

4-21-2011

## Minutes, Arts and Sciences Executive Committee Meeting, Thursday, April 21, 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, April 21, 2011" (2011). *Executive Committee Minutes*. Paper 39.  
[http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as\\_ec/39](http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ec/39)

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 Minutes  
Executive Committee  
April 21, 2011**

Members Present: Rick Foglesong, William Boles, Claire Strom, Sue Easton, Joan Davison, Laurie Joyner, and Chris Fuse (AAC representative for Barry Levis)

Guests: Jill Jones, Dexter Boniface

- I. Call to order—the meeting was called to order at 12:40 PM.
- II. Approval of Minutes—The Executive Committee approved the minutes of March 31, 2011
- III. Reports
  - A. AAC – Fuse reports AAC concluded its business for the year. He adds that AAC would not be sending forth a recommendation to change the INB major because INB was unable to send a department member to the last AAC meeting.
  - B. SLC – Boles reports SLC agreed to changes in the Code of Conduct related to the alcohol policy. These changes try to accommodate the criticism of the previous policy which held anyone in a room accountable for a violation even if there were a few cans of beer for 15 people. Boles states SLC also responded to concerns from the AD and coaches that the food service hours are inadequate to meet the needs of the 25% of the student body who are athletes. In turn, SLC's discussion with Sodexho will lead to a change of operating hours at various food outlets on campus. Boles explains SLC also asked Sodexho to consider alternatives to the existing policy which leads students to lose money remaining on their food cards at the end of the academic year. Options include tiered plans for purchases and the ability of students to resell money on the food card to other students whose accounts are exhausted. Further a plan exists to revamp the downstairs to offer healthy food and possibly a pub. Finally Boles announces SLC began a discussion of faculty member bullying of students and agreed to continue next year the general discussion of bullying on campus.
  - C. F&S – Easton reports Siry is next year's chair, and F&S hopes to undertake a discussion of the requirements of a transparent budget.
  - D. PSC – Strom announces J Davison is the new chair. She reports PSC finished its review and recommendations of non-salary faculty pay including overload, Holt and Maymester. PSC also completed decisions on IT grants. Strom explains PSC decided the concerns raised by faculty members regarding the proposed bylaw changes are substantial and unable to be addressed within the last 2 weeks of the year. Therefore PSC is pulling the bylaw change proposals and giving the issue to next year's committee to address. Strom also reports she met with Hater to discuss Hater's written response to the faculty feedback.

Hater intends to provide a summary of the feedback and then her response in a written communication to the faculty. Strom notes she also met with Duncan and he conveyed his decision not to respond to the faculty feedback. Foglesong asks Strom to clarify the arrangement reached regarding feedback. Strom says Duncan agreed to respond in some manner of his choosing to the faculty regarding the survey. Jones inquires about to whom the survey now goes. Strom answers she has not seen the feedback, but Duncan said he will share the results with the Board of Trustees. Discussion continues regarding the feedback process which has been ongoing for four years in an attempt to identify a process acceptable to administrators. Strom notes PSC worked to build a process in which administrators would participate and PSC believed that was achieved. Strom also notes Duncan expressed concern about the low response rate from faculty which officially was a little over one-third. Strom explains, however, that it is not anticipated that new faculty members, administrators with faculty status and visitors would respond. Given this, the response rate actually might be understood as approximately 50%. Davison suggests that with 66 respondents this should be a good distribution even if primarily people responded who held perspectives at one or another extreme. Jones asks again about the president's understanding of the importance of this discussion with the faculty. Strom repeats Duncan stated to her that he does not report to the faculty and to respond to faculty feedback would encourage faculty to think he reports to them. Davison asks what administrators are scheduled for evaluations next year, and Strom replies the Dean of A&S and the Provost. Jones suggests Strom should emphasize to the president that it might not be a bad idea to speak to the faculty. Strom replies she does not believe she can change Duncan's attitude. She clarifies Duncan did discuss with her some of the feedback, identifying key issues; Strom believes he understands that discussion as his report. Jones inquires what issues were identified, and Strom answers she believes she only can report that Duncan discussed some issues. Foglesong asks if the agreement regarding faculty feedback held the surveys as confidential. Strom replies she has not seen the surveys and that the president determines to whom he wishes to show the surveys. Strom reiterates Duncan's statement: "no interest in discussing this with the faculty." EC agrees Strom will report the statement to the faculty. Easton states the report also is a good opportunity to make the argument to faculty that they should respond to such surveys.

#### IV. New Business

- A. Administrative Changes (EC) – Foglesong raises the general EC concern regarding Duncan's responsiveness to administrative issues including the status of the DoF office and Joyner's future position. Joyner responds she does not know the status or details of these decisions and no final decision exists. Foglesong expresses to Joyner the concern of EC that this will be the last faculty meeting of the year and the last opportunity to discuss changes and appointments. He asks Joyner whether she knows if Duncan will attend the faculty meeting, and Joyner responds he wishes to make an announcement at

the meeting but will not arrive until the end of the faculty meeting. Foglesong emphasizes his concern that this provides no opportunity to discuss his announcement or other critical issues. Davison supports Foglesong's point and elaborates it is desirable for Duncan to consult with faculty on appointments to positions of such importance to the faculty. She suggests that the all college bylaws require approval for positions such as the President and Provost, and this reasonably could be extended to other positions which undertake comparable tasks or functions. She continues the A&S bylaws specify a faculty vote for various positions including Dean of Faculty, Student Affairs and Admissions, so that a new position which might subsume these positions then reasonably requires faculty approval. Jones asks what power the faculty holds, and Foglesong responds ultimately all power is with the Board of Trustees, but they delegate certain powers to the faculty which they also could revoke. Foglesong further notes Duncan has asserted his willingness to defend faculty decision-making in areas of academic hiring and the curriculum. Easton asks for clarification of the role of faculty in personnel and structural decisions. Joyner asks whether EC is suggesting it has the right to comment on personnel and structural changes. Davison responds certainly personnel changes, but also appointments related to new positions and structural changes which create positions in areas integral to faculty work. Foglesong says the language about the advisement role is ambiguous both regarding how and when it is discharged and whether approval occurs after selection or in response to recommendation. Joyner concurs with this point. Davison notes whereas the language might be ambiguous the precedent is clear. Foglesong states while legally there might be a constitutional issue about the authority of the faculty, this issue of authority is separate from the issue of faculty power. He notes a faculty could hold a no confidence vote which would affect presidential credibility. Foglesong then suggests two courses of action with response to the matter at hand: the first would ask Duncan to address these issues when he next is available for a meeting, and the second delegates the president to meet with Duncan and discuss EC and faculty concerns regarding administrative appointments. Strom moves to delegate Foglesong as president and Jones as president elect to meet with Duncan prior to the faculty meeting to discuss upcoming administrative appointments. Easton seconds and then asks for a further clarification of the meeting with Duncan. Jones states the discussion must be more comprehensive than what announcement Duncan intends to make at the faculty meeting. Foglesong states the intention is to discuss administrative transitions and appointments to administrative positions. The motion unanimously passes.

- B. Proposed Faculty Salary Resolution: RESOLVED, that the faculty supports President Duncan's proposal to give every faculty member a fixed sum payment that becomes part of his or her base salary in 2011-2012, with the remaining funds in the salary pool for that year placed into escrow for use in a merit allocation in a subsequent year. – Foglesong reminds the EC that EC passed the resolution at its previous meeting and asks what happens if it fails.

Foglesong suggests ultimately the decision is that of the Board of Trustees and the administration even if the faculty votes against the merit allocation. Joyner asks whether it is possible the resolution will fail, and Jones and Strom respond affirmatively. Jones explains some faculty members are opposed to merit pay, but other faculty members who favor merit pay are concerned that a mandate which was given to the faculty, now is being revoked or ignored. Jones states a number of people thought that perhaps that if Laurie had been at the Board of Trustees meeting that the awarding of merit pay without a cost of living increase might not have occurred. Foglesong inquires about options if the resolution is defeated. Joyner responds the logical option is to disburse the \$1000 but if there is no consensus then all the money could go to escrow. Joyner inquires again however, why would it fail. Foglesong states he sees this proposal as the best compromise; the method declares everyone meritorious for a lump sum allocation which is more egalitarian than across the board increases, but that some people oppose the proposal because of symbolic reasons linked to the allocation as based on merit. Foglesong notes that Duncan is in a difficult position because to not link the allocation to merit would be to defy the Board. Joyner concurs with Foglesong's interpretation and states that the practical effect of voting down the proposal could be something worse for faculty because it would pass the pay proposal to the administration and perhaps lead to a true merit allocation. Davison suggests there is support for the proposal but that a paper ballot will be necessary at the meeting. Foglesong responds someone must request a paper ballot.

- C. Agenda for 4/27 meeting – Foglesong suggests that the meeting begins with lunch, champagne toasts, and the awarding of the McKean Award. Foglesong asks Joyner about the awarding of Cornells which typically are announced in February. Strom states her committee selected a recipient and the decision is with Wellman. Joyner believes Wellman will make the award at the meeting. Foglesong asks whether Duncan will give the Diversity Award at the end of the meeting. Strom voices a preference that all awards be presented at the beginning of the meeting and asks whether Joyner can announce this award. It tentatively is agreed all awards will be presented at the beginning of the meeting and followed by committee reports. There is no old business. New business will begin with SLC's two proposals on the posthumous degree policy and attendance policy. Foglesong then will introduce EC's salary policy resolution. The meeting will conclude with Lewis' announcement and hopefully discussion.
- D. Announcement from the President's Office of a Rollins' Senior Send-off – Joyner announces a shrimp boil with beer and wine for faculty, staff and students on May 6, Friday 5-7pm. Joyner encourages all to attend.
- E. Board of Trustees Meeting – Foglesong asks Joyner about the status of faculty discussion with the Education Committee at the upcoming meeting. He explains in the recent past the EC President and chair of AAC attended the meeting. Joyner says she will inquire.

V. Adjournment—The meeting was adjourned at 1:46pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Joan Davison  
Vice President/Secretary