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I. Call to Order. 12:34pm.

II. Approval of the minutes from the 4-27-11 and 5-4-11 faculty meetings. A motion to pass the minutes from 4-27-11 is moved and seconded. The minutes are approved. A motion to pass the minutes from 5-4-11 is moved and seconded. The minutes are approved.

Carol Lauer makes a motion to suspend the rules to allow a motion from the floor. The motion is approved. Barry Levis rises on behalf of junior and senior faculty to propose a resolution from the floor. The resolution states: “It is with regret that the Arts and Sciences Faculty must censure President Lewis Duncan for his disrespect of Rollins’ principles of shared governance by establishing a new school and altering the senior administrative structure without consulting or providing due diligence to the Faculty.” The motion is approved. Sharon Carnahan calls to question. The motion to call to question is seconded. The motion to call to question passes. Carol Lauer asks for a point of clarification: what is the meaning of “censure”? Joan Davison responds that a censure is different from a vote of no confidence. The intent of a censure is not to remove the individual but rather to express that the faculty as a body has been disrespected by one of its members. In this case, the objective is to formally communicate
that the process of establishing a new school and altering the administrative structure ignored faculty views and rules. Bob Moore asks an additional point of information: who can vote on this resolution? Parliamentarian Socky O’Sullivan responds by quoting the A&S bylaws. The bylaws state that voting membership includes “all those holding full-time positions as instructors, assistant professors, associate professors, and professors, who are appointed either to academic departments of the College, to the Hamilton Holt School, or to the library and whose primary responsibility is to teach in the College of Arts and Sciences; Arts and Sciences administrators with faculty rank or holding tenure at Rollins College; Directors, librarians, and department chairs with faculty rank.” A paper ballot is requested and automatically granted. Jill Jones asks supporters of the resolution to vote “Yes” and those opposed to vote “No.” Ballots are distributed. Jonathan Miller asks for a point of clarification: will the results of the vote be announced? Jill responds that she would be glad to announce the numbers as soon as they are available. The results are later reported as follows: the resolution to censure President Duncan passes by a vote of 81 in favor, 10 opposed and 6 abstentions.

III. Governance Balloting. Jill Jones states that the bylaws require at least ten days of notice before the faculty approve governance slates. She requests a motion to suspend the rules to expedite the voting process. Joe Siry moves to suspend the rules. The motion is seconded and approved. Jill moves that the faculty approve the FEC slate. A motion is made to approve the slate by verbal acclamation. The motion is seconded and approved. Bob Sherry is approved by verbal acclamation to the FEC for a 2-year term. Jill asks if there are any nominations from the floor for the Finance and Service committee. There are no nominations. Hoyt Edge moves that Paul Reich be voted by acclamation for a two-year term. The motion is seconded and approved. Paul Reich is approved by acclamation. Jill notes that there is also a one-year term for the Finance committee. Carol Lauer moves that Twila Papay be accepted by acclamation. The motion is seconded and approved. Twila is approved by acclamation. Jill announces that there are two vacancies on the Academic Affairs Committee for a two-year term and a one-year term. Jana Mathews is on the ballot for a two-year vacancy. Tom Cook asks that the candidates stand. There are two candidates for the one-year vacancy: Steve Klemann and Mark Anderson. The AAC ballot is distributed. It is later announced that Jana Matthews and Mark Anderson have been elected.

Jill announces that she would like to welcome the new faculty and administrators to Rollins College and asks that they stand and identify themselves. The new faculty include Anne Murdaugh (Physics), James Klepek (Environmental Studies), Elizabeth Hunt (Library), Peter Selgin (English), Michelle Stecker (History) and Provost Carol Bresnahan.

IV. Committee Reports

a. Academic Affairs (Gloria Cook, Chair). Gloria notes that the suspension of the “N” general education requirement has been affirmed. The AAC committee also approved two modest curricular changes in Music and Latin American & Caribbean Affairs. The committee additionally
approved several International Programs, including the change of provider for the London program, a new study abroad program in Argentina, and the expansion of partnership with SIT that will allow faculty and students to conduct independent research in developing countries. The AAC committee has requested that the curriculum review committee headed by Rachel Simmons present their recommendations to the faculty as these are important for the faculty to consider.

b. Professional Standards (Joan Davison, Chair). The PSC committee met once to set its agenda. Two key agenda items that arose from the meeting are, first, a faculty misconduct policy to guarantee federal compliance and, second, the student-faculty collaborative research program (in particular, the committee is discussing how to maximize the utilization of limited funds since many proposals were not funded last year). PSC business also includes approving various grants; those anticipating a sabbatical should be aware that proposals are due soon.

c. Finance & Service (Joe Siry, Chair). The F&S committee has met once. The committee’s agenda includes looking at lowering the credit hour requirement for graduation, partly in response to Rachel Simmon’s committee’s work. The F&S also has representation on the Campus Budget and Planning committee (a committee of mostly staff and senior administrators as well as the F&S chair and faculty president). One issue under discussion is how much tuition will go up, with figures ranging from 2 to 4 percent. The Board of Trustees is coming to Rollins in October to approve a preliminary budget. Another issue under consideration is merit pay, specifically for Rollins’ staff, where the stated policy is that salary increases are awarded on the basis of merit. Joe also reports that Sodexo (food services) generated a $100,000 surplus. The issue of gender equity is also on the F&S agenda, specifically regarding non-salary pay. Furthermore the committee is considering whether or not Rollins’ staff should have a series of regular meetings (i.e., staff meetings). Last but not least, F&S will look at the financial impact of the 3-2 program between A&S and Crummer. Socky O’Sullivan asks a question about the pool of merit pay, noting that the College of Professional Studies decided to allocate their portion of the escrow. Joe confirms that this is true.

d. Student Life (Jenny Queen, Chair). The Student Life Committee has met once and set its agenda. In addition to the items on today’s agenda, SLC has been looking into the following. First, the posthumous degree policy. Second, dining services. Third, working with PSC on travel policies for students. The committee is also working with ACE on student programming and examining living learning communities, RCC, and residential life, and physical education. A healthy behaviors colloquium is being planned on drug abuse, particularly prescription drug abuse. Also the committee is looking into issues of campus safety, especially in light on the recent campus incident.

e. Executive Committee (Jill Jones, Chair). Jill reports that the Executive Committee sent a letter to the Board of Trustees expressing the faculty’s
displeasure with the President’s abrogation of faculty governance. The Phi Beta Kappa letter was attached to the letter to underscore that this concern was shared by a broader constituency than just the A&S faculty. The AAUP also sent a letter to the Board. Jill states that she feels like we the A&S faculty have expressed ourselves and that she hopes that we can move forward since we have a lot of work to do. Jill reminds the faculty that tomorrow is the deadline to submit amendments to the all-college bylaws to the AHFAC (all-college bylaw review committee). Socky O’Sullivan asks a question: at the all-college faculty meeting, can individual faculty propose amendments (to the amendments of the all-college bylaws) from the floor? Emily Russell, representing AHFAC, responds that the committee is still following Roberts’ Rules of Order. She states that the reason for the request to submit amendments before the all-faculty meeting is merely to streamline the process. Rick Foglesong notes that there is a requirement, separate from Roberts’ Rules, that amendments to the all-college bylaws be announced seven days in advance. Jill Jones notes that this rule exists to ensure that all changes to the bylaws are well thought out. She states that she believes that new bylaws will be adopted whether we pass them or not. Therefore, she believes that we should do our best to pass the best changes we can. Carol Brenahan states that the announcement about the all-college meeting (to discuss the proposed bylaw changes) has not gone out yet. However all faculty should have already received the timeline and proposed bylaw changes from the AHFAC committee since these were sent in an email to all faculty.

V. Other Business

A. **Shall we approve the attached proposal, “Proposal 6,” which issues jointly from SGA and SLC? (see Attachments).** Jenny Queen introduces Drew Doty from Student Government. Jenny reviews the history and rationale for Proposal 6 to establish a campus pub. The resolution has been approved by both SGA and SLC. She notes that senior administrators requested that the resolution come before the A&S faculty. Joe Siry moves that we consider the resolution. The motion is seconded. Carol Lauer asks about insurance. She states how a campus pub would be possible when faculty are not supposed to be drinking in the presence of students. Lisa Tillmann responds that she taught a course in the spring and that she was invited to join her students at the restaurant/bar “Hamburger Mary’s.” She investigated whether doing so was in violation of college policies. She notes that she could not find any rule that specifically prohibits faculty from drinking in the presence of students who are of legal drinking age. Dean of Students Karen Hater notes that an alcohol task force has been formed and that they aim to come up with an all-college alcohol policy (like many other institutions have) to clarify this and other issues. The task force has just sent their final draft of the policy to the President’s Council.
(a committee of senior administrators) for their approval. The draft proposal addresses the issues that Carol has asked about. Karen states that Lisa is correct: there is no strict prohibition on faculty being in the presence of students who are drinking legally. Sharon Carnahan asks why this is a good idea in the eyes of SGA and SLC? Drew Doty responds that there was student uproar about campus alcohol policy last year. One part of the policy they wanted to change was to permit open containers of alcohol in the lounge areas of dormitories. He states that opening up lounge areas on campus, where students can drink responsibly, would actually deter students from binge drinking off campus or in their rooms where they often drink quickly before returning to socialize in the dorm’s public spaces. He states that President Duncan rejected this idea (drinking in lounge areas) but that he wouldn’t be opposed to alcohol being sold in the campus center. Furthermore, there is the issue of student athletes being able to eat after hours. The campus pub would give them a place to eat after regular hours and create campus community. Jenny Queen notes that the pub would be part of a broader process of renovation of the student center. Jim Small states that he remembers when we had a pub on campus. He is wondering why we got rid of it. Jenny responds that the change in drinking age from 18 to 21 was one reason the pub was abolished. Barry Levis notes his concern with a campus pub will be controlling access to liquor for underage students since many students of legal age share alcohol with underage students. How do we control this situation? Jenny suggests there could be a wrist band system, or other mechanisms. R. Matilde Mésavage asks what kind of alcohol will be served, and whether there will be a limit. Jenny states that those policies have not all been set. The motion calls for beer and wine only, not a full liquor bar. Furthermore, there are laws restricting over-consumption. Wendy Brandon asks how this connects to the overall campus alcohol policy: are we not a dry campus? Also, she notes that Rollins had a policy where students policed themselves at approved parties. She states that her sense was that these policies were successful in creating responsible drinking behaviors. She is wondering how this connects to these larger issues? Jenny responds that we are not strictly a dry campus because legal drinking is allowed in dormitories. The prohibition is only in dormitories in which everyone is under 21. However, this resolution calls for something different in that Rollins will be selling alcohol. Socky O’Sullivan notes that there are two types of alcohol licenses. Furthermore, when we look at our student body there is a vast number who are over 21 when we consider the size of Holt and Crummer. He notes that the old pub was called the “Tar Pit” and that it was a major social site for faculty-student interaction before and after campus sports events. He states that it was a wonderful way for faculty and students to socialize and students were responsible drinkers. He notes that many colleges in Florida have this. He argues that we can do this and it would significantly improve things here since prohibition does not work. Paul Stephenson states that he supports the resolution. His one concern is how
students would pay for this. He would object to students paying with their r-cards. Drew responds that SGA agrees; students would not be allowed to buy alcohol with their r-cards. Josh Almond states that there are plenty of schools Rollins’ size that do have a campus pub like Beloit College where he taught prior to joining the faculty at Rollins. He argues that a campus pub does not radically change student behavior, but in his experience, it operates very well. Eileen Gregory asks what the financial cost to the campus is and what our legal liability is. She asks if this resolution has gone to the college lawyer. Jenny Queen responds that it is not the purview of the SLC committee to figure this out since the legal issues are administrative ones. She believes the Dean of the College would handle this. Michael Gunter asks if there will be any more opportunities to provide input about the renovations of the campus center. Jenny affirms that there will be more opportunities and that she and Alice Davidson are on the committee with Steve Neilson. Laurel Goj calls the motion to question. The motion to call to question is seconded and passes. The motion to approve the resolution passes.

B. Shall we approve the attached proposal issued from SLC “Attendance Policy to be considered by A&S Faculty”? (see Attachment). Bill Boles moves that the faculty approve the attendance policy proposed by SLC. Joe Siry seconds. Socky O’Sullivan has a point of information: he asks what the definition of legitimate “college business” is, and what is the difference between business on- and off-campus? Students, he notes, often have a broader interpretation than do the professors. Bill Boles clarifies that college business implies something more than a meeting; for example, a soccer match or theater production. Mario D’Amato states that the policy is unnecessarily complex. He would prefer a policy with language that is more of a recommendation to faculty. He states that this is a suggestion not a motion to amend the current policy. Bill Boles responds that the purpose of this policy is to place the responsibility on the students. Jim Small moves to table the motion. The motion to table is seconded. The motion to table passes.

VI. Announcements

1. Jenny Queen notes that the Executive Council is attempting to organize a wine and cheese event with the Board of Trustees. The Board Chairman Duane Ackerman is very excited about the invitation. They have scheduled a half hour for the event. A guest list will be generated rather than having a meeting with 180 faculty and 36 Board members. The Board is now organizing the party.

2. Kenneth Miller (Director of Campus Safety) has an announcement about emergency plans such as hurricanes, tornadoes, and power outages etc. Campus safety has prepared a short tool: a list of key phone numbers, addresses etc. he encourages faculty to pick one up before leaving. It is just one of many tools including print and web-based.
3. Jill Jones announces that Mark Anderson has been elected to AAC along with Jana Mathews.

VII. Adjournment
1. A movement to adjourn is made, seconded and passes. Meeting adjourns at 1:51pm.
ATTACHMENTS

Attendance Policy to be Considered by A&S Faculty

CLASS ATTENDANCE

It is the responsibility of the faculty to publish attendance policies for their courses in the course syllabus. If a distinction is made between "excused" absences and "unexcused" absences, it must be conveyed in the attendance policy. At the instructor's discretion, a student's grade may be lowered for failure to comply with the attendance policy.

Exceptions exist for absences owing to religious observances and college business. If a student misses a class because of either situation, then the student must confer with his/her professor as to how and when the make-up work will be done, which includes the possibility of turning work in early. Absences will be addressed by the faculty member in accordance with his or her attendance policy. A student will not fail a course because the number of religious observances and/or college business absences exceed the number of absences allowed, except if excessive absences make it impossible to fulfill the competencies of the course. The student’s class participation grade in the course, though, may be affected.

--In regard to absences due to religious observances, students must communicate any attendance conflicts to their professor before the end of the official add/drop period.

--In regard to absences due to college business, students must present to their professor written evidence of an upcoming absence as soon as they are aware of the conflict.

It is the student’s responsibility to discuss with his/her professor how and when make-up work should be completed before missing class.

If the student feels s/he must be absent from class for any other reason, it is the student’s responsibility to confer with the faculty member to determine whether the absence is to be considered "excused" or "unexcused" as defined by the attendance policies. The Office of the Dean of Student Affairs will communicate when students must be absent from campus for hospitalization, family emergencies, or similar contingencies. Students will be responsible for all work missed.
SLC & SGA are asking A&S Faculty to consider a resolution supporting SGA’s Resolution #6:

Resolution
Rollins College SGA Senate
Authors: Drew Doty, Philip Leffler, Lito Valdivia, Sam Pieniadz
Sponsor: Lito Valdivia, Philip Leffler, Sam Pieniadz
RESOLUTION NO. 6

Resolution Of The Senate Of Rollins College Student Government Association for the Proposal of Alcoholic Beverages to be Served in what is currently known as Dave’s Down Under.

Whereas, there is a general consensus among students and faculty a like to have a “pub” or an area that serves alcoholic beverages as well as food on campus. This “pub” will be incorporated into the already existing area known as “Dave’s Down Under,” and will serve as a late night dining facility as well as a community lounge.

Whereas, it has come to our attention that there is an issue on campus with “binge drinking,” particularly among underage students. We believe that as an educational institution it is in our best interest to create an area on campus where students and faculty, over the age of 21, can exemplify responsible drinking habits. In an effort to build a sense of community at Rollins, it is important that this area be on campus rather than off. Furthermore, as it has come to our attention that several athletic practices conflict with the current dining hours, we believe that it is the responsibility of the school to also provide a late night dining service.

Whereas, there is already an established “lounge” on the lower level of the Cornell Campus Center, we want to incorporate a more complete and wholesome, late night dining option with the service of alcoholic beverages (beer and wine) in this same area. Furthermore, we would like to incorporate the outdoor patio, between the Alford pool and Dave’s Down Under, as an extension to this “pub.”

Now, Therefore, Be It Resolved, That this governing body will propose to the Dean of Student Affairs, Karen Hater, in collaboration with the “Alcohol Policy Task Force,” that there be a “pub” on campus, located in Dave’s Down Under.