

10-4-2012

Minutes, Arts and Sciences Executive Committee Meeting, Thursday, October 4, 2012

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 4, 2012" (2012). *Executive Committee Minutes*. Paper 22.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ec/22

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.

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

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

- I. Call to Order.
- II. Approve the Minutes from the last Executive Committee meeting (9-13-12).
The minutes are approved.
- III. Old Business
 - A. Institutional Planning Documents (A & S faculty response and priorities). Jill Jones states that this issue is an urgent one since the Board of Trustees is meeting soon. She states that the A&S faculty colloquia revealed some important points of consensus among the A&S faculty, specifically support for the new General Education system and support for a 5+1 teaching load interpreted as a minimum 3-2 teaching load where the +1 can be teaching a sixth course but also can be used as release time for other priorities such as RCC. Carol Bresnahan asks if this means that some faculty would be teaching 4 courses. Discussion follows. There is broad consensus in the committee that, no, this is not the intention. Rather the idea is that the +1 would be like a “supercourse” in that it would count as two classes. Carol states that the terminology “supercourse” is rather vague so she would use a different terminology. Jill states that there was confusion in the first colloquium about the terminology. Toni Holbrook states that the terminology is still misleading. Claire suggests that we could think of it more as a 6-course load, but specify that some courses, very demanding or innovative courses, count as two. Bob Smither asks how this will work. Who will approve this? Will it be PSC? Claire suggests that PSC could come up with a list of what counts as “+1.” Bob Smither asks if there would be a time limit on this. Ben Varnum states his concern that some of the smaller majors could be hurt by reduced course offerings if professors earn additional release time. Jill states that she does not believe this will be a problem because departments think in terms of departmental needs first and college-wide needs second. Toni asks if we will also look at major requirements since some majors are very large in terms of required courses. Claire states that another idea would be to reduce the physical education requirement. Toni asks what will happen with RCC compensation, will it be subsumed by the course release. Jill states, yes, that would be

quite reasonable to count the release as compensation. Toni asks if the +1 could include service-related activities. Claire asks who would make this determination; she suggests that perhaps PSC could make the first attempt to define +1 and we could go from there. Carol states that this policy can only happen if we go ahead with a reduction to 128 hours. She states that she has reviewed the numbers with President Duncan and that the 5+1 proposal is financially feasible with the savings from the reduced course load. Toni, returning to her point about service counting as part of the +1, states that assessment is an example. She states that assessment is not administrative. She states that it has to come from the faculty. She states that successful SACS assessment in 2014 will also take concerted work on the part of the faculty. SACS will be looking for a “sustained pattern” of assessment. She states that we need to get started this semester, very quickly. Bob Smither states that his understanding with the RAARs was that Rollins only provided a sample to SACS. Toni confirms that, yes, this is true. However, she states that she does not believe a sample is going to be sufficient moving forward with SACS. Jill, returning to the 5+1 issue, states that she is pleased that the Provost’s office supports the concept of the 5+1 load.

IV. New Business

- A. Toni and Carol: Evidence of Learning Team. Carol Bresnahan states that we need this team in place to develop a template to meaningfully assess learning outcomes. She states that this is really important in terms of SACS accreditation. Carol states that this committee needs to be staffed by people who can get things done. Claire states that she has a procedural question. If we approve this slate, what happens if someone does not agree to serve? Carol states that, in that case, she would pass the name by EC. Claire asks if there are individuals that have been overlooked in coming up with this list. Toni states that the names were chosen with scholarly collaboration in mind. Jill asks if we support this. Claire states that she has a concern that there should be a liaison with this committee and AAC and PSC. Carol Bresnahan states that she is open to this idea; she asks if there are individuals that AAC or PSC could recommend. Toni agrees; she states that the more voices, the better. Toni states that the goal is to develop a template at the divisional level. Bob Smither asks what CPS representation exists on this group. Toni states that Jim McLaughlin (Education) would represent CPS. Holt and Crummer are also represented. The Executive Committee approves the proposed slate.
- B. PSC

1. EC vote on the Resolution to change the wording of A&S bylaw Article VIII, Section 1 Bylaws change: *Resolved, to change the wording of A&S bylaw Article VIII, Section 1, "The Dean shall not recommend the appointment of anyone of whom a majority of the tenured and tenure-track members of the appointee's department or program disapproves. If a new appointment must be made when a majority of the members of the department or program cannot be consulted, the Dean may recommend no more than a one-year visiting appointment." The new wording of the bylaw will state: "The Dean shall not recommend the appointment of anyone of whom a majority of the tenured and tenure-track members of the appointee's department does not approve."* Jill states that she has personal experience with this issue and that it can cause significant departmental problems. Carol states that this document was drafted before email existed and some of the language is now irrelevant as a result. Jill states that this proposal has already been approved by PSC. The Executive Committee unanimously endorses the resolution.
 2. New FSAR form. The committee considers PSC's recommended changes to the FSAR form. Bob Smither asks about the language under grants. What does it mean for a grant proposal to be "out"? He states that "submitted" is a better word. Carol on a similar point suggests that the language under grants be better specified. She notes that "unfunded" grants are different from "submitted" grants which might still be funded. The committee suggests that Bob incorporate more specific language to discuss grant proposals.
- C. F&S proposal to increase travel funds. Bob Moore states that the F&S committee has reviewed travel budget figures from the Dean's office. He states that the travel budget has not gone up since the early 1990s. He is proposing that the travel budget for individual faculty members be increased from 1200/1500 (domestic/international) to 1900/2400. A second part of the proposal is changing the participation requirements from 100% and 80% to 100% and 70%. Jill states that she does not like the 80% or 70% rule. Bob Smither states that everyone recognizes that the static travel allowance is a problem at Rollins since it has not been adjusted for so many years. He states that Bill Short is looking into ACS practices. For example, he notes that at Rhodes faculty get a flat \$2000 and any unspent remainder carries over. Bob Moore states that the carry-over system could have strange consequences if certain faculty never use their travel money; could they accumulate thousands of dollars or should there be a limit? Ben Varnum asks if it will be a first-come, first-serve model. The committee agrees with Bob Smither that we should do further research before adopting the current proposal since there may

be better alternatives out there for enhancing faculty travel budgets. The proposal is tabled pending further discussion.

D. AAC

1. Adding a GPA requirement to minors. AAC proposes that there should be a GPA threshold for minors like there is for majors. EC endorses the change unanimously.
2. Motion for establishing relationship of General Education and AAC. Claire reviews what has happened since the faculty retreat, before a Director (Mark Anderson) was chosen. She states that there has been some concern about this issue. She has met with Mark and they worked together on a resolution specifying the relationship between AAC and the General Education Director. The resolution passes.

E. The Executive Council. Jill states that, in spite of being summoned, nothing has happened with the Executive Council; the process appears to be stalled. Carol states that she will follow-up and see what is happening.

F. Bylaws. Claire brings up another issue. She states that the A&S bylaws on-line are still not the correct version. She states that this is a serious problem since the bylaws specify important procedures such as faculty appeals and some of the information on-line is incorrect. Jill states that an additional problem exists with respect to email lists. Carol asks who owns the lists. Bob Smither states that that is the problem-nobody seems to know the answer.

V. Committee Reports

A. Student Government. Ben reports that they are implementing Robert Rules for student government meetings. Furthermore, they are revising the government constitution. They are also appointing three new senators since three resigned. Ben states that the students are also planning to discuss the Institutional Planning documents for 2012-2015. Jill asks if Ben received the documents summarizing the colloquia. Ben states that he did. He asks Carol what information he can share with students. Carol states that the information is already on the webpage and is therefore public.

VI. Adjournment. The meeting is adjourned at 1:41pm.