

10-21-2010

Minutes, Arts and Sciences Executive Committee Meeting, Thursday, October 21, 2010

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 21, 2010" (2010). *Executive Committee Minutes*. Paper 45.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ec/45

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
October 21, 2010**

Members Present: William Boles, Sue Easton, Barry Levis, Claire Strom, Nick Horsmon, Deb Wellman, Joan Davison,

- I. Call to order—the meeting was called to order at 12:34 PM.
- II. Approval of Minutes—the minutes of the October 7, 2010 executive committee meeting were approved.
- III. Reports
 - A. F&S – Easton announces F&S continues to solicit comments and questions for Eisenbarth and Joyner to address at the budget colloquium on November 2.
- IV. Old Business
 - A. Valedictorian – Levis explains AAC discussed the concerns of EC and succumbed to its pressure and reason. Levis elaborates only faculty members of AAC will make vote on the valedictorian, although the deans of the Faculty and Student Affairs will attend the meeting. (See attachment 1.) He adds AAC believes because no current specification exists in any college documents on the valedictorian selection, AAC concludes it can move forward with the new process for May 2011. Levis notes AAC’s remaining question is whether the faculty should vote on the change. Davison asks Horsmon whether SGA voted on the new process and he answers SGA discussed and supports the process. SGA specifically voted on whether to include students on the selection committee; SGA overwhelmingly opposes students on the committee. Horsmon notes he believes students support immediate implementation of the new process. Davison asks Levis whether AAC addressed concerns regarding service. He responds that individual students will make their case regarding service, and faculty members are open to a broad understanding of service. Levis says the only strict criterion for eligibility is that a student has a 3.9 at the end of the fall semester. Boles suggests that if the new requirements for valedictorian will be placed in the catalogue, then the faculty should consider the issue. Boles moves to take to the faculty the AAC proposal for selection of the A&S valedictorian. Strom seconds and the motion unanimously passes.
 - B. Dean of Student Affairs Reports – Davison re-introduces the issue from the previous meeting regarding the content of the Dean of Student Affairs report to the faculty. She notes that the May 2003 and March and April 2008 faculty meeting minutes clarify the Dean of Student Affairs report is intended to address serious incidents and to allow for conversation

regarding these incidents. The initial resolution in May 2003 from Don Griffin states, "That any serious incident [concerning inappropriate behavior in the residence halls] be reported to the faculty by a representative of the office of the Dean of Student Affairs, initially by email, but also at either a regular faculty meeting or a special forum, where a conversation may occur." Griffin then explained the faculty ultimately is responsible for student life, and therefore transparency must exist. In 2008, a Griffin/Boles resolution asked for a bylaw change so that the report of the Dean of Student Affairs once a semester or upon request of the president of the faculty is codified. The bylaw change passed. The rationale for the change indicates: "A report to faculty every semester will help us understand the issues that our students face. In addition, a report about serious situations will help us to address the rumor mill." The background statement expresses concern that in the period from 2003-2008 only two "serious" incidents were reported. The bylaw change was adopted in April 2008. Wellman says Hater intends to deliver a report at the next faculty meeting. Davison says issues or rumors surrounding the student death, Baker Act, and arson should be included. Wellman explains Hater and she plan to form a task force on drug and alcohol issues, and they hope to have faculty support. Wellman notes Hater will mention the task force in her report. Boles says SLC discussed the new alcohol policy at its last meeting. He mentions Ken Miller was critical of student behavior; Campus Safety write-ups indicate the number of incidents is about the same as in the past but the number of serious incidents increased. He identifies as serious those which require transport. Boles notes the egregious incidents tend to occur in McKean. He further notes Miller provided a complete report for SLC. Davison suggests that report sound like the type of report the faculty hopes to receive from the Dean of Student Affairs. Wellman states students have a different perspective on what is occurring. Horsmon explains some students perceive the new alcohol policy as causing the problems on campus. Horsmon elaborates the new policy provides clear cut terms regarding enforcement and sanctioning. Additionally the policy interprets an under-age student as in possession if in the same room as where alcohol is open; therefore student drinking moved off campus. Boles comments alcohol violations, however, usually are linked to other rule violations. Horsmon concurs students must draw attention to self to have campus security enter a room, although students cannot be in a common area with alcohol. Strom mentions she is not opposed to alcohol, but students must realize a death occurred and drinking to the point of hospitalization or death is not adult behavior. Horsmon says student leaders are concerned about causes. He elaborates assume the policy change is the cause of this behavior is not true simply because the policy change preceded the increase in severe incidents. Levis inquires about the availability of alternative activities. Boles says after dark night activities are held on Saturday night but there is a need for activities on Thursday nights. Boles advocates a shuttle service to Winter

Park Village. Horsmon notes an additional factor which contributes to problems is the tendency for the whole campus to go to the same party or place on a given night. Boles mentions Rollins now has a representative on an Orlando task force to address underage consumption in clubs.

V. New Business

- A. Pre-Matriculation Courses – Levis explains pilot courses for pre-matriculation students were offered on a temporary basis with Allen taking students to Costa Rica and Wei taking students to Shanghai. Levis states AAC now seeks guidance as to whether such courses are distinctly different from the international initiatives and therefore should be called pre-matriculation programs and considered under different guidelines. Levis elaborates Edge started these courses in order to involve students in the academic side of campus, build community and increase retention even before orientation. Levis notes the program does seem to encourage retention. Levis again asks EC whether these pre-matriculation courses should be considered a new program or an international initiative. Levis suggests the former allows for expansion and domestic trips. Easton asks whether RCC serves the same purpose. Levis responds it seems beneficial to begin to integrate students before they arrive on campus. Easton agrees a pre-matriculation program which is more than just international initiatives allows for growth and diversity. Davison asks whether the program places low and middle class students at a disadvantage because of the cost as well as the requirement students begin in early August. Wellman states there is some limited travel money available to students but this is an issue. Boles agrees with the value of an extended program and suggests EC in general sees value in a pre-matriculation program. AAC will continue to work on these courses as part of a pre-matriculation program.
- B. Asian Studies Major- Levis notes consideration of the major was tabled less spring until the October faculty meeting, but AAC still has not dealt with the proposal. He explains AAC received the proposal two weeks ago, and the Bob Moore believes additional lines are not necessary for the major. Davison suggests that might currently be true but as retirements occur, the program might need faculty replacements which otherwise would not be supported. Levis states lines always are an issue for ACC. Wellman states the major will cost money. EC agrees Levis will report to the faculty at its October meeting that AAC has the major under consideration.
- C. PSC and FEC –Strom states she took to FEC the concerns of EC regarding amendments. She explains FEC’s responses now must move through PSC, but FEC cannot submit bylaw changes until the previous changes regarding the membership are accurately recorded. Davison notes this is an issue for the Provost’s office which handles bylaw changes. Wellman says she will ask Moser to make the change as well as checking faculty minutes archives for previous changes which have not been entered. Strom

notes the bylaw change regarding confidentiality is prepared for the October faculty meeting. (See attachment 2.)

- D. Agenda for Faculty Meeting 10/28 – Davison summarizes the issues which seem to exist for the October faculty meeting and asks whether there is sufficient business to meet. These issues are: a report of the Dean of Student Affairs on serious incidents with time for question and conversation, a report from AAC on its current consideration of the Asian Studies major proposal, a vote on the new FEC bylaw related to the confidentiality of the committee's deliberations, and a vote of the new criteria for valedictorian. Strom states she believes it is important to meet and give adequate time for discussion. Davison asks whether it also might be useful to hear a report on the Provost Search from Ed Cohen. Boles agrees but notes Cohen is concerned if his report precedes reports by administrative and Crummer representatives. Wellman mentions the deadline for applications is December 15, and some members of EC worry the process is moving too slowly. Boles states most faculty members due not even know the full faculty representation on the search committee. EC agrees it is desirable to report on the process and take questions.

VI. Adjournment—The meeting adjourns at 1:33pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Joan Davison
Vice President/Secretary

Attachment 1

Proposal for New Selection Process for the College of Arts and Sciences Valedictorian

Each year the Arts and Sciences faculty will select a valedictorian who will be recognized at graduation and give the commencement address. Selection of the students will be based on a combination of GPA and service to the college and the community. The student selected will embody the ideals of the Rollins College mission statement: he or she will exhibit the qualities of a global citizen and responsible leader as well as maintaining the highest level of academic achievement.

Selection Process:

The Office of Student Records will provide a list of the students eligible to graduate *Summa Cum Laude* at the end of the fall semester before they will graduate to the Dean of Student Affairs. The Dean will then invite each student to submit an application to be

considered for the position of Valedictorian. The student will complete a form in which he or she will explain his academic achievements, his/her contributions to the Rollins College and his/her involvement to the local or world community. The student will also obtain two letters of recommendation from faculty and one letter from an individual familiar with the student's service. All referees should be asked to comment on the student's ability to make a public address.

The selection committee will consist of the faculty members of the Academic Affairs Committee and the Deans of the Faculty and Student Affairs as non-voting members. The committee will initially devise a rubric for the selection process. The committee will then review the students who completed the application process, measuring them against the rubric. In addition to academic achievement and service, the committee should also weigh the individual's ability to make a public address. The committee at its discretion may ask either all of the applicants or selected finalists for a personal interview. Once the committee has made its selection, they will notify the successful student who will begin the process of composing the commencement address.

**COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES
VALEDICTORIAN
NOMINEE INFORMATION FORM**

CAMPUS ADDRESS _____

PHONE: (____) _____

MAJOR: _____

MINOR: _____

PLEASE COMPLETE THE FOLLOWING USING ADDITIONAL ATTACHED PAGES IF NECESSARY.

1. To what do you attribute your academic success?
2. Indicate your involvement in services benefiting Rollins College.
3. Indicate involvement in services to your local or the world community.
4. How do you see yourself contributing to Rollins College and your community as a result of your degree?
5. The selected recipient must give a public address at Commencement. Are you willing to do this?
____ Yes ____ No

6. What public speaking experience do you have?

Return Completed Form to:
ROLLINS COLLEGE, OFFICE OF THE DEAN OF STUDENT AFFAIRS
ATTENTION: KAREN HATER, DEAN
1000 Holt Avenue (CAMPUS BOX 2345)
WINTER PARK, FL 32789
SUBMISSION DEADLINE: MARCH 24, 2011

COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES
VALEDICTORIAN
FACULTY RECOMMENDATION FORM

_____ I waive my right to inspect this reference when completed and understand that it will remain confidential.

_____ I do not waive my right to review this document.

Student's Signature: _____

REFERENCE: The student named above has been nominated to be Valedictorian for 2011. This award is presented each year to the graduating senior who has demonstrated exceptional academic achievement and service benefiting Rollins College and the community. The recipient of the award is honored at graduation ceremonies and presents an address on behalf of his or her graduating class. The selection committee would greatly appreciate your candid assessment of this individual's qualifications for this distinguished award. The selection process is, of course, competitive. Please provide as much information as possible.

1. Why do you believe this individual deserves this award?
2. What outstanding academic qualities does this student exhibit?
3. Are you aware of demonstrated service to Rollins College or the Community on the part of this individual? Please explain.
4. Please address your knowledge of this individual's public speaking abilities.

Faculty Signature

Department Date

Faculty Name (Please Print):

Please return this completed form to the attention of Karen Hater, Dean of Student Affairs, Rollins College, 1000 Holt Avenue (Campus Box 2345), Winter Park, FL 32789. **SUBMISSION DEADLINE: MARCH 24, 2006.**

**COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES
VALEDICTORIAN
SERVICE RECOMMENDATION FORM**

____ I waive my right to inspect this reference when completed and understand that it will remain confidential.

____ I do not waive my right to review this document.

Student's Signature: _____

REFERENCE: The student named above has been nominated to be Valedictorian for 2011. This award is presented each year to the graduating senior who has demonstrated exceptional academic achievement and service benefiting Rollins College and the community. The recipient of the award is honored at graduation ceremonies and presents an address on behalf of his or her graduating class. The selection committee would greatly appreciate your candid assessment of this individual's qualifications for this distinguished award. The selection process is, of course, competitive. Please provide as much information as possible.

1. In what capacity have you observed this individual's service to Rollins College or the community?
2. Why do you believe this individual deserves this award?
3. How has the student demonstrated service to Rollins College and the Community on the part of this individual? Please explain.
4. Please address your knowledge of this individual's public speaking abilities.

Date

Signature

Address

Name (Please Print):

Please return this completed form to the attention of Karen Hater, Dean of Student Affairs, Rollins College, 1000 Holt Avenue (Campus Box 2345), Winter Park, FL 32789. **SUBMISSION DEADLINE: MARCH 24, 2011.**

Attachment 2

FEC Bylaw Change

Review by the Faculty Evaluation Committee. The Faculty Evaluation Committee conducts its own evaluation of each candidate for tenure or promotion. The evaluation will be based on the following sources: the written report and recommendation by the Department Evaluation Committee, the department's approved criteria for tenure or promotion or, in the absence of approved criteria, specifications of how College criteria for tenure and promotion are defined, measured, and applied, the assessment of external evaluators (when requested by the candidate), the report and recommendation of the appropriate Dean, the candidate's professional assessment statement, an interview with the candidate, and any other material or information that the Committee has obtained in the exercise of its duties. The Committee may also consult with the Candidate Evaluation Committee, the appropriate Dean, or any other member of the community.

Meetings of the Faculty Evaluation Committee (FEC) must be confidential, regardless of subject matter under consideration and may be attended only by the duly appointed members of the FEC. Candidates for tenure, promotion, and mid course reviews will attend their scheduled FEC interviews as well as additional meetings at the request of the candidate or FEC. At the invitation of the FEC, other persons, who the bylaws state may be consulted, may attend meetings of the FEC to which they are invited. This by law supersedes all other by laws or faculty handbook rules, which may be contrary.

The Faculty Evaluation Committee cannot challenge substantive requirements of a department for tenure or promotion that has approved criteria. The Faculty Evaluation Committee will require the evaluation from the Candidate Evaluation Committee to adhere to its approved criteria, both procedural and substantive.