

4-23-2009

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Executive Committee Meeting, Thursday, April 23, 2009

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 23, 2009" (2009).
Executive Committee Minutes. Paper 65.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ec/65

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 23, 2009**

Members Present: Donald Davison, Paul Harris, Laurie Joyner, Wendy Brandon, Susan Libby, Michael Gunter, Marissa Germain, Barry Levis

Guests: Jim Eck, Rick Foglesong, Joan Davison, Allison Wallrapp, Karen Hater

- I. Call to order—the meeting was called to order at 12:40 PM.
- II. Approval of Minutes—Consideration of the April 9, 2009 minutes were postponed until the next meeting of the Executive Committee
- III. Old Business
 - A. Request for foreign language residential learning community—Although this was referred to AAC and Student Life, Davison felt that there should be a forum on this issue. Harris wondered if it involved just learning/living committees, but Davison said that it regarded a much broader issue on how to utilize college space. Brandon said that the matter would be considered by ACC as residential housing space to further the academic interests of the college. Joyner asked Hater when there would be a formal announcement of housing decisions for next year. Harris said that process would change next year since the Student Life Committee or the entire faculty did not review it. Joyner asked for clarification about housing next year. Hater reported that all groups would retain their housing except one. Gunter asked about the language groups. Hater said that the Spanish RCC would be in Ward as well as German.
 - B. Student Life Committee

Student Affairs Mission Statement (see attachment 1)— Jennifer Queen sent the final report and mission statement. Both the task force and Student Life have endorsed it unanimously. Harris raised the question about whether it should be reported to the faculty or required faculty endorsement. Germain asked about what had happened in the past. Davison said was not a Bylaw and can just be placed in the handbook. Levis felt that should have a faculty vote because faculty should buy into the document. Harris said that the committee would accept no friendly amendments because the wording they have used was very carefully selected. Harris also said that the statement clearly emphasizes the role of the faculty so that it would be strange not to have the faculty vote on it. Brandon wondered if the Executive Committee had to endorse the

statement. The Executive Committee voted to endorse the Mission Statement.

- C. Status of Diversity Committee resolution—Davison reported that Norsworthy had requested a committee to oversee hiring and retention of minority faculty. The suggestion has been referred to AAC and PSC. Questions arose which were referred to Diversity Committee for clarification of these questions. J Davison said that the correct procedure should be a joint effort by both Crummer and A&S. Joyner wondered if this proposal was still on the table in this form. She thought that the Diversity Committee had made several changes, and they did not want to proceed with the current form since they have re conceptualized the process. She felt the Executive Committee needed to seek clarification from the two diversity chairs. Davison asked Brandon to work with him to obtain that clarification.

IV. New Business

- A. Appoint a new faculty member (two-year term) to Academic Honor Council—this will be for two-year term since Madeline Kovarik will remain on the board. Several recommendations were made, and Davison would approach those suggested.
- B. Faculty Appeals Committee—The Executive Committee again made several suggestions, and Davison would approach them to see if they would be willing to serve.
- C. Student Life Committee
 - 1. Amendment of Code of Community Standards (see Attachment 2)—Harris reissued procedures for revision of the code because of the difficult process and it not being consistent with best practices at other schools. Student Life would require a super majority rather than pass the changes through SGA. Germain asked for a clarification on the amendment procedure. Harris said that every three years the Student Life Committee must review the code and a 2/3's vote was needed to change it. Then the changes would go to Provost for implementation. Harris said that both Student Life and Student Affairs approved this change, and now the Executive Committee can adopt it. Brandon moved and Libby seconded the motion. The Executive Committee approved the amending process.
 - 2. Dean of Student Affairs Ex Officio member of committee (see attachment 3)—Harris said that Student Life asked PSC to propose bylaw to allow the Dean of Students to serve as an ex officio

member of Student Life. [At this point in the meeting, Eck passed Joyner a note, and they exchanged some knowing looks. Very suspicious.] Joyner later explained “the suspicious exchange with Jim Eck related to a Holt issue that he was asking about and whether it should be brought up at EC. Since the issue had never been to the appropriate standing committee it seemed premature and so I said I did not think the timing was appropriate. As I recall the issue had to do with the possible integration of a couple of undergraduate majors, English and Music.” The committee also has asked to have its membership expanded to have seat for a Student Affairs staff person. The Executive Committee approved

- D. Updated College policy regarding discrimination and sexual harassment—The Provost Office wanted to know the best way to disseminate the new policy. Gunter reported that it had not been brought to Finance and Services. Davison said that he did not know where it sat so that the Provost’s office should disseminate it themselves. Gunter complained that only one faculty had been involved with the IT review. Joyner wondered how the faculty member of the search committee had been nominated. Davison had informed Jonathan Miller that there needed to be more faculty participation in the process.
- E. Academic Affairs Committee
 - 1. Handbook revisions—Brandon reported that a new incomplete statement has been approved by AAC and should be placed in the catalog. Joyner said that the current incomplete process posed a significant problem for academic appeals because incompletes were being awarded for a great variety of reasons. There needed to be more restrictions on the incomplete designation. Brandon also mentioned that the policy of readmission of dismissed students was under discussion. Joyner said that the policy on dismissal would no longer allow students to transfer credits they had taken at other institutions during the period of dismissal. AAC also present a bylaw revision to make it clear that AAC has control over the Holt School curriculum. Finally a new transcript designation for courses with service learning component is being developed.
 - 2. Curriculum Renewal Committee—Musgrave and Simmons have agreed to run for this committee. Brandon will ask others to serve as well. The committee will supervise Phase 3 of the curriculum process. Davison said that the committee will maintain momentum for wholesale curriculum revision. .
- F. Discussion/Assessment of effectiveness of governance—Davison asked for observations from members of the Executive Committee about the

effectiveness of the governance process this year. Germain felt that there needed to be more communication especially between the higher administration and students. Joyner suggested that there was not enough coordination between the deans of Student Affairs and Faculty about a variety of procedures. She saw a half dozen things that needed to be addressed. Germain reported that there will be a restructuring of SGA to have class rather than living unit representations. Davison felt that a major challenge for governance was how much time was spent by committees. He thought that chairs especially are overworked without any real compensation. Libby agreed that committees don't have time to discuss larger issues because they often get bogged down details. Harris said that elections should be done differently. A person running should explain why he or she wanted to run and participate. New members often say that they were expected to run for a committee for the tenure process rather than explaining why they wanted to get involved on a particular committee. He questioned why some will want to serve.

VI. Adjournment—The meeting was adjourned at 2:00PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Barry Levis
Secretary

Attachment 1

Student Affairs Mission Statement Committee Report to the Executive Committee April 14, 2009

Committee Members: Jennifer Queen, Assistant Professor of Psychology, Eric Smaw, Assistant Professor of Philosophy, Thom Moore, Associate Professor of Physics, Eileen Gregory, Professor of Biology, Laurie Joyner, Dean of the Faculty, Karen Hater, Interim Dean of Student Affairs, Joanne Vogel, Director of Counseling and Psychological Services, Allison Wallrapp, Student Representative

The Executive Committee of the Faculty charged this committee of faculty, administrators, staff and student representatives with looking at the current mission statement of the Division of Student Affairs and amending/rewriting as necessary in order to offer the division a clear vision of its own goals and its connection to Academic Affairs. We saw our task as one of laying out a direction or vision of the Division, not with prescribing how this vision is manifested. After meeting six times in Spring 2009 the following statement was crafted:

The Division of Student Affairs at Rollins College advances the mission of the College of Arts & Sciences by collaborating with the Faculty in creating and maintaining an environment that fosters intellectual, social, and personal learning and growth for our students.

Our vision is to foster and promote a healthy and caring environment that focuses on essential learning outcomes with an emphasis on personal and social responsibility.

This statement serves as a reminder to the Faculty that they are ultimately responsible for all aspects of student life in and outside the classroom according to the College's bylaws (All Faculty Bylaws, Article I, General Governance). It connects the mission of Student Affairs to that of the Art & Sciences and ties it to LEAP learning outcomes, but leaves the "how" of the implementation to the student affairs professionals. During implementation, input from relevant constituents, including students and non-student affairs staff, is crucial.

The statement was discussed at a Director's Meeting in the Division of Student Affairs and was met with approval. The Student Life Committee unanimously endorsed the statement after a committee report during its April 14, 2009 meeting. The committee now recommends that it be brought to the Faculty of the Arts & Sciences for a vote of endorsement before the end of the academic year.

We are also recommending that the Student Affairs Mission Statement be added to the A&S Faculty Handbook near the A&S Mission statement as well as being posted on the DOSA web site. Publishing the statement in the handbook addresses the concern that the

mission seems to change with every staffing change by requiring that any future changes be brought to the Executive Committee and the Provost of the College.

Attachment 3

From: Paul Harris
To: Donald Davison; Susan Libby
CC: Karen Hater; Student Life Committee; William Boles
Date: 4/6/2009 10:52 AM
Subject: Bylaw Change

Hi Susan & Don,

Last year the Student Life Committee voted unanimously at our November 11 meeting to have the Dean of Student Affairs as a non-voting member of the Committee. In the past, some Deans have attended meetings while others have not. SLC felt it was important to have the Dean attend on a regular basis and having Dean Hater regularly attend this year has reinforced this conclusion.

I know that I e-mailed Don on this topic at the time and he advised me to talk to Susan, to bring it up at the 11/13/09 meeting, and in the mean time to unofficially invite Karen Hater to our meetings. I thought that I had brought it up at the 11/13 meeting and mentioned it to Susan at that meeting, but the minutes do not support my memory and apparently I did not make the request in a formal manner. I take responsibility for the delay in this action.

I would now like to formally request that PSC take up the following bylaw revision that SLC unanimously supported at our 11/11/09 meeting:

1. The membership of the Student Life Committee should include a 3rd staff member that would be elected from a pool drawn from the Division of Student Affairs
2. The Student Life Committee should include the Dean of Student Affairs as a non-voting member.

Our rationale for the first item was that there should be some level of staff representation from the division of the college devoted to student life. This could be accomplished by adding a third staff member that is required to be drawn from that division. An alternate approach would be to make a requirement that one of the two existing staff positions be from DSA.

The reason for the second item is already discussed above.

These goals could be accomplished by making the following changes to Article VII, Section III, of the Bylaws:

As Currently Stated:

Membership. The membership of the Student Life Committee shall consist of thirteen voting members: six elected from the faculty, two members of the

professional staff elected by the members of the staff, and five students selected 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.

Revision:

Membership. The membership of the Student Life Committee shall consist of fourteen voting members: six elected from the faculty, three members of the professional staff, at least one of which is drawn from the Division of Student Affairs, elected by the members of the staff, and five students selected 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 Student Affairs serves as an ex-officio, non-voting member.

Given the busy agendas leading up to the end of the year, I realize that this business will most likely be pushed forward to next year. I apologize for the delay.

-Paul

Paul B. Harris, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Department of Psychology
Rollins College
1000 Holt Avenue - 2760
Winter Park, FL 32789
Phone: 407-628-6316
Fax: 407-646-2685

Attachment 2

Request to Revise the Amendment Procedures in *The Code of Community Standards*

Current Amendment Procedure:

A. *The Code of Community Standards* may be amended by the following procedure:

1. An amendment may be introduced by any member of the College Community in either the Student Government Association Senate, in accordance with SGA Senate by-laws, or in the Student Life Committee, in accordance with the by-laws of the Faculty of the Arts and Sciences.
2. If approved by the SGA Senate by a two-thirds majority, the proposed amendment then proceeds to the Student Life Committee for approval or rejection by majority vote. If the Student Life Committee rejects the proposed amendment, the committee must return it to the SGA Senate with reasons for its' rejection and, if possible, with suggestions for making the amendment acceptable. Further negotiations may continue, aimed at winning Student Life Committee approval of the amendment, but at any time after the first rejection, the SGA Senate may forward its approved amendment to the Executive Committee.
3. The reverse procedure of item (2) above applies to amendments introduced in the Student Life Committee and approved there by a majority vote, except that the SGA Senate must approve or reject such amendments by a two-thirds vote.
4. When an amendment has been deliberated by both bodies and approved by at least one, it is the responsibility of the Student Life Committee to bring the amendment and any alternate amendment approved by the contending body to the attention of the Executive Committee for its judgment, in accordance with The Responsibilities set forth in the By-laws of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences.

B. The College also recognizes the possibility that compelling or extenuating circumstances may require that amendment procedures be adjusted. Therefore, under these circumstances, amendments only require the approval of the Dean of Students and the College's Executive Committee. Corrections will be reflected immediately on the Office of Community Standards and Responsibility web site.

C. Grammatical changes and/or changes to Community Standards and Responsibility "Standard Operating Procedures" only require approval by the Dean of Student Affairs. Corrections will be reflected immediately on the Office of Community Standards and Responsibility web site.

Concerns with the Current Procedure:

1. It is a cumbersome, confusing process that has resulted in very few revisions to the Code (the Code has not been revised in 4+ years).

2. Best practices in judicial affairs and risk management indicate that the Code should be reviewed and amended on a regular basis (typically, at least every 3 years) to reflect changes and trends in student behavior and to ensure that the Code is aligned with the College's mission and educational philosophy.

Community Standards and Responsibility's Recommendations:

The Office of Community Standards and Responsibility believes that the above rationale creates a compelling circumstance to adjust the amendment procedures. Therefore, these changes would fall under section B of the current amendment procedures and would require the approval of the Dean of Students and the Executive Committee.

It is our recommendation that the following changes be made to the written Amendment Procedures in the Code:

- A. *The Code of Community Standards* shall be reviewed at least every three years by the Student Life Committee. Proposed changes must be approved by a two-thirds majority vote of the Student Life Committee. If approved, proposed changes will be forwarded to the Provost for final approval.
- B. The College also recognizes the possibility that compelling or extenuating circumstances may require that amendment procedures be adjusted. Therefore, under these circumstances, amendments only require the approval of the Dean of Students and the Provost. Approved amendments will be reflected immediately on the Office of Community Standards and Responsibility web site and will be effective upon approval.
- C. Grammatical changes and/or changes to Community Standards and Responsibility "Standard Operating Procedures" only require approval by the Dean of Student Affairs. Corrections will be reflected immediately on the Office of Community Standards and Responsibility web site and will be effective upon approval.