

10-29-2009

## Minutes, Arts & Sciences Executive Committee Meeting, Thursday, October 29, 2009

Arts & Sciences Executive Committee

Follow this and additional works at: [http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as\\_ec](http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ec)

---

### Recommended Citation

Arts & Sciences Executive Committee, "Minutes, Arts & Sciences Executive Committee Meeting, Thursday, October 29, 2009" (2009). *Executive Committee Minutes*. Paper 60.  
[http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as\\_ec/60](http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ec/60)

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  
October 29, 2009**

Members Present: Rick Foglesong, William Boles, Thom Moore, Jim Small, Lisa Tillmann, Allison Wallrapp, Joan Davison, Laurie Joyner, Roger Casey, Lewis Duncan

- I. Call to order—the meeting was called to order at 12:37 PM.
- II. Approval of Minutes—The Executive Committee approved the minutes of October 15, 2009.
- III. Old Business
  - A. Bylaw change from AAC (see Appendix A) – Small introduces a suggested bylaw change which clarifies AAC’s jurisdiction over Holt. Small explains this is fallout from last year exchange regarding vetting of Holt courses as part of the A&S system, and as consequence of this also the need for AAC to look at graduate programs. Small elaborates that two changes are prominent: to state Holt School as under AAC’s purview and update the reporting to the appropriate dean, that is the dean of faculty. Additionally, once there is an explicit inclusion of Holt then the committee should have a student from Holt. Small states there is no need to change the faculty composition of the committee as it is a common faculty. Foglesong asks about something not changed which is about report to the dean on the replacement of; Small explains that line really is about creation of new lines. Joyner states that is why AAC now sends a member to the Dean’s Advisory on faculty lines. Wallrapp asks whether the addition of Holt membership to AAC might lead to including someone on EC from Holt. Small says this is not really under consideration. Casey asks Wallrapp whether she also represents Holt students. Wallrapp states she does collaborate with Holt students but does not represent these students. Small moves bylaw change and Boles seconds. The bylaw change passes unanimously
  - B. Diversity Council liaisons – Foglesong explains the Diversity Council seeks representation from governance committees and asks what EC’s position should be. He suggests this is complicated because the Council is not part of faculty governance. Small states he appointed an AAC member to act as a liaison but after one meeting that person said they were uncertain about the purpose of attendance. Tillmann says she asked Strom about a clarification regarding the request for a liaison and Strom told her the Council simply was looking for a point person in case something relevant developed for EC. Davison explains a solution for this exists as the Diversity Council should send its business through EC. She

elaborates the Diversity Council should contact EC if it has business it wishes faculty governance to consider and then EC will route the business to the appropriate committee as it does with all other issues. Casey says the request of the Diversity Council highlights the problem of entities which address all college issues: those entities are in a catch 22 as they try to address issues but lack a formalized mechanism to act. Foglesong suggests this is a problem of the tail wagging the dog, as we are governance, but what are they; he notes they have budgets but uncertain authority except for the authority granted by the provost. Casey says these committees (such as internationalization) grew out of other committees and then made recommendations about their status which went through governance bodies and were voted on by faculty. Small reiterates proposals should be sent to governance to be vetted and asks why would this process be different than for any other committee. Casey responds the scope is beyond A&S. Small responds that the all faculty meeting exists as an important mechanism to solve such issues. Moore asks what the specific question under debate is, and suggests EC return to the question whether there should be appointments from committees to serve on the Diversity Council. Foglesong notes the options seem to be a laissez faire approach by which committees appoint someone if they wish, or a formal policy. Tillmann says the Diversity Council can call a committee chair if there is a particular issue to pursue. Small responds he does not see such contact as different from what currently exists and such an approach already gives non-governance committees direct access to committee chairs. Tillmann presents a motion to “make chairs of committees and the faculty president a point of contact between governance committees and the Diversity Council.” Moore and Foglesong concur this is what we already do. Small wishes to know the exact wording of the memo sent by the Council to committee chairs. Boles reads the request which asks for governance committees to send a representative as a member to the Council. Small emphasizes the Diversity Council requested not a member but a point of contact. Casey suggests the Diversity Council desires codification of existing practice. Moore and Foglesong again support the notion of formalizing the fact the Diversity Council can contact chairs and the president with business. Small, given this understanding, seconds the Tillmann motion. The motion passes unanimously.

- C. Maymester Pay and Comprehensive Review of Compensation – Foglesong states that Moore previously requested a decision as to whether PSC or F&S will undertake the comprehensive review of compensation. Casey reports that in conversation with the deans of Holt and the Faculty he believes it is desirable to take a comprehensive look at the scope of faculty work and activities compensated beyond the base level and then present the findings to EC. He explains the administration’s desire to see work compensated in a manner consistent with institutional goals. He believes it is preferable for the administration to undertake this research rather than the faculty. Small, Moore, and Tillmann endorse this

approach. Casey explains that compensation is rational but there are multiple, independent, different systems operating. Casey contends each system is rational but the total picture might not appear that way. Casey elaborates “we never said what we wish to incentivize.” Davison mentions the Kurtz study which showed that while there is not a gender bias in base salary, gender inequity appears when additional compensation is explored. Casey concurs he recalls the Kurtz study and the new research will look at the gender issue. Foglesong summarizes that the Casey proposal is for the administration first to conduct a comprehensive review of compensation and then report to EC. Foglesong asks whether EC can expect a report this year and Casey says hopefully early in the second semester. EC endorses this approach.

#### IV. New Business

- A. Strategic Compensation Assessment Committee – Foglesong states the EC must nominate a membership for the Strategic Compensation Assessment Committee consistent with the motion which passed at the October 22 faculty meeting. He says EC and the Committee need to act quickly so future merit pay considerations can proceed. The resolution reads: “To create a 6-member committee consisting of one person from the original Faculty Salary Council, one member from the Merit Pay Appeals Committee, and four members selected to give balance to the committee in terms of divisions, gender and rank. The committee's meetings should be open. The charge of the committee is to assess the process used to award merit pay in 2009, including the criteria applied and the method of evaluation, and to make recommendations to the faculty, through EC and PSC, for making our system for awarding strategic compensation more effective, efficient and fair. The committee will begin work as soon as possible and complete their assessment by mid-February 2010. The committee members will be appointed by the EC and approved by vote of the faculty. They will report simultaneously to PSC and EC. In the course of their deliberations they will host at least one faculty colloquium.” Foglesong says the current questions now are what is the scope of the committee responsibility, what is the timeline and whom do we appoint. Moore comments that having the work completed by February will be tough but doable. Foglesong suggests the scope should be considered before appointments. Davison asks about the resolutions commitment to both efficiency and fairness, and argues it seems difficult to promote both more efficiency and more fairness. These seem to be trade-offs. Tillmann asks if efficiency was a problem during the merit awards, and Moore responds no. Foglesong explains he sees efficiency as modifying fairness and this is a reminder for the committee that both efficiency and fairness are desirable. The faculty does not wish to lose efficiency. EC agrees on a

slate balanced by rank, discipline and gender of Cavanaugh, Kypraios, Goj, Smither, Cook, and Smaw.

- B. Study of the structural relationship of the Dean of Student Affairs Office to the rest of the College – Foglesong states EC must appoint a committee based on the resolution which passed at the October 22 faculty meeting to: “Appoint Karen Hater as Dean of Student Affairs (not interim) and create a committee to study the structural relationship of the DoSA office to the rest of the institution.” Foglesong identifies the issues for consideration as mandate, timeline and membership. He suggests a consultant study about the issue before committee work on the issue begins given most faculty do not have an expertise in the operations of Student Affairs. Foglesong mentions that Holbrook suggested a consultant. Casey expresses some skepticism about a consultant’s ability to provide assistance given confusion and disagreements about values and structures. Small agrees and asks what the purview of the committee is: where the dean fits and if we need that dean or whether we give the job to the dean of the faculty? Tillmann and Foglesong concur with Small’s points. Foglesong states he sees two issues: one, what models exist and two the interpretive question about what model best fits us. Small explains he wants information because he does not know enough at this point to move forward with a committee. Casey says contracting is a problem because any consultant will ask what our comparables are. Faculty members often define us as a national liberal arts college yet we are a masters’ comprehensive institution or at least a mixed model. Joyner states it is difficult to resolve structural flaws if we cannot resolve values. Small cites the problem as our values do not mesh with reality. Casey says the structure does not mesh with reality of comprehensive institution. Casey states the College could hire a consultant to do the background research on various models but then the problem is how we define ourselves. Foglesong responds he is uncertain about creating a committee for a fools’ errand. The meeting then moves to adjournment due to lack of time.

- V. Adjournment—The meeting was adjourned at 1:51pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Joan Davison  
Vice President/Secretary

## Appendix A

### PROPOSED BYLAW CHANGE FROM AAC

#### Current Bylaws:

##### Section 1. The Academic Affairs Committee

*Responsibilities.* The Academic Affairs Committee shall have primary authority in all policy matters concerning curriculum, student academic standards and honors, academic advising, continuing and graduate education programs of the College of Arts and Sciences, the library and media services, and in all matters pertaining to academic schedules and calendars. Each year, the committee shall issue an advisory statement to the appropriate Deans on the appointment and replacement of members of the faculty.

*Membership.* Membership of the Academic Affairs Committee shall consist of twelve voting members: eight from the faculty (four at large and four divisional, the latter of whom shall be selected from within the division they represent) and four students chosen by the Student Government Association. The students shall be appointed at the beginning of the academic year and remain on the Committee for a period of one year. The Dean of the Faculty serves as an ex-officio, non-voting member.

#### Proposed Changes:

##### Section 1. The Academic Affairs Committee

*Responsibilities.* The Academic Affairs Committee shall have primary authority in all policy matters concerning curriculum, student academic standards and honors, academic advising, continuing and graduate education programs of the College of Arts and Sciences **and the Hamilton Holt School**, the library ~~and media services~~, and in all matters pertaining to academic schedules and calendars. Each year, the committee shall issue an advisory statement to the ~~appropriate Deans~~ **Dean of the Faculty** on the appointment and replacement of members of the faculty.

*Membership.* Membership of the Academic Affairs Committee shall consist of twelve voting members: eight from the faculty (four at large and four divisional, the latter of whom shall be selected from within the division they represent) and ~~four~~ **three** students chosen by the **College of Arts and Sciences** Student Government Association **and one**

student chosen by the Hamilton Holt School Student Government Association. The students shall be appointed at the beginning of the academic year and remain on the Committee for a period of one year. The Dean of the Faculty serves as an ex-officio, non-voting member.