

9-16-2010

Minutes, Arts and Sciences Executive Committee Meeting, Thursday, September 16, 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, September 16, 2010" (2010). *Executive Committee Minutes*. Paper 47.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ec/47

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
September 16, 2010**

Members Present: Rick Foglesong, William Boles, Sue Easton, Barry Levis, Nick Horsmon, Laurie Joyner, Deb Wellman, Joan Davison, Dick James (for Claire Strom)

- I. Call to order—the meeting was called to order at 12:42 PM.
- II. Approval of Minutes—the minutes of the August 26, 2010 executive committee meeting were approved.
- III. Reports
 - A. AAC- Levis identifies the issues before the committee:
 1. Maymester- the committee is waiting for a report from the provost on the outcomes of this Maymester. Additionally, AAC is working on a separate course approval form for Maymester courses because many members believe the semester is so much shorter than the regular semester that courses must be different and therefore each course offered in Maymester should be approved separately as a new course.
 2. Valedictorian – consideration continues as to the guidelines for the selection of the valedictorian with regard to the number of hours earned at Rollins. AAC also is assessing whether additional criteria beyond GPA should be used to select the valedictorian. For example, should all students with a certain GPA be invited to submit a resume which highlights service activities?
 3. Asian Studies major – AAC expects to receive updates on work on the major, and a colloquium is scheduled for 9/23.
 4. Pre-matriculation – AAC will assess last summer’s program and determine whether the courses should continue.
 5. Changes to INB – AAC also expects to receive and review changes to the INB major.
 6. Live Registration – At Toni Holbrook’s request live registration is postponed. The process involves more complexity than anticipated. Foglesong asks whether AAC is considering a reduction of graduation hours. Levis responds the Curriculum Review Committee which reports to AAC is handling this issue. He notes Simmons is in charge of the committee.
 - B.FSC – Easton explains the old business before the committee which includes funding for CWR for ethical production committee, faculty status on the Board of Trustees and staffing of the sustainability committee. She notes she sent an e-mail to Short to receive funds for CWR. She also states Warnecke will chair the ethical production committee and work with representatives from the students, athletics and the bookstore. Easton asks about the final status of faculty on the Board of Trustees, and Foglesong

explains the faculty approved its presence on the Board, but the Board has not accepted the faculty's terms. He suggests this is an ongoing issue requiring further discussion and consideration. Easton also states Peska will serve on the sustainability committee. Easton then elaborates on FSC's goals and focus for 2010-2011:

1. understanding and communicating budget issues to faculty and staff and other campus constituencies so they understand basic financial issues role;

2. follow up regarding faculty equity in releases and pay. Davison suggests this is a critical issue because it also concerns whether people are being paid for work then deemed meritorious. Davison asks about the report which Casey promised continuously throughout last spring semester. Foglesong and others suggest that the report might not exist. Davison responds EC then must consider how important the report is given the extensive demands on IT. Easton states she spoke with Deb Wellman about this issue. She notes the issue relates to a morale problem and the sense of inequity and suggests consideration must be given to how to resolve these problems and address these sentiments. Levis raises a question about staff not receiving a salary increase and whether a staff salary increase is possible. He suggests priorities must be assessed and wonders about the \$100,000 expenditure for the lacrosse field in Eatonville. Easton answers the staff is not as upset as faculty members about the lack of raises because they prefer job security. She contends the fundamental questions are what expenditures are fair, and where money should and should not be spent. Foglesong concurs there is a need for faculty to be informed, and information from Budget and Planning should be disseminated and explained for the sake of morale.

C. PSC – James, reporting for Strom, states PSC will focus on evaluation of teaching, FEC clarifications including timelines, and the question of ownership of on-line material.

D. SLC- Boles reports SLC is studying the issue of attendance policies as these relate to religious holidays, athletic competitions, and professional conferences. He notes it seems responsibility resides with students who should communicate with professors; he also suggests athletics and multicultural affairs should communicate with the faculty. Initially SLC hopes to encourage communication rather than mandating a policy. Boles further reports LLC, Explorations and Res Life convened to discuss LLC and its relationship with RCC. Finally Boles announces the outdoor learning space is near completion and information soon will be available regarding scheduling.

E. SGA – Horsmon reports SGA elections for Senate are scheduled for this week and following elections SGA will be able to fully staff committees.

IV. Old Business –

A. Social Honor Code – Boles introduces the “Statement of Honor” and states very few changes exist but the committee did add sentences about non-

academic violations and about respect of the environment and property. (See Appendix 1.) Levis asks about social violations of the R Code and whether they are violations of honor. Boles answers affirmatively but that different bodies examine and sanction different violations. Boles elaborates that social code violations have a tiered system. Wellman asks if the sanctioning bodies for social code violations are student led. Boles responds no, the system continues to be the same as in the past. Joyner inquires where the new Statement of Honor will be published and whether an attorney has seen the document. She expresses concern about due process issues and suggests the Dean of Student Affairs vet it through a lawyer. Boles states he meets with the Dean tomorrow and will raise the issue with her. Davison asks about the emphasis on property as opposed to other rights such as security of the person. Boles answers that the committee did not want to create new values currently not incorporated into other aspects of the existing code. Foglesong notes if EC changes the document then it must be sent back to other groups for approval. Boles moves a resolution to take the Statement of Honor to the faculty for consideration and vote. Davison seconds and the resolution unanimously passes.

V. New Business

A. James, on behalf of PSC, requests to create a subcommittee to create a metric for evaluating teaching effectiveness. James explains PSC did not finish this task last year and it seems preferable to form an ad hoc committee to first gather information about peer and aspirant institutions and then consider what will work at Rollins. He notes PSC suggests a committee with representation from each division as well as Zimmerman, a librarian, and alumni of FEC and FSC. He recommends Zimmerman, Lines, Harris, Mays, Hargrove, Laws and alumni of FEC and FSC. He notes the FEC and FSC perspectives are desirable to discuss where difficulty in interpretation currently exists. James further nominates Vitray as an FEC alumnus. Boles asks about tension between the presence of a librarian on the committee and the fact the library faculty do not teach and are not assessed with this mechanism. James responds “if there is not tension, it is not Rollins.” James further notes PSC already discussed librarians and teaching. Joyner asks the record to show the interim provost recognizes the issue of librarians and teaching as an important issue which needs to be taken seriously as should the status of librarians as teaching faculty. She elaborates that although librarians do not teach and do not compete with other departments for lines, the A&S faculty budget pays for their lines, and thus this is money unavailable for other A&S faculty. Joyner also states that although the status of librarians as faculty or non-faculty is split 50/50 nationally, most of peer and aspirant institutions do not have librarians with faculty status. James responds that at least at this point it seems FSC has dealt fairly with librarians and perhaps there will be a document to measure librarianship. Joyner asserts such a document will require by-law changes. James then notes Homrich is working on a CIE for graduate programs. James introduces a resolution “to create an ad hoc

subcommittee with members from each division, a librarian and alumni from FSC and FEC to pursue how to evaluate for teaching effectiveness.” Levis seconds and the motion passes.

B. Procedure for facilitating discussion of the structural relationship of the Provost office to the Dean of Faculty office – Foglesong explains EC and the faculty must respond to a request from Duncan on whether to engage in a discussion on the relationship and if so how to proceed. Foglesong notes Duncan suggests using a consultant firm to facilitate conversations and educate about models from other institutions. Foglesong elaborates this discussion might occur simultaneously with the search. He inquires whether this is a good idea, but also notes the desire to discuss the structural relationship received support at the colloquium. Foglesong further notes EC did hold such colloquia in the spring but these sessions were poorly attended. Boles inquires about Casey’s point last fall and the previous spring that the evaluation of the provost is not in the jurisdiction of the faculty because the provost does not report to faculty but rather to trustees. Levis responds the faculty has evaluated presidents and provosts in the past. He elaborates that the faculty frequently is involved in the discussions regarding administrators’ work and some presidents and provost responded positively. Levis further notes Casey’s statement might be wrong. Foglesong adds, however, that the bylaws do not give the faculty the right to change the administrative structure. Boles asks who initiated the discussion regarding the structural relationship and Levis replies the faculty based upon dissatisfaction. Wellman suggests it is good to see how other schools operate. Davison identifies potential problems related to the discussion. She notes that a discussion of structures and functions during the search process might dissuade strong candidates. She further contends that if an outcome of the discussion is to move toward a single provost or dean, then the search seems to be irrelevant because Duncan has stated he has promised Joyner a job as dean. Easton comments this is an important point which demands consideration. Boles concurs. Levis explains that a problem with the provost position is the provost tends to hold Crummer and A&S as equals. Levis further expresses concern about the cost of employing a consulting firm. Davison again notes the potential problem of holding a search prior to deciding whether to consolidate the position, in which case there need not be a search. Wellman states only one person is guaranteed a job and that is Joyner. Foglesong summarizes that these are important issues but the question is whether to send the issue to the faculty for discussion where hopefully Duncan can respond to these concerns. Boles moves “we shall take to the faculty the question whether to employ a consulting firm to facilitate discussions regarding structural relationships and to advise the faculty about models at comparable schools.” James seconds and the resolution passes.

C. Formation of a Provost Search Committee – Foglesong announces Duncan agrees with the formation of a search committee. Easton inquires about the

necessity of a search committee if Duncan intends to employ a search firm, and Foglesong responds the firm only facilitates the process. Boles asks about the size of the search committee and suggests perhaps a slate of two people from each division. Foglesong agrees and notes the importance of balance based upon gender and rank. EC considers various names for a slate and agree upon Dexter Boniface, Bob Moore or Scott Hewit from Social Sciences, Nancy Decker, Martha Cheng or Rosana Diaz from Humanities; Susan Libby, Gloria Cook or Rachel Simmons from Arts; and Bruce Stephenson, Jay Yellen or Pedro Bernal from the Sciences.

D. James introduces the question from FEC regarding relief given the caseload through the appointment of another member. Foglesong responds this requires a by-law change. James asks whether a 1-year exception might be made. Foglesong elaborates the issue is not only that of the by-law change but also maintaining fairness for all candidates. The issue only can be addressed through a faculty vote on a proposed by-law change.

VI. Adjournment—The meeting adjourns at 1:51pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Joan Davison
Vice President/Secretary

Appendix 1

SLC'S PROPOSED STATEMENT OF HONOR

A few words

A word of explanation about the following proposal from SLC: A few years ago the Academic Honor Code (crafted by SLC) was passed. However, there was no charge of that committee to create a Social Honor Code. Shortly after the approval of the Academic Honor Code, the SLC began working on a Social Honor Code with various stops and starts along the way. In the Fall of 2009 (following on actions of the SLC and SGA over the past few years) the SLC created a subcommittee to craft a Social Honor Code. The committee was composed of two faculty members: Creston Davis and William Boles; two Student Affairs staff members: Brent Turner and Diane Willingham; and two SGA members: Alex Brown, and Allison Wallrapp.

The subcommittee soon realized that in the approved Academic Honor Code there was already a proviso in the matriculation pledge that covered some aspects of social behavior —“*by behaving responsibly, respectfully and honorably in my social life and in my relationships with others.*” In addition, the subcommittee acknowledged that we already have a mechanism in place via the Office of Community Standards and Responsibility

that deals with issues of social infractions just as we have a mechanism to deal with academic infractions. It was not our charge to challenge the framework or change the dynamics of either system. (If there are issues, then that is for a different committee to explore.)

Instead, we limited our pursuit to two points: 1.) creating an umbrella statement of Honor that would cover academic and social elements at Rollins College and 2.) tweaking the commencement pledge to address a few more social elements.

In addition, we did not feel it was within our subcommittee's purview to define what the specific values of the college are, especially since there is an ongoing discussion of what it is that we actually want to stand for as an academic institution. Hence, we opted for more general terms of honor rather than specifics. (If the faculty or college wants to pursue more specific language, then SLC will gladly take up the issue, but we believe our current Statement of Honor is a solid first step in providing a statement about our institution's commitment to Honor in general.)

Our Statement of Honor was drawn from language that the faculty and SGA had already accepted when they approved the Academic Honor Code.

If approved, Student Life proposes that the Statement of Honor become part of the fabric of our community just as the Academic Honor Pledge currently is. It could be placed prominently on our web page, in Residence Halls, in the Campus Center, on admission documents, and on banners displayed on the light posts that dot the campus (once the campus turns 126 years old).

On the following pages, you will first find the current description of our Academic Honor Code, taken from the web site.

You then will find our proposal. All the changes we propose are in bold.

CURRENT DOCUMENTATION ON WEB SITE FOR ACADEMIC HONOR CODE

The Philosophy of the Academic Honor Code

Integrity and honor are central to the Rollins College mission to educate its students for responsible citizenship and ethical leadership. Rollins College requires adherence to a code of behavior that is essential for building an academic community committed to excellence and scholarship with integrity and honor. Students, faculty, staff, and administration share the responsibility for building and sustaining this community.

Each student matriculating into Rollins College must become familiar with the Academic Honor System. The College requires that students be able and willing to accept the rights and responsibilities of honorable conduct, both as a matter of personal integrity and as a

commitment to the values to which the College community commits itself. It is the responsibility of instructors to set clear guidelines for authorized and unauthorized aid in their courses. It is the responsibility of students to honor those guidelines and to obtain additional clarification if and when questions arise about possible violations of the Honor Code.

The Honor Pledge and Reaffirmation

Membership in the student body of Rollins College carries with it an obligation, and requires a commitment, to act with honor in all things. The student commitment to uphold the values of honor - honesty, trust, respect, fairness, and responsibility - particularly manifests itself in two public aspects of student life. First, as part of the admission process to the College, students agree to commit themselves to the Honor Code. Then, as part of the matriculation process during Orientation, students sign a more detailed pledge to uphold the Honor Code and to conduct themselves honorably in all their activities, both academic and social, as a Rollins student. A student signature on the following pledge is a binding commitment by the student that lasts for his or her entire tenure at Rollins College:

The development of the virtues of Honor and Integrity are integral to a Rollins College education and to membership in the Rollins College community. Therefore, I, a student of Rollins College, pledge to show my commitment to these virtues by abstaining from any lying, cheating, or plagiarism in my academic endeavors and by behaving responsibly, respectfully and honorably in my social life and in my relationships with others.

This pledge is reinforced every time a student submits work for academic credit as his/her own. Students shall add to the paper, quiz, test, lab report, etc., the handwritten signed statement

“On my honor, I have not given, nor received, nor witnessed any unauthorized assistance on this work.”

Material submitted electronically should contain the pledge; submission implies signing the pledge.

The Student Life Committee Proposed Change (all changes in bold)

Rollins College Statement of Honor

In order to preserve a community of trust and respect, we are actively committed to honesty, fairness, and responsibility.

The Philosophy of the Honor System

Integrity and honor are central to the Rollins College mission to educate its students for responsible citizenship and ethical leadership. Rollins College requires adherence to a code of behavior that is essential for building an academic community committed to excellence and scholarship with integrity and honor. Students, faculty, staff, and administration share the responsibility for building and sustaining this community.

Each student matriculating into Rollins College must become familiar with the Honor System. The College requires that students be able and willing to accept the rights and responsibilities of honorable conduct both as a matter of personal integrity and as a commitment to the values to which the College community commits itself. It is the responsibility of instructors to set clear guidelines for authorized and unauthorized aid in their courses. It is the responsibility of students to honor those guidelines and to obtain additional clarification if and when questions arise about possible violations of the Honor Code. **Academic violations will be handled by the Academic Honor Council, while non-academic situations will be handled by the Office of Community Standards and Responsibility.**

The Honor Pledge

Membership in the student body of Rollins College carries with it an obligation, and requires a commitment, to act with honor in all things. The student commitment to uphold the values of honor - honesty, trust, respect, fairness, and responsibility - particularly manifests itself in two public aspects of student life. First, as part of the admission process to the College, students agree to commit themselves to the Honor Code. Then, as part of the matriculation process during Orientation, students sign a more detailed pledge to uphold the Honor Code and to conduct themselves honorably in all their activities, both academic and social, as a Rollins student. A student signature on the following pledge is a binding commitment by the student that lasts for his or her entire tenure at Rollins College:

The development of the virtues of Honor and Integrity are integral to a Rollins College education and to membership in the Rollins College community. Therefore, I, a student of Rollins College, pledge to show my commitment to these virtues by abstaining from any lying, cheating, or plagiarism in my academic endeavor, by behaving responsibly, respectfully and honorably in my social life and in my relationships with others, and by respecting the campus environment and the property of all members of the college community.

The academic component of this pledge is reinforced every time a student submits work for academic credit as his/her own. Students shall add to the paper, quiz, test, lab report, etc., the handwritten signed statement

“On my honor, I have not given, nor received, nor witnessed any unauthorized assistance on this work.”

Material submitted electronically should contain the pledge; submission implies signing the pledge.