Paul Reich, Charlie Rock, Dawn Roe, Don Rogers, Sigmund Rothschild, Scott Rubarth, Emily Russell, Susan Salinger, Bob Sherry, Patricia Silver, Rachel Simmons, John Sinclair, Chris Skelley, Jim Small, Eric Smaw, Bob Smither, Cynthia Snyder, Steven St. John, Bruce Stephenson, Paul Stephenson, Claire Strom, Kathryn Sutherland, Bill Svitavsky, Ken Taylor, Lisa Tillmann, Patricia Tome, Giorgio Turri, Gio Valiante, Rick Vitray, Anca Voicu, Tonia Warnecke, Debra Wellman, Jay Yellen, Wenxian Zhang

Guests: Dr. Pat Schoknecht, Sharon Agee, Christina Lee

- I. Call to Order - The meeting was called to order at 12:40 PM
- II. Approval of Minutes - The minutes of the April 29, 2009 meeting of the faculty were approved as corrected.
- III. Reports
 - A. Committee Reports
 1. Executive Committee – Foglesong begins with an explanation of the role of EC. Foglesong reports EC created the Merit Pay Appeals Committee (MPAC) to hear cases and the committee completed its work. Foglesong also discusses the revival of the Faculty Salary Council (FSC) and the need for FSC to review the initial distribution of merit and associated process and criteria. The members of FSC are division heads plus an EC appointment. Foglesong also reports on administrator evaluation. He explains the EC will proceed with the evaluation/feedback of the Dean of the Faculty. The process is for EC to discuss the results of the faculty evaluation of Joyner with her, and then for Joyner to respond to the EC with a written statement which EC will include in its minutes for all faculty members to

read. Foglesong states EC will await recommendations from PSC regarding constructive feedback for senior administrators.

2. Professional Standards - Moore identifies the PSC work for the year. PSC will reexamine the issue of evaluation of administrators and plans to decouple feedback from evaluation. PSC also will study the Maymester pay schedule. The schedule developed as an issue because faculty members expressed concern and questioned whether the pay was equitable. PSC also intends to form a subcommittee to consider faculty publications going into an openly accessible database. Finally, Moore states PSC will consider CIE changes. Harris and Houston produced a tutorial for the CIE. The PSC will test it, provide feedback, and put it online in the near future. Then PSC will address the issue of how teaching is assessed and whether the CIE should be the only assessment available.
3. Finance and Services – Tillmann states a carry-over issue is faculty presence on the Board of Trustees and announces a colloquium next Friday. Tillmann says ongoing committee members Van Sickle and Schutz will lead the colloquium as well as the effort to investigate the issue of faculty presence on the board of trustees. The intention is to ascertain: Does the majority of faculty want a presence, and if so, in what capacity (on the Board itself or committees and with an observer or participant status)? Finally, how would faculty members be chosen to represent the faculty on the Board? Tillmann notes F&S intends a sustainability initiative which focuses upon F&S' plans to continue to consider efforts to reduce waste and increase recycling availability/compliance. Tillmann explains F&S is pursuing an initiative to join the Worker Rights Consortium to ensure Rollins' gear is made under fair labor conditions. F&S has reviewed Follett's policies with reference to vendors and has joined with Student Labor Action Project (SLAP). Tillmann states the committee intends to discuss the issue of the living wage with Eisenbarth and request an update on how Rollins' employees and contractors' employees are doing in this regard. Tillmann reports the living wage calculator suggests a salary of \$9.38 an hour for one adult and \$17.34 for one adult supporting one child. Tillmann states she also discussed with Eisenbarth the possibility of a spring colloquium and asked TIAA and Fidelity as well as our economics department to send reps to a meeting to explain their conceptions of socially responsible investing. An additional question for the colloquium is how can we ensure that Rollins' investments reflect our mission of responsible leadership and global citizenship especially in an era of hedge funds which do not disclose the specific stocks and funds in which they invest?
4. Academic Affairs - Small notes the previous year's success of RP and curricular renewal. He states this year will be a quieter year as these programs begin, however, there is a new committee in place for curricular renewal. Small says AAC now is active in reviewing the curriculum of various departments. There also is a proposal for an MA program under consideration. The question of topics courses and appropriate procedure for approval of these courses now is handled

by requiring a topics course to be submitted for regular approval after it has been taught twice. Small explains another issue initiated last year and continuing this year is to return to a normal vetting process of programs and courses in Holt. AAC will make some recommendations for A&S bylaws related to its authority dealing with Holt programs and course approvals. Vitray asks about whether we could have a second set of RP pilots simultaneously with review of the first pilots. Small states he thinks this is possible. Rock asks what the title of the new MA proposal is. Small responds its Bruce and Rick's master's program. Foglesong answers the degree name is "Masters of Planning in Civic Urbanism." Kypraios asks about decreasing the number of hours for graduation. Small states the number of hours is still on the agenda.

5. Student Life – Boles reports Student Life in conjunction with Academic Affairs and the Dean of Student Affairs and Dean of Faculty already convened a forum on housing to examine how housing preferences work and what the nature of faculty involvement on this issue should be. He states staff and students outnumbered the faculty members in attendance. He explains the SLC then met this past Tuesday (September 22) to discuss the first step, which at this point is to determine the protocol for groups to apply for priority group housing if one or both of the fraternities currently on probation do not retain their housing after the December Residential Organization review. The second step will be to decide how new groups can apply for open housing made available if a fraternity on probation is removed. The third step will be to decide whether an open housing system (where all group houses are up for grabs every year) should replace the current policy that residential groups maintain their houses as long as they stay in "good" status. Boles next states the SLC concurrently is working on the Student Honor Code. A subcommittee of two SLC faculty members, two SGA members, and two staff members will be meeting regularly to discuss the Student Social Honor Code. In this way all three constituencies are in dialogue about how to bring the code to fruition. The first subcommittee meeting occurs tomorrow (September 25th). Boles also states SLC will be meeting with Scott Bitikofer and Jeff Eisenbarth to discuss the creation of an outdoor meeting space for classes. Finally Boles explains all faculty members of the Student Life Committee will now be part of the pool of faculty used for Administrative Hearing Boards. The chair of SLC will continue to serve as the faculty member of the appellate board. He explains the rationale: Faculty members on SLC are elected to represent the faculty's perspective on student life. Kovarik asserts a distinction must be made between academic and social honor code and that depending on the process used to consider a social honor code, someone associated with the academic code should be involved. O'Sullivan asks about the reason for RAs resigning. Boles says RA resignations happen every year as it does with peer mentors due to the fact of behavior inappropriate with the leadership role they accepted. Rock states he had good intentions about coming to the Friday housing meeting but did not attend because he was busy and discouraged by the little progress made on housing over the years. Rock explains students have no real

equal access to governance or same access to housing. Rock in particular would like to have a universal housing system rather than a system of social control and wonders if such a system is under discussion. Boles responds this is not an immediate issue but LLCs are part of the issue. Mario asks what authority faculty has to deal with housing. Boles states SLC advises DoSA. Boles explains Harris and SLC became involved late last year. Levis says in past faculty has passed legislation to determine housing process. Boles confirms college owns the housing. Vitray asks about his concern regarding the housing system where a house messes up, is placed on probation, and then does just enough to get off probation. Vitray states this is a recipe for cyclical sick behavior. Foglesong says housing allocation is one of the most critical issues because the college owns the housing and faculty have responsibilities for student life.

B. Administration

1. President Duncan – Duncan thanks the faculty for hard work in particular the implementation of first year of strategic pay and the launching of RP both of which are significant. He announces his next open forum with faculty is 10/27 when the probable topic will be a distillation of the outcome of the Board of Trustees’ retreat. Duncan also announces as part of the trustee retreat he invites the faculty to offer alternative programming during the Audit Meeting which is October 8 from 3:30 until 4:30. Duncan concludes this will be the faculty’s event to organize.
2. Vice President Casey - Casey announces budget and planning committee is meeting and will develop and then present a package which will consider revenue. Casey next discusses the Dean of Student Affairs search given Hater’s role as interim. Casey notes in May ’08 Lee resigned and he decided to appoint Hater as interim. Casey explains the EC then preferred to delay a search a year while a redefined mission of Student Affairs was developed; therefore he reappointed Hater for a second year as an interim. Casey states he asked EC about current plans for a search and EC reached the unanimous decision to begin a national search for which Hater could apply as a candidate. EC also voted for Casey to work with Foglesong and Boles to create a slate for the search committee. O’Sullivan points out that when the dual dean model was established it was agreed to evaluate and determine how well the model works for Rollins. O’Sullivan suggests two deans might compete for resources and it might be preferable to assess. O’Sullivan states his comments are more than rhetorical. Edge states he concurs with O’Sullivan and sees serious structural issues interfering with a national search for this position and thinks the faculty should take time to decide structural issues before proceeding. Foglesong notes similar issues discussed in EC but felt as faculty members expect national searches in departments so too should have a national search for this position. Foglesong agrees various structural issues exist to consider and states the committee should address all these issues. Casey says he is uncertain the committee will undertake these issues to extent O’Sullivan anticipates but it does seem to be the case the

faculty desires more influence and is more focused on this issue than in previous year. Casey asks D. Davison to comment on decisions made in EC last year. Davison says Casey is basically correct, EC talked about the student affairs mission and aligning student affairs issues with academic affairs but EC really did not discuss alternative models. Foglesong wonders whether the issue should be moved to new business. Rock asks point of information and what occurs if we do not immediately move ahead with the search. Casey states it is not a good idea to have an extended interim and have an entire division under the leadership of an interim. Casey concurs with O'Sullivan and Edge that structural considerations exist. Lairson states he believes it is unwise to try to do a search and address structural issues simultaneously and that perhaps first the faculty must consider the relationship between the Dean of the Faculty's office and the Dean of Student Affairs' office. O'Sullivan suggests to consider Lairson's idea and vote. Lairson presents the motion "EC will appoint a committee to examine the structural relationship of the Dean of Students Affairs Office to the rest of the institution and report back to the faculty in 30 days with a recommended decision about what to do next, including the possibility of moving forward with a search." The motion is seconded by many voices. Cavanaugh asks about last year's clarification of the relationship between the Dean of the Faculty and Dean of Student Affairs – what was the decision? D. Davison says some discussion focused on the issue but the discussion was related to other concerns regarding the office, and was informal and not sustained. Davison explains the discussion was restricted in part by the immediacy of the issue because of the short clock given for a search given the time of the resignation of Lee in May. Davison notes no research on alternative models or best practices occurred. The faculty votes on the motion and it carries overwhelmingly with only a few objections.

IV. Old Business

None

V. New Business – Prior to new business Foglesong introduces Dr. Pat Schoknecht, the new CIO. Schoknecht states she looks forward to working with faculty on technology concerns and hopes to be invited to department meetings. Jonathan Miller then introduces David Noe as new digital services librarian.

- A. Election of at-large AAC member for 1-year term. EC brings the name of Don Rogers and the faculty accepts by acclamation.
- B. Election of at-large PSC member for 1-year term. EC brings the name of Anca Voicu; Kovarik nominates Gio Valiante to the ballot. A paper ballot vote occurs and the faculty elects Voicu.
- C. Open Meeting Protocol (Bylaw interpretation) – Foglesong explains the background to concern regarding good governance, faculty members participation and transparency. He further explains the Bylaws provide for open meetings. (See Appendix 1). Therefore he announces, the Executive Committee at its September

17, 2009 meeting decided, on a pilot basis, that “open to observation” shall include: widening the circle of people who understand parliamentary procedure; opening meetings; and establishing a giant blackboard where asynchronously the faculty can deliberate on issues. Foglesong states the specifics with regard to open meetings: “1. The time, place, and agenda for all governance meetings shall be announced in advance on the Governance Web site. This shall be the responsibility of the committee chair and his/her departmental administrative assistant. 2. All governance meetings shall be open to faculty, students, and staff at the college. 3. Persons attending a governance committee meeting who are not members of the committee may speak at the meeting only with the permission of the committee’s chair. 4. All governance committees should meet in rooms with enough space to accommodate non-members. 5. All governance committee minutes should be posted on the Governance Web site as soon as they are approved. This shall be the responsibility of the committee chair. 6. Application: The above rules shall apply to the Executive Committee and all standing committees of the faculty, as well as the subcommittees they create; to the committees charged with selecting recipients of the Arthur Vining Davis Award and the Cornell Faculty Fellows; and to other committees wishing to use the good offices of Faculty Governance, such as the Diversity Advisory Council and the Internationalization Committee. The rules shall not apply to the Faculty Evaluation Committee, Faculty Salary Committee, Merit Pay Appeals Committee, and the Grievance Committee, except when they are addressing matters of policy.” Strom states the Diversity Committee is not a faculty committee, but the wording refers to it as such. Foglesong agrees to drop the word faculty in reference to these committees in the application. Newman asks about the last sentence regarding policy and states consideration by FEC of policy changes or interpretations usually arises out of particular case. Newman explains FEC is not a policy making committee but does suggest bylaw revisions which stem from cases. Newman argues these discussions can not be open. Foglesong says the issue is one of trust, and trust must exist that meetings will be open when necessary for policy discussions but not for consideration of individual cases. Edge states an analogous issue is the meetings for Arthur Vining Davis and Cornell awards. Edge argues these committees deal with individuals rather than policy. Foglesong replies the EC felt strongly that competition for grants should be open so that faculty members know why they are not selected, and so the committee members are held accountable to making good choices for the right reasons. Foglesong replies there will be opportunities to deliberate on the matter over blackboard. Lairson then expresses concern about the process to assess merit pay. He argues FSC is not in position to do assessment and there should be a committee with wider and open access for faculty members. Lairson moves “Merit Pay Assessment should be done by a new committee of five faculty members appointed by EC with a member from each of MPAC and FSC and three additional people from outside the process selected to give balance in terms of gender and rank so we have a broader discussion, analysis, and assessment of what happened.” Papay seconds. Tillmann cautions on voting after the official

end of meeting the time. Tillmann calls for the motion on the floor to be tabled until the next meeting. The motion carries.

VI. Announcements

A. Strom, Co-Chair, Diversity Advisory Council announces a survey to evaluate diversity initiatives at Rollins and encourages faculty members to complete and return the survey.

B. Chong announces a Helping Hands across America campaign at Rollins on 10/12 and encourages faculty to contribute food.

B. Foglesong announces a Fall Faculty Party on the CFAM Patio, October 3 at 6:00 pm.

VII. Adjournment - The meeting was adjourned at 1:51 pm.

Appendix 1

OPEN MEETING PROTOCOL

WHEREAS, the A&S Bylaws call for our meetings to be “open to observation,” as provided below:

Article II, Section 5. Attendance and Participation by Other Non-Members

All meetings of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences and its governance committees shall be open to observation by any employee or student of the College, provided, however, such open observation shall not apply in grievance considerations, including hearing on that subject. The right of a non-member to speak at meetings of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences shall ordinarily be granted by the President of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences or the chair of the committee. A non-member shall ordinarily be limited to a combined total of five minutes in which to speak. Exceptions to the practice of open meetings or to the limit of a combined total of five minutes of speaking time for a non-member shall require a vote of the members of the committee or faculty. [emphasis added]

WHEREAS, the Executive Committee is charged with interpreting the Bylaws, as provided below:

Article VI, Section 2. Responsibilities and Duties

The Executive Committee convenes and sets the agenda for the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, refers business to the appropriate committees, reviews proposed committee legislation, brings such legislation to the Faculty, acts on it (subject to their review) or returns it to committee, interprets the authority of standing committees as set forth in the

Bylaws, prepares at-large faculty nominations to fill committee vacancies, interprets these Bylaws, reviews them annually, proposes any changes in them to the Arts and Sciences faculty, and acts for the faculty when a quorum cannot be assembled. Minutes of the Executive Committee shall be published and distributed to the entire College community in a timely fashion.

THEREFORE, the Executive Committee at its September 17, 2009 meeting concludes, on a pilot basis, that “open to observation” shall mean the following:

1. The time, place, and agenda for all governance meetings shall be announced in advance on the Governance Web site. This shall be the responsibility of the committee chair and his/her departmental administrative assistant.
2. All governance meetings shall be open to faculty, students, and staff at the college.
3. Persons attending a governance committee meeting who are not members of the committee may speak at the meeting only with the permission of the committee’s chair.
4. All governance committees should meet in rooms with enough space to accommodate non-members.
5. All governance committee minutes should be posted on the Governance Web site as soon as they are approved. This shall be the responsibility of the committee chair.
6. Application: The above rules shall apply to the Executive Committee and all standing committees of the faculty, as well as the subcommittees they create; to the committees charged with selecting recipients of the Arthur Vining Davis Award and the Cornell Faculty Fellows; and to other faculty committees wishing to use the good offices of Faculty Governance, such as the Diversity Advisory Council and the Internationalization Committee. The rules shall not apply to the Faculty Evaluation Committee, Faculty Salary Committee, Merit Pay Appeals Committee, and the Grievance Committee, except when they are addressing matters of policy.