

10-1-2009

## Minutes, Arts & Sciences Executive Committee Meeting, Thursday, October 1, 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 1, 2009" (2009). *Executive Committee Minutes*. Paper 62.  
[http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as\\_ec/62](http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ec/62)

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 1, 2009**

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

Guests: Leon Hayner, Sandy Weisstein, Brent Turner, Diane Willingham, Mahjabeen Rafiuddin

- 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 September 17, 2009.

Boles introduces a motion to change the order of business and discuss the committee to consider restructuring of the Dean of Student Affairs office prior to dealing with old business. Boles explains many of the guests are in attendance to listen to that discussion. The motion passes.

III. New Business

- A. Dean of Student Affairs- Foglesong focuses the discussion on the resolution which passed at the Faculty meeting: “EC will appoint a committee to examine the structural relationship of the Dean of Student Affairs Office to the rest of the institution and report back to the faculty in 30 days with a recommended decision about what to do next, including the possibility of moving forward with a search.” Small states he spoke with Toni Holbrook and learned her dissertation covers the topic of relationships between academic and student affairs offices. He suggests we should ask her about her knowledge. Tillmann seeks to clarify what is asked of the committee we are to create, and what the committee’s recommendations to the faculty must include. Foglesong responds he believes there are a couple options for EC including to do nothing, proceed with a search, or address a number of issues related to the structure. Foglesong also suggests that if EC believes it is impossible to complete the task requested in the resolution, then EC should say so to the faculty. Moore asks what it is EC can decide and is it EC or the faculty’s decision. Moore contends the Office of Student Affairs is outside of the structure we control. Foglesong asks Casey who has authority to create a vice president, what are the budget implications of the creation of a vice president’s office, and what affect might postponement of the dean’s search have on the search itself. Casey states the faculty lacks authority to create a vice president, and the board and the President share this authority. He elaborates the institutional by-laws state at least three vps

exist. Casey continues that he is not aware of a vice president at a multi-school college who serves only one school or institution. He also states the enormous cost will be a budget issue and extend beyond the position to the question of support structure. He points out that a vp really cannot maneuver and control student affairs unless all students in all schools are under that person. Casey also states he is quite certain a VP of student affairs is not a priority. Small redirects the issue and says his impression of the faculty's discussion was not about a vp of student affairs but about whether one dean, either student affairs or academic, is over the other dean. Small says that was the tenor of motion. Davison suggests PSC is the appropriate committee to consider the resolution because the bylaws give PSC the responsibility to provide advice on structure. Davison also concurs with Small that the faculty are concerned about the relationship between the faculty and the student affairs office. She states the consideration of structure should go beyond thinking about a vp and perhaps focus on the possibility of an associate dean of student affairs who parallels the associate dean of the faculty. She notes student affairs ran well with an associate dean and that this person could be a faculty member who then connects the office to the faculty. Boles asks what the two-dean structure to which O'Sullivan referred was. Davison says she is uncertain but he might have meant either the system under Denicola when the Provost also was the Dean of the Faculty, or the system when Briggs was at Rollins with the Dean of the Faculty and the Dean of Student Affairs sharing offices and staff, in order to facilitate cooperation but at the same time permit faculty to control student affairs. Davison suggests at this time the Dean of the Faculty was considered the first among equals. Foglesong expresses concern about the search and in particular how student affairs will be affected if the current dean stays another year in an acting capacity. Foglesong also expresses concern about what direction a study committee might go. He then suggests it is possible to have a dean and a study committee with the proviso that while the dean serves a two or three-year term the college seriously consider restructuring. Tillmann asks what the real difference is between operating as an interim as oppose to being dean. Boles responds the difference is in the continuity and planning which is possible. He points out our guests have concerns about 3 deans in 2.5 years or 4 deans in 4 years. Tillmann states when she reread the minutes from last year it looked like a decision for a national search was made. She expresses concern that many of her colleagues are surprised about conversation about whether to have a national search and a lot of people are committed to the idea of a national search. Tillmann concludes she is for a national search. Small responds a committee cannot effectively look at this issue in 30 days, and that if we correctly do the research then we have a problem with undertaking the search this year. Casey states the search already is wrecked by the resolution. Moore says it is not our decision whether to search for a Dean. He points out the Provost came and asked whether to search and EC supported a national search. Small

reiterates the motion was not well thought and the work of the committee is impossible in the time frame. Tillmann argues for a colloquium within 30 days; Tillmann says issues are difficult to discuss in faculty meetings because of the compressed time frame and she hopes to assess faculty intensity about the issue with a colloquium. Tillmann notes few people have demonstrated an interest in the F&S colloquium on Friday but whether 4 or 40 attend might be an important indicator. Boles says he has never seen 40 faculty members at a colloquium. Foglesong mentions that is why asynchronous dialogue is important. Moore states the resolution calls for a committee but only the administration can decide whether to search or stop the search. He suggests we could proceed both with the search and also proceed with the study committee. He admits the existence of the committee might undermine the search but suggests maybe the committee will reach the conclusion we need more than an acting dean. Moore states the committee also can address the issue of structure. Casey notes Rollins' unique structural characteristics for an institution its size. He contends institutional structures evolve over time with people and culture; for example, a structure which could work would be a dean of A&S and that individual could have wide ranging responsibility over admissions and the dean of student affairs but the logical moment for such a change is when there is a shift in the admissions office. Casey states the issues are bigger than just DOF and DOSA. Casey admits that clearly faculty have questions about the structure but he is not certain whether a majority favor a search. Casey states if he knew then what he knows now he would have asked for a 3-year dean's appointment and then moved forward. Casey says the individual has good relations with the faculty and the dean of the faculty, and understands the quirkiness of Rollins' culture. Small and Boles say one option is to look at the structure, to create a committee to deal with the question of structures and models and to permit Casey to decide about the national search. Tillmann states she is thinking about the group who want to look at structure and favor a national search. Boles says we must select one or the other. Foglesong reiterates the options are to do nothing, appoint the committee or make EC the comm. Moore moves to appoint the EC as a study committee. Small seconds. Tillmann asks about a fallback position given the apparent faculty intent that EC appoint a committee. Small says the time frame is the problem. Foglesong responds he wishes to honor the time frame and therefore it is necessary the EC serve as the committee. The motion passes.

#### IV. Old Business

- A. Appointment to FSC – Foglesong states EC must consider what to do with the question of the EC appointment to FSC given the faculty's tabled motion on a new committee and the imminent report of MPAC about merit pay and appeals. The tabled motion reads: "Merit Pay Assessment

should be done by a new committee appointed by EC with a member from each of MPAC and FSC and three additional people from outside the process so we have a broader discussion, analysis, and assessment of what happened. Foglesong suggests only one committee should do assessment – either the FSC or a new committee envisioned in the tabled motion. Foglesong states his reservation for the record: it is ill advised for the committee which decides on the process and allocates merit pay to then assess merit pay. Foglesong elaborates although it is true the language of the policy adopted called for this process, he believes faculty members did not pay attention to that point, but rather focused their interests on merit pay. Foglesong states he will say and needs to say forcefully he favors merit pay but there are problems with merit pay and we must remedy these through a favorable process. Joyner questions if the process is so flawed then why were there only a limited number of appeals and changes. Joyner also expresses doubt that the MPAC will identify new problems not identified by FSC. Tillmann says this might be true but her only concern is the narrow ground offered for appeals and this possibly limited appeals. Joyner states only one person currently on the FSC continues from the previous year, and so it is not really the case that the committee which created the process and allocated the funds would be evaluating itself and its process and decisions. Tillmann asks how often the average department undergoes external review and wonders if the merit process should undergo external review on some regular time period. Moore suggests using the existing structure for assessment given most of FSC is new. He states the EC could fulfill both the current policy guidelines and the guidelines of the tabled motion if EC's appointee to FSC is from the MPAC. Moore moves that EC appoint a member of MPAC to FSC with attention to gender balance. The motion passes.

## V. New Business

- A. Plans for October 8 conversation with Trustees – Foglesong announces Lorie Kyle reserved the Bieberbach Room at 3:30 for the faculty forum with the trustees. Small asks on what the forum will focus and recalls last year the faculty had a long period of icebreaker with the education committee before addressing issues. Casey states it is difficult to know which trustees will attend because of the busy schedule that day. Small asks Casey what he believes the trustees will want to hear. Casey responds curricular reform is of interest. The EC decides to focus upon the RP and ask RP faculty to attend. The RP presentations already are prepared so this will facilitate the forum. Joyner mentions that on Wednesday trustee Fuller will have lunch with faculty and hopes to exchange trustee questions and concerns and hear faculty members' questions, concerns, and worries.

- B. Notification to persons mentioned in minutes – Davison suggests an addition to the EC's transparency initiative. She moves "the Vice President/Secretary will notify non-members of EC mentioned in the minutes and encourage these individuals to read the approved minutes. Such non-members will be encouraged to contact the VP/Secretary and to post on Blackboard clarifications of their actions and comments which they deem desirable." Davison explains this provides people (particularly those who served in governance or on governance task forces from the previous year) an opportunity to respond to or clarify assumptions and statements made by the current EC. Tillmann questions whether this is sufficient and suggests the minutes should include clarification when there are factual errors. Davison states the minutes detail what happened not necessarily facts. Moore suggests facts sometimes are disputable. Davison responds the minutes perhaps could offer clarification of indisputable facts (such as if someone states a year incorrectly). EC votes on the motion, and it unanimously passes. Tillmann asks about her concern regarding factual accuracy and Foglesong states EC's meeting time is over but EC will return to the issue.

VI. Adjournment—The meeting was adjourned at 1:48pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Joan Davison  
Vice President/Secretary