

9-15-2011

## Minutes, Arts and Sciences Executive Committee Meeting, Thursday, September 15, 2011

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, Thursday, September 15, 2011" (2011). *Executive Committee Minutes*. Paper 36.  
[http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as\\_ec/36](http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ec/36)

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).

**Approved Minutes**  
**Executive Committee Meeting**  
**Sept 15, 2011**

In attendance: Alexandria Mozzicato, Laurel Goj, Gloria Cook, Joan Davison, Jill Jones, Jenny Queen, Dexter Boniface, Bob Smither, Carol Bresnahan.

I. Approval of Minutes—September 8. A motion to approve the September 8, 2011 minutes is moved, seconded and passes.

**II. Committee Reports**

A. AAC. Gloria Cook delivers an update on the AAC committee. The AAC has reaffirmed the suspension of the “N” General Education requirement for the classes of 2013 and 2014 non-science majors. AAC has also approved two modest curricular proposal changes in Latin American and Caribbean Studies and also music. The International Program (IP) Office presented several proposals that AAC has approved. These include the International Study Abroad Program in Argentina, the change of provider for the Rollins in London semester study and intern abroad program. AAC also approved IP’s proposal to expand their partnership with provider SIT that will support a rising student and faculty interest in study abroad and independent research in the developing world. The Rollins Plan (RP) pilot program is also on the AAC agenda. Jenny Queen notes that because the program is a pilot, student class choices are limited when compared class choices outside the program. Laurel Goj notes that scheduling problems are another problem with the program. Joan Davison notes that there are too few students left in the program to evaluate its effectiveness. While many students left the program, she believes it was for mainly non-intellectual reasons such as scheduling conflicts. Bob Smither notes that Jenny Cavanaugh is doing a follow-up report on the RP pilot. Gloria next notes that the Department of Anthropology has requested priority in fourteen of their courses for their majors. Joan asks whether or not the banner registration system can handle a priority system; she does not believe it can. Bob notes that giving priority to majors would be a potential problem for 100- and 200-level courses. Joan asks whether or not this proposal by Anthropology is a “backlash” against the waitlist system. Jenny comments that the waitlist system was designed to give priority so it is unlikely that it would be in response to that change. Gloria asks whether or not giving priority for majors can be accomplished through course prerequisites.

B. SLC. Jenny Queen delivers an update on the SLC committee. She notes that there are two agenda items from last year that need to be taken up again: first, the attendance policy, which needs faculty approval and, second, the posthumous degree policy. Carol Bresnahan asks why the posthumous degree policy is a student life issue rather than an academic issue. Jenny responds that this policy is more of a “PR” (public relations) issue since, obviously, deceased students will not represent Rollins after the awarding of such a degree. Joan comments that some members of last year’s Executive Committee felt that a posthumous degree should require some basic academic and social standards. Jenny replies that the authors of the proposal believe that this is not an academic issue. Furthermore, the wording of the policy is purposefully vague and designed to be looked at on a “case by case” basis because it is an emotional issue for parents and imposing academic standards could be awkward. Jenny reads the policy;

#### *Bestowing of a Posthumous Degree*

*In the case of the event of a student dying before finishing coursework at the college, a posthumous degree will be awarded if the student had completed a substantial amount of the coursework required for the major and degree.*

#### *Procedure:*

*A posthumous degree can be requested by either the student’s family or the department in which the student was a major. The request must first be approved by the major department and then forwarded to the Dean of the Faculty. Upon approval of the Dean of the Faculty and Provost, the Board of Trustees will be asked for final approval.*

*If the request for the posthumous degree comes from the student’s major, the Provost will first confer with the student’s family to see if the request is acceptable before the approval process begins.*

*Upon approval of the Board of Trustees, the degree will either be mailed to the family or presented to them in a private ceremony. The student’s name will be included in the Commencement list of graduates.*

*The degree will be posted on the student’s permanent record as follows (example):*

*Degree Awarded Artium Baccalaureus 8-MAY-2011*

#### *Primary Degree*

*Major: English*

*Minor: Writing*

Carol believes that judgment would be involved in any case of awarding a posthumous degree and that there should be some academic standards involved in the decision. Joan argues that without standards it will be tough to say “no” to any grief-stricken parents. Carol states that she

is pleased that the Dean of Arts & Sciences and the Provost will have decision-making authority in this regard and thus can play an important role in upholding academic standards. Next, Jenny continues, the SLC committee would like for the Student Government Association resolution on a campus pub to be placed on the faculty agenda. Jenny reads the resolution (see attached RESOLUTION #6). This resolution was unanimously supported by the SLC last year, but the Dean of the College has asked that it be brought before the A&S faculty for support. Jenny notes that some of the issues contained in the resolution (besides the pub issue) were already resolved by the SLC committee last year, but since this is the resolution that passed SGA, this is the resolution that should be brought to the faculty. Laurel comments that Sodexho is already looking at this issue. Jenny adds that the pub idea is part of the discussion surrounding the planned renovation of Rollins' campus center. Alexandria Mozzicato notes that SGA has been involved in this discussion as well. She asks whether or not the campus center renovation is going forward. Jenny replies that the money has not been approved by the Board, although planning is going forward; for example, an architect has been hired, and there is "lots of discussion." SLC has a faculty representative on the planning committee which is chaired by Steve Nielson. Alexandria comments that SGA is under the impression that some sort of renovation will definitely take place.

C. F&S. Laurel Goj reports on behalf of the Finance and Service committee. The committee needs two positions filled and they have two names on the ballot (Twila Papay and Paul Reich). At their first meeting, the committee discussed, first, the idea of Rollins creating an all-staff meeting to occur regularly throughout the year. The second item discussed was merit pay. Specifically, given that the College of Professional Studies (CPS) has awarded merit pay from escrow, one question is whether or not the College of A&S should do likewise in the interest of maintaining cohesion between the two colleges. The committee also believes that the merit pay system itself needs to be re-evaluated. Bob Smither states that he does not support the current system of merit evaluation and is open to discussing alternative policies. Joan asks who would be included in the all-staff meeting and whether staff meetings would involve exempt and/or non-exempt staff. Jill Jones asks what the difference is between exempt and non-exempt staff. Joan replies that the non-exempt category includes most of the hourly staff, many of whom do not earn a lot whereas the exempt staff includes some employees with high compensation packages. Finally, Laurel reports, a concern was raised regarding the fact that last year's salary letters were emailed to the faculty rather than sent in the mail.

D. PSC. Joan Davison provides an update on PSC. The committee has discussed more than a dozen issues and tried to prioritize them. The issue that has topped the committee's agenda is the distribution of money for the faculty-student collaborative research program. Joan notes that there is criticism of how such funds are distributed emanating from multiple divisions. She notes that in last year's funding cycle, the rules changed without sufficient warning; specifically, while the program solicited two types of proposals, the committee only funded proposals of one type. Carol asks who makes the funding decisions. Joan replies that the Director (currently Chris Fuse)

establishes criteria for selection but then seeks recommendations from PSC; the Director's criteria create strict parameters for the PSC recommendations. However, Joan continues, the role of PSC is no longer clear since the Dean of College office now oversees this program as a student program rather than an academic program. Furthermore, PSC discussed the budgets awarded for summer research, especially providing compensation for students and faculty to deliver a conference paper, a requirement of the program. Joan notes that the high cost of conference travel associated with this requirement greatly reduces the money available for the summer research projects themselves. Joan adds that PSC believes that the issue of student conference travel is partly a student life issue and perhaps there should be a standardized policy. Bob Smither states that it is indeed a big problem in his office since they only have \$5000 total to support student conferences and there are no rules governing how to distribute the money. Jenny states that she would like for PSC and SLC to work together on this issue. Laurel inquires whether anyone raised the issue of equity since some faculty are awarded multiple summer research students (four or five) and others none. Joan replies that this particular issue was not brought up. Joan notes that there was some discussion of whether funds should be distributed more equitably across divisions. Jenny notes that, in her opinion, the goal of the program should be to maximize "one-on-one" time between students and faculty, not to support large lab groups. Laurel concurs that you cannot give students the attention they need when working with more than one student. Joan notes that the admissions office boasts about the program and its availability to students, but fails to mention the competitive nature of the process, and that very few students are ultimately selected. Finally, Joan continues, there is the issue of salaries paid for Masters Programs classes in the Holt school. She notes that there is some controversy as to who has the mandate to review salary policies for teaching such classes. She adds that salary rewards vary across the different M.A. programs. Bob Smither affirms that it would be in the purview of PSC to comment on this matter. Jenny notes that the Communications major in Holt is an A&S program whereas the Communications department is in the CPS. Bob Smither adds that the college still has not resolved the issue of "dual citizenship" between A&S and CPS faculty. Joan states that this could become a problem in the future if a faculty member has to go through two faculty evaluation committees, specifically if they reach difference conclusions about promotion. Furthermore, Joan continues, there is the issue of who can lead field studies; specifically, whether or not staff can lead field studies that are credit-bearing. Lastly, Joan notes, PSC is seeking a second student representative to serve on their committee.

E. SGA. Alexandria reports that senator elections were online through [getinvolved.rollins.edu](http://getinvolved.rollins.edu) and went great. It is the first time in a while that student government has started the year with all 16 class senators and all organizational senators. Student government has already had two Senate meetings with legislation brought to us from Rollins Outdoor Club (ROC) asking to cosponsor the "ROCstafarian" event they are planning. She also notes that student government is having a Senator retreat on Saturday September 17.

### **III. New Business**

A. Policy/Procedure for allegations of faculty academic/research misconduct. Carol Bresnahan notes that PSC discussed the issue of faculty academic/research misconduct last year. She notes that it is a Federal requirement to have a policy for schools that receive federal funds and that Rollins therefore needs to have a policy. The PSC committee, she notes, considered a policy last year but it has not been brought before any other faculty group or been put in the handbook or the website. Carol states that we need an interim policy immediately to guarantee compliance. Carol has drawn up a draft of such a policy that mirrors the policy drafted by PSC last year; however, she believes it makes more sense to adopt last year's policy since it has already been vetted by faculty governance in the form of last year's discussion in PSC. Joan states that last year's PSC, in late March, temporarily approved the proposal in cases related to federal grants, but did not ask EC to endorse this approval. The incoming PSC actually discussed the issue at its first meeting, but decided it was an issue for the all college faculty, rather than merely A&S. Carol asks that we endorse last year's proposal as an interim policy and then have PSC re-evaluate and modify the policy as needed. The Executive Committee unanimously endorses the interim policy.

B. The Slate for the Faculty (Approve and Send out). Jill announces that she will send out the slate of faculty candidates for governance positions. She notes that there is still a vacancy for AAC.

C. Phi Beta Kappa (Carol). Carol Bresnahan, speaking on behalf of President Duncan, asks whether or not faculty believe that faculty searches and hiring decisions should prioritize membership in PBK. She states that the chances of Rollins getting a PBK chapter in the future will be better if we can increase the number of PBK faculty key-holders. Laurel notes that in her department search last year in Chemistry, five of six of the candidates they considered were PBK members; however, their department did not use PBK membership as the ultimate litmus for choosing the candidate (in fact, they preferred the one candidate who was not a member). Carol states that, as she understands it, the Deans at Rollins are in charge of hiring negotiations and that the Deans were the ones who were told to look in favor of PBK candidates. She asks if the faculty support this. Joan notes that it is not a longstanding tradition at Rollins to factor PBK membership into hiring decisions; rather it was a practice of the past few years and was not broadly conveyed to the faculty that PBK was an important search consideration. Joan states that it is difficult to say whether or not the faculty supports this policy since it is not broadly known among departments. She notes that she would support including a candidates' membership in PBK as one of many considerations, such as diversity, but not as the only factor. Joan states that she was part of the PBK campus review process and participated on three different committees that the visitation team requested. She notes that the concern of the PBK visitors, as expressed to her, was not necessarily with the absolute number of PBK faculty at Rollins but rather their distribution across divisions. Laurel concurs, noting that she is the only member of PBK in the Natural Sciences Division.

D. Voting on the Bylaws. Jill notes that Ed Cohen has expressed a concern about the promotion and tenure process specified by the CPS bylaws and that, as a result, he would have trouble voting supporting changes to the All College bylaws designed to include CPS. Jenny states that the promotion and tenure rules in the CPS bylaws are underspecified. Joan reiterates that this is a problem for faculty with joint appointments across the two colleges. Carol states that faculty can propose amendments to the bylaws. Carol suggests that there should be a comparison of standards across departments and maybe a college-wide committee is needed. Jenny notes that the CPS resisted the idea of an all-college FEC.

Jenny provides an update on her attempts to open communication channels with the Board of Trustees. Jill notes that, recently, the Board of Trustees has had far more contact with CPS faculty than A&S faculty even though the A&S faculty greatly outnumber CPS faculty. Laurel notes that the President's invitations to meet with Board members often reflect the President's "pet projects" of the time. Carol suggests that perhaps the Executive Committee could work with the President to identify a representative sample of faculty to meet with the Board. Jenny states that the faculty want to have more contact with the Board than just meals with the President that have set topics. Rather the faculty want to have genuine social interaction with Board members.

Jill will send a preliminary agenda for our first faculty meeting. The meeting is adjourned at 2pm.

**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 alike 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.