

4-22-2010

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Executive Committee Meeting, Thursday, April 22, 2010

Arts & Sciences Executive Committee

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ec

Recommended Citation

Arts & Sciences Executive Committee, "Minutes, Arts & Sciences Executive Committee Meeting, Thursday, April 22, 2010" (2010). *Executive Committee Minutes*. Paper 56.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ec/56

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.

Approved Minutes
Executive Committee
April 22, 2010

Members Present: Rick Foglesong, William Boles, Jim Small, Lisa Tillmann, Allison Wallrapp, Laurie Joyner, Joan Davison

Guests: Claire Strom, Jonathan Miller, Udeth Lugo, Nick Horsmon, Pedro Bernal

- I. Call to order—the meeting was called to order at 12:40 PM.
- II. Approval of Minutes—the minutes of the April 20, 2010 executive committee meeting was approved.
- III. Old Business - none
- IV. New Business
 - A. Faculty recommendation regarding provost candidates – Foglesong states two processes are at work in the provost search. He elaborates the first process is defined by Duncan and has a certain autonomy; the second process relates to faculty by-laws which provides for a faculty vote for the Provost. Foglesong therefore suggests that the EC must schedule a meeting for a faculty vote on provost. Miller states the last candidate leaves campus on the 6th. Miller explains Duncan wants the search committee to send two to four acceptable candidates from which the selection committee will decide, although it also is possible to declare a failed search. Small restates Miller's point for clarification: the search committee presents 2-4 candidates to the president and selection committee. Miller affirms. Small then suggests that only after the selection committee reaches a decision should the faculty give endorsement. Foglesong concurs with Small's suggestion in general but says the issue with this search is one of timing and the particular problem that candidates interview after the last faculty meeting. Foglesong notes it is critical to maintain the integrity of processes, and it is EC's responsibility to maintain the integrity of A&S faculty processes. He elaborates the faculty has a right, consistent with the spirit of its bylaws, to talk about candidates and reach conclusions. Foglesong says the faculty may decide to do something different than what the president envisions. Miller responds the president wants a list of acceptable candidates. Foglesong emphasizes the faculty may express itself in multiple ways; the faculty can meet as a body and individual faculty members will offer reaction to candidates at specific events. He stresses the faculty meeting is critical for faculty in governance to share views and reach a collective wisdom. He

concludes the faculty may reach conclusion within the parameters of the president's process and they may not. Foglesong suggests the faculty meet on May 7 and at that time discuss whether or not individual candidates are acceptable, and if the faculty prefers who is its first choice. Miller responds Duncan wants an unranked list because many constituencies have input going into the final selection and he does not want to make a selection in a different direction than any particular constituency. Foglesong says he understands Duncan's desire, but faculty preferences may be different. Miller asks whether the meeting will be all faculty members or A&S. Foglesong answers Crummer is a different constituency. Tillmann states she believes what is important is the faculty meets to discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the different candidates; she suggests this is more important than ordering the candidates. Davison moves and Tillmann seconds "EC shall convene a special faculty meeting on May 7 at 10am to make a recommendation regarding provost candidates." Foglesong then inquires about the process for faculty members to provide individual input regarding candidates after specific meetings. Miller states the search committee is asking for comments via e-mail. Davison responds some faculty members prefer to submit an anonymous form and traditionally faculty members indicate whether candidates are strong, acceptable, or unacceptable. Miller acknowledges he understands people want a form but wonders about indicating acceptable and unacceptable. Miller also suggests faculty members might relay mixed messages with two votes after a specific event and in the faculty meeting. Foglesong emphasizes the importance of faculty dialogue, information sharing and deliberative democracy. Bernal offers an example of a suggested evaluation sheet which includes an option for identifying the candidate's acceptability and providing comments. EC agrees it likes the form. Strom returns to the issue of two votes and asks which vote the search committee will take as its instruction. Foglesong emphasizes faculty governance has a right to make its own decision. Small wonders if the faculty should rank order the candidates. Foglesong responds this specific decision can be made on May 7. The motion passes.

- B. Introduction of Nick Horsmon – Wallrapp introduces Horsmon as the SGA president for next year. Horsmon is welcomed. Davison comments that Wallrapp has been an extraordinarily dedicated, informed and responsible member of EC. Davison moves and Boles seconds "We recognize Allison Wallrapp for her responsible service on EC, including her dedication and preparation and her contribution to shared governance and rational deliberation." EC passes the motion unanimously.
- C. Post Commencement Reception – Foglesong addresses Duncan's memo regarding alcohol at the reception. He notes one issue is about the appropriateness of alcohol and a second issue relates to the time of the reception. He states the faculty agrees not to compromise on alcohol, but to compromise on timing. Foglesong says the mint julep party use to be held later in the day but shifted to immediately after graduation when the

college started holding graduation on Mother's day – people are not available for a party late afternoon on Mother's Day. Foglesong states the new start time would be 1pm. Foglesong moves "We shall start the post-commencement reception later to allow faculty to attend the reception for students and their parents. We shall serve alcohol at the reception." The motion is seconded and passes.

- D. FEC Nominations – Foglesong asks: "Whom shall we appoint to FEC?" Small asks how many spots are open. Foglesong responds three. Foglesong reads a suggested list from Newman and FEC which considers diversity of division and gender. EC agrees if possible to form a slate from Ed Cohen, Jay Yellen, Yudit Greenberg, and Kathryn Norsworthy.
- E. RCC Goals – Small asks whether we shall ask the faculty to approve the slightly revised goals for RCC. (See Attachment 1). He explains the main change is a statement which requires content commensurate with an introductory level course. He elaborates there was a disparity between courses in the past especially when staff members taught. He concludes this change should raise standards. Small asks does EC approve the change and does it need to go to the faculty. Davison contends the change is minor and given it revises standards to be strong and consistent then EC probably can approve on behalf of the faculty. Davison moves and Small seconds, "we endorse the change on behalf of the faculty." The motion passes.
- F. Faculty Feedback to Administrators – Strom on behalf of Moore and PSC explains the issue came about because PSC previously assumed the administration endorsed the plan in the fall but opposition continued. Finally the plan is approved by the President, Provost, Dean of the Faculty, Dean of Student Affairs, and Dean of Holt. Strom notes the agreement emphasizes feedback and provides for the questionnaire development with the administrator. She notes the administrator will write a statement, receive feedback and then respond to faculty. Davison questions the feedback schedule specifically the process beginning with the Dean of the Faculty who just completed a process and the reception of a new provost. Strom emphasizes Joyner accepted the process and new administrative personnel will accept the process as part of their employment. Foglesong asks if the process should go to the faculty for approval. Tillmann suggests it is not necessary the process go to the faculty because any changes would then need to be renegotiated with the administrators. Strom concurs the proposal for the process should not to go to faculty. Davison suggests there is a need to ask colleagues whether this process sufficiently provides for faculty discussion with administrators to be worth the effort. Strom suggests EC consider a motion to endorse the plan of the process and then EC could consider whether to take to the faculty. Strom moves and Tillmann seconds, "EC endorses the new process for faculty feedback to administrators." The motion passes. Strom then moves and Tillmann seconds "EC will inform the faculty of the process but not send for a vote." The motion passes 4-2 with Boles and

Davison dissenting. Davison objects she understood the second motion would be “EC will send the process to the faculty.” She requests since this changed she wishes to change her vote to opposing the first motion. All accept this change. (See Attachment #2 for new guidelines.)

- G. Student Affairs Articulation Committee – Foglesong asks “Shall we extend the report deadline for the Student Affairs Articulation Committee to January 15, 2011?” Foglesong explains the committee requests an extension given the nature of its work. (See Attachment #3). EC agrees with the extension and considers the request for additional membership. Davison suggests the importance of adding a representative from the Dean of the Faculty Office because these offices must work closely and the committee’s mandate is to examine Student Affairs relationship to other office. EC agrees to place Mae Fitchett on the committee in this capacity. EC further agrees Foglesong should contact Queen, Barraneche, and Lines to try to finalize additional faculty membership.
- H. Holt Associate Degree – Small introduces a request from Eck to eliminate the Holt Associate degree. He explains this request is consistent with the Kaludis report. Small elaborates very few students enroll in the program and it really is a legacy from the past. The motion to eliminate the degree is seconded and passes. EC endorses elimination and votes to send to the faculty.
- I. Meet on April 29 – EC agrees to meet on April 29 in the PDR immediately after lunch with the provost candidate. At this time EC will complete pending business including the statement of honor.
- J. Agenda for faculty meeting on 4/28 – EC agrees recognitions and awards will follow lunch. Then the faculty will move to business and begin with the Honor Code revisions; the ethical production proposal will be handled time permitting. Elections will occur concurrently.

V. Adjournment—The meeting adjourns at 2:00pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Joan Davison
Vice President/Secretary

ATTACHMENT # 1

GOALS FOR ROLLINS COLLEGE CONFERENCE COURSES

The objective of RCC courses is to facilitate first-year students in becoming engaged and integrated members of the Rollins community of learners.

1. Engaged Learning

- seminar courses that may serve as a venue for curricular experimentation
- class size limited to 15-17 students
- content and workload commensurate with introductory-level course in relevant discipline
- focus on development of learning skills and research skills
- faculty serve as first-year advisors
- introduce and encourage use of Thomas P. Johnson Student Resource Center
- introduce mission of Rollins College: responsible leadership and global citizenship
- introduce concept of liberal arts education and values of College of A&S: community of learners committed to a tradition of innovation, academic excellence, and lifelong learning and service
- introduce and explain General Education Curriculum

2. Integrated Learning

- Peer Mentors serve as academic and social role models to help integrate students into academic and campus life
- integrated co-curricular and extra-curricular activities coordinated by faculty and peer mentors to forge links between classroom and campus life
- activities focused around key dimensions of Personal and Social Responsibility (from AAC&U LEAP Learning Outcomes):
 - striving for excellence
 - cultivating personal and academic integrity
 - contributing to a larger community
 - taking seriously the perspectives of others
 - developing competence in ethical and moral reasoning

ATTACHMENT #2

Guiding Principles for Faculty Feedback to Administrators

Purpose

To develop a system that provides for a regular and candid flow of information between the faculty and administrators concerning the perception of each administrator's performance in the aspects of the position that affect the faculty. This system is primarily intended to provide constructive feedback that the administrators can reflect upon and respond to, with the ultimate goal of improving the effectiveness of the administration and their relationship with the faculty.

Goals

The goal of the system is to provide a method for administrators to receive feedback directly from the faculty at large and for the faculty to have some method to inform administrators of their opinions on administrative performance on matters directly relating to their interaction with the faculty. These matters may include such things as the educational process and program; student life issues; issues pertaining to salaries, promotion and tenure; and issues concerning the interaction between the administration and the faculty. This mechanism will also provide an opportunity for the administrators to identify concerns of the faculty, and then to reflect on and respond to these concerns.

Guiding Assumptions

- 1) The process will be undertaken in a spirit of collegiality, with the intention of assisting in the professional development of the administrator and improving communication between the faculty and administration.
- 2) The mechanism will include feedback from the entire faculty.
- 3) A questionnaire format will be used and the questions will be developed in a spirit of cooperation between the faculty and administrators.
- 4) The administrator will be provided the opportunity to write a brief self-assessment that will accompany the questionnaire.
- 5) The individual and his or her supervisory chain will be provided access to all of the comments submitted by the faculty.
- 6) Research indicates that the maximum benefit from a system such as this occurs only when there is some formal response from the person receiving the feedback. Therefore, it is expected that the administrator will respond to the faculty, either orally or in writing, after reviewing the comments.
- 7) The feedback mechanism will be a biennial event that will not necessarily be linked to the period of evaluation.

Process

The process will eventually include all appropriate administrators; however, the initial effort will be to implement a program that includes the President, Provost, Dean of the Faculty, and Dean of Student Affairs. The feedback process will occur on a continuing two-year cycle beginning with the Dean of the Faculty and Dean of Student Affairs during the 2010-11 academic year.

The method for feedback will be a survey conducted on-line anonymously and all faculty will be asked to participate. The questions should be phrased in such a way as to encourage both specific and general comments. There will be a two-week window in which faculty will be able to respond.

Once all faculty have had an opportunity to respond, the collected responses will be provided to the administrator and his or her supervisory chain. The administrator will then be expected to respond to the feedback within a reasonable time frame.

The Professional Standards Committee will review this policy two-years after the process begins and will report to the faculty on the effectiveness of the process and any proposed changes.

ATTACHMENT #3

Rick,

The Student Affairs Articulation Committee (hereafter, the Committee) met on April 2, 2010 and discussed the charge of the Arts and Sciences Faculty with regard to a review of organizational/structural relationship of the Dean of Student Affairs and the Provost, Dean of the Hamilton Holt School, Dean of the Crummer School and the Dean of Faculty.

In order to complete a thorough review as indicated in the October 22, 2009 motion of the A&S Faculty, it is our opinion that we need additional time, given the complexity of the issue and the lateness in getting started. We also believe the Executive Committee should add additional members to the Committee. We recommend an additional two faculty members, one of which should be a woman and an additional student affairs staff member. Secondly, the Committee felt that since administrative structures are decisions made by the administration, we should wait until a new Provost is appointed and in place and solicit input from him or her. We also felt in order to understand best practices in higher education, there needs to be a period for research and data collection. To the latter point, Steve Neilson and Brent Turner have volunteered to collect this data over the summer and have it ready for Committee consideration in the fall.

We hope the Executive Committee could populate the committee as we have proposed by mid-September, so we may begin our work. We anticipate that we can conclude our work as a committee by January 15, 2011 and ask the Executive Committee for the extension to properly respond to the inquiry posed by the faculty.

Submitted by,

Larry Eng-Wilmot, Professor of Chemistry
Steve Neilson, Professor of Theatre, Special Assistant to the President
Brent Turner, Director of Student Involvement and the Cornell Campus Center
Derrick Paladino, Assistant Professor of Counseling

Steven S. Neilson
Special Assistant to the President
Rollins College
1000 Holt Avenue - 702
Winter Park, FL 32789
Office - 407-691-1014
Cell - 407-620-5264