

12-4-2012

## Minutes, Arts and Sciences Executive Committee Meeting, Tuesday, December 4, 2012

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, Tuesday, December 4, 2012" (2012). *Executive Committee Minutes*. Paper 19.  
[http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as\\_ec/19](http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ec/19)

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).

**Minutes**  
**Executive Committee Meeting**  
**December 4, 2012**

In attendance: Jill Jones, Dexter Boniface, Joan Davison, Claire Strom, Dan Crozier, Bob Moore, Ben Varnum, Bob Smither and Carol Bresnahan.

- I. Call to Order. The meeting is called to order at 2pm.
- II. Approve the Minutes from the last Executive Committee meeting. The minutes from November 15 are approved.
- III. Announcements
  - a. Carol Bresnahan states that the Executive Council has met to discuss how to proceed with Rollins' Strategic Planning initiative; specifically, how to gain faculty input. Acting on the recommendations of the Executive Council, the administration is planning a half-day Strategic Planning Retreat. This will take place on Tuesday, January 29 at 330 Fairbanks beginning at noon and lasting until 4:30pm. An email announcement will be forthcoming. Carol notes that this retreat could also contribute to Rollins' accreditation application with SACS, especially identifying what the next QEP should be for Rollins.
- IV. Business
  - a. Mission Statement. The preamble of Rollins' all-college bylaws states that, "*Rollins is a comprehensive liberal arts college. Rollins is nationally recognized for its distinctive undergraduate Arts & Sciences program.*" To accommodate recent structural changes (i.e., CPS), Dexter Boniface proposes that the college mission statement be modified as follows: "*Rollins is a comprehensive liberal arts college featuring distinctive residential undergraduate programs in Arts & Sciences and Professional Studies.*" A motion to approve the revised

statement is made and seconded. The A&S Executive Committee endorses the proposed change (none opposed).

- b. **AAC: 128 Credit Hour Proposal** (see Attachment #1). Claire Strom reviews AAC's proposal for how to reduce the graduation requirement from 140 to 128 hours. Claire clarifies that, under this proposed system, labs would not count for credit hours for students; they would be part of the class that they are associated with. Bob Moore asks about five hour classes, in language for instance. Claire states that 4-hour and 5-hour classes would be treated the same. She notes that Nancy Decker from Modern Languages was on the committee that drafted this proposal and did not object. Another change is Physical Education classes being reduced. Claire states that a few concerns emerged: meeting staffing needs, guaranteeing that divisions benefit equally from the proposed change, and the fact that Holt charges by credit hours and would lose money under this new system if nothing else changes. Carol Bresnahan comments that she has discussed this issue with Holt Dean Dave Richards and believes a solution can be reached; there would be a monetary loss for Holt only if nothing else changes. Joan Davison raises a procedural question: shouldn't this issue be discussed at the Department Chairs level before going before the faculty tomorrow? Jill Jones asks for clarification about why some faculty believe they would not benefit as much as others. Claire states that one challenge is RCC. From a departmental perspective, when a faculty member teaches RCC, the department loses a class in the department; under this proposal, the department would lose two classes (RCC +1). Some departments may not be able to lose two classes and still meet their departmental course offering needs. This problem appears to be particularly acute in certain science departments. Claire states, furthermore, that this problem could be compounded by the new General Education system since departments will be asked to teach entirely new courses; she states that these two changes create contradictory impulses. Joan Davison notes that, for this reason, there needs to be a compensation option for faculty that cannot take a course release. Bob Smither states that if there is high demand for certain classes, science faculty could perhaps utilize adjuncts and therefore take a release. Jill Jones states that in many departments there is opposition to the idea of having adjuncts or visiting faculty teach the department's core classes. Ben Varum states that one of his biggest concerns is that students would not be

able to get the classes they need in their major. He notes that the idea of having adjuncts fill the gap is not what students would expect. He worries that this could be a move in the wrong direction as adjuncts may have lower standards than full-time faculty. Ben states that faculty need to convince the students that these changes will improve Rollins' education; students' perceptions are important, and most students have not been a part of this conversation, and will not understand the rationale for the changes. Joan states that she is sympathetic to Ben's concern but states that the old system was not accomplishing what it sought. She notes that the new system would liberate students to take more elective classes. Claire underscores Ben's point that communication between the faculty and students is needed for these changes to be successful. Ben agrees. He states that students are not well informed now. Joan states that with the 5+ system, nobody is worse off, and many faculty will be better off, and these are important points to emphasize. Bob Smither states that these three changes – 128, 5+ and General Education – are all inter-related; therefore, thinking through these changes is going to take more time than it would if we analyzed each proposal in isolation.

- c. **PSC: 5 + 1 proposal** (see Attachment #2). Joan reviews PSC's proposal. She notes that the committee had a discussion about whether or not Neighborhood classes should count; the committee endorsed this idea with the understanding that these classes would be new courses, and faculty members would spend time integrating and assessing courses as well as focusing on the attached LEAP outcomes. Therefore, these courses are not re-packaged classes from the old General Education system. Carol Bresnahan asks about Honors RCC, would that count as "plus" since it is RCC, even though it is Honors and team-taught. Joan states that this specific question did not come up, but PSC is not warm to the idea of team-teaching given the assessments provided by James Zimmerman. Carol asks if the RCC status would trump the fact that Honors and team-taught courses are off the list. Joan states that it probably would. When looking at such details, she notes that perhaps this is for the Dean to decide, and PSC developed broad policy. Joan adds that one of the tricky issues is whether instructors and lecturers would be eligible for a +1 course release; the committee reasoned that the plus program should only apply to tenured and tenure-track faculty, but that the Dean is free to contract lecturers, instructors and visitors as he believes best meets the

College's needs. PSC understood the Dean could decide to contract a visitor for a 5Plus with responsibilities in RCC or the Neighborhoods, and PSC certainly supports a 5 Plus for such faculty members. Bob Smither asks if there is a 5+ opportunity for everyone who wants one. Joan states that the list is extensive since it reflects all of the different interests and divisional perspectives of the varied people on the committee. Claire states her concern that the list is too extensive. She is concerned that this will not help RCC, which she believes should be a priority for such a proposal. Joan agrees. She states that her personal preference would be for CE, RCC and Neighborhood courses to be the main priorities, not student trips, tutorials, and field studies; however, she notes that these latter activities are a special priority for others on the committee. Claire and Joan agree other methods to compensate for student trips, tutorials and field studies already exist. Bob Smither asks a hypothetical question. What if 5+1 passes, and the General Education system is not up and ready, would this system still make sense? Joan states, yes, that it would provide a great incentive for RCC. Bob Smither notes that many people have already signed up to teach RCC. Do they deserve this bonus, or would a new call need to be sent out noting this incentive? Joan states that she sees no problem with rewarding those that have already made the commitment of teaching in RCC given the sacrifice this implies. In any case, she states that the goal is not ultimately a monetary one (though she notes that faculty do respond to material incentives), but rather the goal is to give faculty the time to do important things well. Jill states that faculty teaching a 5+1 should not teach an overload; this seems to defeat the purpose Joan just articulated. The committee agrees with Jill. Joan asks about short courses and MLS courses; are these considered "overload" too? She notes that these are the types of details that the committee dreads because a system such as this could get very complex. Jill Jones states on the record that she does not support the bottom three items (student trips, independent studies and field studies) counting as "plus one." She supports the top three: CE, RCC and Neighborhood courses. Joan asks if we say "no overloads," does this count summer school. The committee reasons that summer classes would not count as overload but would be treated separately. Joan asks how she should proceed. Claire proposes that we need more dialogue before bringing this to the faculty at large. She suggests that perhaps AAC, PSC and the Dean's Office could meet collectively along with divisional stakeholders, before bringing this to the faculty.

- d. **General Education.** Joan states that she has an issue with the General Education proposal discussed by Mark Anderson at the last faculty meeting. She believes that the original proposal was superior to the one Mark discussed. In particular, she does not think the onus should be on faculty to justify teaching in their own division—rather, the form should only be required of faculty teaching outside their division. Joan states that rather than changing all the rules for everyone, the faculty should create an exception for the small number that this would apply to. Joan specifically suggests a system in which faculty members who wish a course to count in a division of which they are outside, then petition AAC and the chair of the department to which the course best relates, for permission for the course to count in the particular division. In this way only courses coming from outside of a particular division, rather than all proposed courses, will require review. Claire asks how voting against Mark’s proposal would be perceived by CPS. Claire states that she worries that CPS will perceive the situation as unequal if they have to go through some sort of approval process that other faculty normally do not. Jill states that CPS is a separate college and therefore is not in our divisional structure. Joan adds that at most schools like Rollins general education is housed in A&S, not in career-oriented schools. Joan further elaborates that CPS members could either use the suggested process to seek approval as a particular divisional course, or they could apply to teach the fifth course.
- e. Bob Smither requests that he be able to make an announcement at tomorrow’s A&S Faculty meeting.

V. Adjournment. The meeting is adjourned at 3:30pm.

VI. Student Government Report (sent by email).

Ben Varnum reports that the Student Government Association (SGA) held the final first semester meeting on November 28, 2012. At the meeting, SGA invited Dr. Claire Strom to speak about the proposed reduction in credit hours for A&S/CPS students as well as answer a few questions about General Education changes. Though a number of clarifications were made

regarding the changes, there was not a clear consensus as to whether the students agreed or disagreed with the ideas that were explained. A number of questions revolved around the end objective of these shifts on the mission of the college and the overall experience of students. Since the last report, the SGA has passed legislation to encourage faculty/staff participation in SGA meetings at an open forum to increase conversations about student needs, to solidify a connection between our Exploring Rollins Traditions committee and the R Pride Traditions committee in hopes of strengthening campus pride, to further increase organizational transparency through posting minutes and legislation to Facebook, and to support the Holliday Fun Fest through encouraging student attendance and sponsoring gifts for children. An amendment to the SGA Constitution was introduced and passed to fix outdated information regarding the positions and responsibilities of the Executive Board members.

# **ATTACHMENT #1**

## **128 Credits**

### **Mandate:**

AAC was asked to figure out how to make 128 credits work. It has come up with the following plan. However, the committee strongly urges PSC to return to consideration of the 5+ and address the concerns listed below.

### **128 Credits**

#### **Assumptions**

128 credits to graduate  
No fewer than 32 classes to graduate  
No class worth more than 4 credits  
Needs to be paired with 5+

#### **Problems**

Faculty load needs to be divorced from student load

#### **Solution**

Student load = 3 hours or more class time per week = 4 credit class  
Faculty load = 3 hours or more class time per week = 4 credit class  
Labs under 2 hours per week = 1 credit hour  
Labs over 2 hours per week = 2 credit hours

Regular load for students = 16 credits

Regular load for faculty = 12 credits

#### **Other Requirements**

Drop 1 required PEA class  
Reduce the number of PE credits allowed for graduation from 8 to 6

---

### **Concerns with 5+**

#### **Staffing**

If the 5+ involves a course release for faculty teaching certain classes and if it will be paid for by a reduction in adjuncts and visitors how will departments meet their staffing needs? AAC recommends that this be discussed by department chairs before moving to a full faculty discussion.

#### **Sciences and Expressive Arts**

Different teaching model in sciences and expressive arts with more specific classes being required for major  
Some faculty can teach + classes but CANNOT take course release  
Some faculty CANNOT teach + classes because of serving majors  
Thus, the 5+ would offer benefits to some faculty that cannot be shared by others.

#### **Finances**

If \$3,500 is offered in lieu of a course release, will the college be able to afford it?  
Holt currently charges its students on a per credit basis. Reducing the credits to 128 will reduce the income generated by Holt by about \$3,000 per student (per Sharon Lusk).



## **ATTACHMENT #2**

### **PSC RECOMMENDATION: 5PLUS**

PSC addressed the 5 PLUS to determine what would constitute a PLUS. PSC agreed upon the following:

- CE courses
- RCC
- Neighborhood courses (but not W, F, Q although these were debated; PSC ultimately the Neighborhood courses required integrated learning, theme activities, incorporation of appropriate LEAP outcomes, and assessment)
- Student Trips (domestic or international)
- Tutorials, Independent Studies and Honor Theses exceeding 4/year
- Field Studies not currently counted (the committee was aware of current special status for Marine Biology and Environmental Science)

PSC decided that each faculty member would earn either the 5+ or \$3500 after teaching in any one of these categories, but each faculty member could only receive the 5+ or the \$3500. PSC agreed that current stipends for the RCC would be eliminated. PSC appreciated some faculty members might benefit more from this system than other faculty members, but agreed no faculty member would fare worse.

PSC recognized it could not resolve every possibility associated with the 5+, but did agree that the 5+ only applies to tenured and tenure track faculty members. PSC reasoned that lecturers are separately contracted to specific teaching tasks. PSC further concluded (although less comfortably) that this also is true regarding visiting faculty members and artists-in-residence. (If the dean wishes a non-tenure track faculty member to teach an RCC or Neighborhood, then the dean could adjust the individual contract accordingly; PSC supports the concept of such adjustments.)