Approved Minutes  
Arts & Sciences Faculty Meeting  
Thursday, October 28, 2010  
12:30 – 2:00 pm


Guests: Jim Gerhardt, Sharon Carrier

I. Call to Order at 12:34 pm

II. Approval of minutes from September 30 faculty meeting

III. Committee reports
A. AAC - Levis reports that Asian Studies major was tabled until the October meeting, and AAC approved the revised Asian Studies major, but the proposal is not ready for the faculty because it still must go through the Executive Committee. He states the new proposal probably will come to the faculty at the November meeting. Levis announces AAC now undertakes an evaluation of Maymester and pre-matriculation programs.
B. F&S – Easton invites questions for the vice presidents’ budget presentation on November 2. She asks faculty members to send their questions to Goj prior to October 29. Easton explains this process of dialogue on the budget will continue throughout the year. Easton also notes the Board of Trustees discussed budget parameters for 2011-2012.
C. PSC- Strom states PSC is reviewing dates for promotion, tenure and post tenure review as well as beginning the process of feedback to administrators which will occur in the spring
D. SLC – Boles reports SLC continues to address the attendance policy and issue of missed course work due to religious holidays and student travel for college business. He explains after SLC crafts a policy it will forward the policy to AAC. Boles states SLC continues with excited conversation regarding the college’s alcohol policy and on and off campus drinking. SLC also is examining the affordability of international field study trips. The new Honor Statement and Social Honor Code from SLC is under review by the college’s lawyers.
E. Announcements – Duncan discusses the construction of the Inn at Rollins and the process of meeting with consultants. The current plan is to construct a hotel with 110 rooms which will provide higher occupancy rates than a larger hotel. The estimate is that the inn will generate $2 million a year in profits after construction debt is paid and about $17 million in the first 10 years of operation. Duncan announces on Tuesday he made a presentation in Maine to the Harold Alfond Foundation and the Foundation agreed to a $12.5 million gift for naming purposes of the inn. The gift carries the requirement that the first 25 years of $50 million of profits, whichever comes last, be placed into an endowment restricted to financial aid for students at Rollins College. Duncan sees the acquisition of this gift, the largest gift excluding bequests in the history of the College, as a triple with the inn, endowment, and financial aid benefitting. Duncan emphasizes the Alfond gift is wonderful and transformative.
F. Provost Search Committee Report – Cohen, the co-chair of the search committee, announces the faculty membership as Cook, Decker, Fuse, Mays, B. Moore, Russell, and B. Stephenson. Cohen states he co-chairs the committee with Eisenbarth and representatives of other constituencies also are members. Cohen reports that on October 14 the committee met with Witt-Kieffer, which the college retained to help with the search. He explains Duncan charged the committee with presenting him with 2-4 fully acceptable but unranked individuals for provost. Cohen states that candidates should possess an earned doctorate and sufficient achievements to be tenured at the rank of full professor, appreciation of liberal arts and experience as a vice president or dean at a peer or aspirant institution. He explains Witt-Kieffer will conduct the initial checks and meet next with the committee on January 19 with a list of candidates who meet the characteristics. The search committee then will narrow the list and hopes to complete the search by the end of February. Cohen adds the committee urged the search firm to supply a diverse group of finalists. Levis asks about the February visitation date and whether this is late particularly given the inconclusive search last year. Cohen says Witt-Kieffer believes the date is early given the start date of the search and believes strong candidates will be available.
F. Report from Dean of Student Affairs Hater – Foglesong explains the bylaws call for the Dean of Student Affairs to supply a report to the faculty
each semester on significant incidents which occur in student life. He introduces Dean Hater for the report. Hater reports two trends seem to characterize serious incidents associated with student life: alcohol mixed with prescription drugs and off campus parties, particularly at downtown clubs. She notes it is a rough start to the year with a Labor Day weekend death at an off campus apartment. Hater explains because the apartment is not in Winter Park, with whom Student Affairs maintains good information sharing, the College has limited information. Hater elaborates that Ken Miller is monitoring the situation and hopes to soon have results from the toxicology and autopsy reports – these reports usually require 8-12 weeks. Hater discusses the problem of alcohol and prescription drugs in relation to two national trends: more college students with mental health issues and more students taking prescription drugs. She notes Rollins has 425 students with documented disabilities, and most are psychological and learning disabilities with students taking prescription drugs for depression, anxiety, and ADHD. Hater cautions the 425 are the students who self-identified to Rollins, but there probably are additional students with diagnoses. Hater explains these students come to college where they sometimes begin to drink with their medications. Last year three students had medical leaves at this point in the semester; this year, 15 have taken medical leaves and four students have been Baker acted, that is involuntarily hospitalized. In two cases, CAPS facilitated the hospitalization and in two cases Winter Park Hospital handled the hospitalization. Hater discusses the volume of students affects CAPS, which on Monday saw 48 students in one day. She states Rollins had 10 medical transports where campus security takes students to the hospital for alcohol and/or drug overdose. She notes the problem takes a toll on the community, especially peer students who are in staff positions as RAs or peer mentors. These students almost are caretakers for other students. Hater explains the concept of responsible action in which a student with alcohol or other problems who calls a peer or campus security for assistance then goes through a different process than the regular community standards. The intention is to help these students and while the number of responsible actions have increased this seems desirable compared to alternatives. Hater concludes regarding the first trend that this is not just the issue of students drinking too much, but that other serious issues including the mix with powerful prescription drugs serious occurs. Hater identifies the second trend is what Boles mentioned in the SLC report and that is alcohol violations. Hater reports violations decreased by 24% from last year (124 violations of which 65% are first year students) but cautions this probably does not mean alcohol use is down but rather moved off campus. Hater explains campus security, resident life and community standards are doing an excellent job of informing and enforcing the alcohol policy, but the result is students are going off campus to drink. Hater qualifies that students over the age of 21 are permitted to drink on campus but not students under 21. Hater emphasizes she is concerned by the trend of clubs which solicit students and pay individual students and organizations to guarantee a number of students to attend a party at a club.
The clubs waive the admission charge, knowing they will make up the money in alcohol sales. The club parties place open bottles on tables for attendees to drink. Students no longer show an id at these clubs; they are admitted as groups and hard alcohol is served. Hater mentions Miller did a great job of researching these parties, which tend to occur on Thursday and Saturday nights. Often when a student is hospitalized, it occurs after this kind of party. Vogel and Willingham now are members of the Orange County Taskforce on Underage Drinking and have told the group about the specific clubs in which little control exists and which hire party promoters and provide busses between campus and the location. Hater states that Rollins has stopped the practice of busses and students are not happy with this decision. Hater concludes Rollins will continue to try to address the trend of off campus drinking and club parties. Harris asks whether Rollins currently holds seniors responsible if they are at a party with underage students. Hater answers if the party is off campus then the residents will be cited for underage drinking. Harris inquires whether anything is stated in community standards about contributing to delinquency. Hater responds Rollins suspended two students for that reason this semester. D’Amato expresses concern the drinking policy is too rigid and that the appropriate standard should be student safety while drinking. Hater states Rollins can not have a college official monitoring underage drinking. D’ Amato says he would rather students watch each other on campus rather than go off campus. Gunter inquires about the task force, working with the city of Winter Park, and the occasional accusation Rollins exports its problems. Hater explains Rollins works well with Winter Park and the current issue involves downtown Orlando. Gunter clarifies his questions and says parties start in off campus houses. Hater responds Rollins receives reports from Winter Park regarding any local problem or issue. Kypraios asks if there is a better alternative and what solutions might work. Hater explains she is discussing with some groups why Student Affairs is concerned with off campus parties and is open to approved on campus parties with beer, or responsible drinking while watching weekend football games. Hater emphasizes the issue is not unique to Rollins. She also notes the new concerns regarding Four Loco, a mix of alcohol and caffeine which is a binge drinkers’ dream. Hater states the drink is frightening and Rollins had its first write up for Four Loco last night. Jones states she appreciates the nuance in Hater’s report and is surprised by the increase in problems as she has a sense of an increase in students who do not want to drink. She asks Hater whether the mix of students causes problem. Hater acknowledges there is a gap between students. Libby inquires whether the increase in students with psychological disorders is a nationwide issue for colleges. Hater responds yes and explains that in some ways it is the success of high schools in working with these students which enables more to attend college. She also notes that in this economy some parents are sending their sons or daughters to state schools but parents of students with disabilities prefer to send them to smaller private colleges which offer greater community and support. Gournelos asks about students sharing drugs and taking multiple pills. Hater admits this is an issue
and more education regarding the danger is necessary. J Davison inquires about the rumored arsons, and Hater says campus security is 99% certain it identified what occurred with the arsons and the young person is no longer on campus. Foglesong asks the faculty if it desires a colloquium on drug and alcohol issues, and the response is positive. D Davison reports Rollins has 425 students with disabilities and this is two and a half times the national average. He notes he has asked peer and aspirant schools about their enrollments to determine whether there is an income effect but the socio-economic demographics of our student body does not seem to explain the number of students with disabilities. Davison acknowledges some faculty members are encountering challenges in class related to responding to students with disabilities and therefore in December a national expert will visit campus to consult on the disabilities program. Additionally on January 14 an afternoon workshop will be held for faculty members to understand the legal responsibilities of faculty members and students. The workshop will include substantial time for a Q&A session. Davison encourages faculty members to reserve the date.

IV. Old Business - none

V. New Business
A. Bylaw amendment regarding FEC confidentiality – Strom moves the bylaw change dealing with FEC confidentiality (See Attachment 1; also sent one week prior to meeting.) Jones asks whether the candidate and FEC can invite other people to the FEC meeting or only FEC. O’Sullivan explains the confidential nature is compromised if the candidate can invite people and FEC might not be able to handle requests for additional meetings from the candidate. Gregory states the mention of the candidate should be eliminated because it is inconsistent with existing bylaws. Strom accepts this change. Foglesong notes the original issue developed after the adoption of the transparency protocol last year. Although FEC was exempted from that protocol, FEC wants this specified in the bylaws. Rubarth asks if the candidate can veto people attending the meeting. O’Sullivan responds the FEC’s work is confidential. Small calls the question which passes. The faculty votes on the motion to change the bylaws which passes by the required 2/3. The amendment bylaw reads: 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 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 bylaw supersedes all other bylaws or faculty handbook rules, which may be contrary.
B. Changes to the process for selecting the A&S Class Valedictorian – Levis reports last year’s valedictorian was a transfer student and a dance major, and substantial discontent developed regarding her selection. Levis explains the current process is simple in which the student with the highest GPA becomes the valedictorian, but some students feel transfer students should not be eligible. He elaborates AAC considered this proposal but many of our best students bring AP and IB courses and deciding upon a transfer rule did not seem possible. AAC then decided to recognize a student as valedictorian based upon the mission statement of the College. (See Attachment 2.) The process would invite all students who at the end of the fall semester are eligible for summa cum laude to apply for the position of valedictorian. Applicants would submit two faculty member recommendations and a recommendation from someone familiar with their service, broadly defined; the AAC might interview students to assess their speaking ability. Levis states the AAC faculty membership would select the valedictorian. Levis notes currently no college document specifies a process for the selection of the valedictorian. He suggests the proposed process reflects the values of the college and seeks a student of the highest academic standing who also has contributed to the college through service. J Cavenaugh says this is a great idea, but qualifies that last year’s valedictorian was an economics major, not a dance major. Harris inquires about the possibility of divisional inequities which sometimes affects senior awards; he expresses his concern that there might be a disciplinary bias on AAC which leads to procedural concerns. Levis responds AAC talked about using divisional chairs to select the valedictorian but concluded AAC includes representatives from all divisions as well as at large representatives. Levis notes it seems impossible to have a perfectly well distributed committee. Carnahan says the position of valedictorian is the last bastion for the nerd who hides out and earns good grades. She contends there are few awards for outstanding academic achievement, while there already are many awards for service at graduation, and if a person has straight As then the person should not have to do other service to become valedictorian. O’Sullivan states he likes the idea of returning to a policy which incorporates other aspects and explains Rollins had such a process before a parent threatened to sue because a student was not selected as valedictorian. O’Sullivan offers an amendment “The list will be limited to students who have spent at least three years at Rollins.” The sentence follows the first sentence in the Selection Process section. J Davison seconds the amendment. Tillman seeks a motion to table the resolution and the motion passes. The resolution is tabled until the November meeting.

VI. Announcements – Carrier reminds the faculty about the 125th and encourages the faculty to participate and enjoy activities. Carrier notes Clay Sharkey should be an exciting speaker. She announces there is an opportunity for panelists to visit classes on Friday morning and talk with students. Carrier also encourages faculty members to attend activities on Friday and Saturday and
over says that more than 700 people will be campus on Saturday. She invites everyone to attend the campus picnic and music under the stars. Tillmann announces to the faculty it is time to consider a resolution of support for the Human Rights Ordinance for Orange County. Foglesong states the resolution is out of order because it is not on the agenda and it is not integral to the work of the faculty. He explains the faculty membership can overturn his ruling. McLaren seeks a suspension of the rules to consider the resolution. The voice vote supports a suspension of the rules. Strom asks whether a quorum exists. A count is taken, 61 people are present, the quorum is 64, and the meeting is adjourned.

VII. Adjournment at 1:55 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Joan Davison
Vice President/Secretary

Attachment 1

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 bylaw supersedes all other bylaws 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.

Attachment 2

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 asked 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.