

2-5-2009

## Minutes, Arts & Sciences Executive Committee Meeting, Thursday, February 5, 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, February 5, 2009" (2009). *Executive Committee Minutes*. Paper 69.  
[http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as\\_ec/69](http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ec/69)

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 February 5, 2009

**Members Present: Laurie Joyner, Roger Casey, Paul Harris, Susan Libby, Mike Gunter, Wendy Brandon, Don Davison, Marissa Germain, Lewis Duncan, Barry Levis**

**Guest: Karen Hater**

- I. Call to order—Davison called to order at 12:35 PM
- II. Approval of Minutes (January 22, 2009)—Consideration of the Minutes will be postponed until the next meeting to make some modifications.
- III. Announcements
  - A. Status of Classical Studies major—Joyner reported that the report of the External Review committee called for the reinstatement of the classics program this semester which Joyner felt was too aggressive. She also felt that the hiring of a tenure track position may be questionable at this time as well as the recommendation that the program would be heavily language based. But she reported that progress has been made. Vander Poppen and Rubarth are examining some innovative ways to reduce the number of courses required for the major. Duncan asked if we have considered the question of housing as a program or a department. Joyner said that the report calls for the creation of a department. Duncan felt the solution was problematic. Also he discussed the level of language needed for the classics program. Joyner said the report was much more traditional and called for four years of language. Germain thought that the focus was on reading and not on speaking. Duncan wondered if the faculty would actually approve the creation of a department. Joyner thought that the report recommended that the department be created, but the individuals currently here could keep their affiliation with the departments they are currently attached to. Levis wondered if we could not have a combined department with history or philosophy. Joyner pointed out the difficulties that arise with the combined departments such as Art and Art History.
  - B. Budget and faculty merit pool—Davison reported that a budget had been approved by the Budget and Planning Committee to be sent to the trustees. Budget contains funds for merit increases. The new protocol called for the salary council to meet with the dean and also the Executive Committee to discuss the salary proposal but he did not want to do anything at this time until after the budget had been finalized.

#### IV. Old Business

A. Finance and Services resolution regarding faculty seats on Board (See Attachment 1)—Davison wanted to clarify what the procedure will be to finalize the resolution. He wished to proceed as quickly as possible and asked if the other committees had examined the Finance and Services proposal. Harris and Brandon reported that their respective committees have it on their agendas but had not gotten to it. Duncan said that he had objected not just to the proposition of faculty representation on the board of trustees but also the statement that the practice was in keeping with peer and aspirant institutions which he felt was misleading. Even the claim about the University of the South was misleading because Sewanee also has a board of regents, where the real work takes place, which has no faculty presentation. Gunter argued that Finance and Services sought either at large positions on the board or at least faculty representation on committees. He suggested that the data supported their position since half the institutions surveyed have representation. Duncan said that if the two issues are linked that it will fail. Davison thought we should ask Finance and Services if they are willing to take out the issue of board representation. Duncan said that he wanted to push forward with having student and faculty representation on certain committees. At the last meeting, he had offered to open the Trustee minutes to help faculty determine what committees would be suitable. Casey reported on his conversation with Andrew Czekaj. SGA is already slotted to make a presentation; and, in the past, Czekaj has invited suitable faculty to be present for discussion of issues coming before the committee. He wanted the faculty presidents of A&S and Crummer to attend this meeting to discuss issues being considered by faculty governance. He wanted to minimize the business to allow for greater time for discussion. Gunter said that F&S did not see representation as decussating voting rights. Brandon wondered about the wording of enhancing efficiency and communication. Gunter did not think the committee was wedded to those words.

#### V. New Business

A. Student Life Committee (see attachment 2)—Harris has distributed a student life survey concerning the issue of faculty motivation to engage in co-curricular activities. The committee had no pressing agenda last year and so they made up their own agenda. Since we are currently looking at a new curriculum, the committee decided to look at the co-curricular. A major issue for the committee was the relative lack of faculty interest in the co-curriculums. The faculty seemed to think that there should be little connection of faculty. Hater claimed that she was not totally surprised by this response. If there was actually a seamless connection between the curriculum and co-curriculum then the faculty might not react to it the way they had in the past. Perhaps if there was a new approach then we might get a different response. Harris said there was a great deal of hostility toward the Greek system and as a result there is little faculty involvement

in Greek life. Faculty reported that they were not being asked. Faculty felt that there was little support for faculty involvement in co-curriculum and some suggested that they might even be punished by departments for involvement in that sort of service. It is not encouraged or rewarded. Joyner felt that might change because of the Leap Learning Outcomes; she has been working with Hater to coordinate these efforts for assessment purposes. Joyner suggested that there was perhaps too narrow an understanding of student involvement as only advising a student group. It is much broader than that. She said that in her letters of faculty assessment, she is pointing out contributions to institutional service including RCC, Honors, service learning, and other things that we have recognized as important. Brandon said that several years ago, she and Eric Schutz had worked with some Greek organizations to understand how they viewed their contributions. Germain felt that a number of Greek organizations are not working as effectively in broadening their activities as effectively as they could. Harris said that there was concern among faculty about liability issues and others just do not approve of the Greek concept. There seems to be no incentive for doing this sort of service. But faculty do see that they have a certain level of responsibility for student groups but are not willing to take time to mentor the groups in this regard. Duncan said that we do not celebrate their accomplishment. Libby expressed concern about the messages that filter down about what the faculty should be doing. If you are putting your energies into one thing then you will be criticized for neglecting something else. She felt that we need to have an understating of what faculty priorities are supposed to be. Germain concurred that there is not a clear sense of what students should experience. The college should have a list of student expectations and a sense of what they should experience as part of a Rollins education. The faculty should prioritize what they think of as service, Casey observed. Joyner suggested that there is so much going on outside of classroom, but faculty seem to focus on the Greeks as the co-curricular. Levis opined that the Greeks had been a serious issue for so long at Rollins that when the issue of the co-curriculum is mentioned the Greeks always come to mind. Hater said that in her brief time in this position she had come to realize that the importance of advising cannot be underestimated. It is so important. ATO has come to her to beg for a faculty advisor; they will make mistakes if they are not given good mentorship. She has been trying to find a good advisor. She pointed out how much difference the advisor has made for the TKEs. Duncan regarded this as a serious faculty issue, and it needs to be solved by the faculty. We cannot have a situation where the faculty shrug off these responsibilities because it is too important. The faculty must agree that the co-curricular is an essential part of their responsibilities. Joyner argued that, to the contrary, faculty are deeply involved. Duncan posited that view did not reflect the sentiments in the report, but Joyner rejoined that there is a great deal going on that goes well beyond what the report represented. Davison observed that there is a need

for clarity of faculty responsibilities. There is a serious disconnect between cues and rewards. He felt that the report should be disseminated to the faculty with a bullet summary. But the additional information presented by Joyner should be released as well. We need to have a faculty discussion on this issue even if we have to take time at a faculty meeting. The Student Life committee should make a series of recommendations as to how to proceed. Duncan thought that a pair of faculty should serve as advisors to various organizations. Davison whined about why Greek organizations need so much attention. Germain said that Greek organizations are more complex and therefore there is a need for consideration. Duncan argued that they were both community service groups and also social organizations. They are therefore very complex and also are central to maintain the traditions at many college campuses including Rollins. Hater suggested that the Greeks hold a very important role for the social life of everyone on campus. Germain also pointed out that if other students can get Greek organizations to support an event then it has much greater chance of success. Duncan felt that he might support eliminating Greek organizations but only with the endorsement of an informed faculty. He saw that most of the criticism comes from those who have not really been involved or informed about what was going on. Casey saw this discussion as endemic throughout colleges. Gunter felt that students need more choices so they are not so dominated by the Greeks. While they represent only 35% of the student body, they have a much greater presence. Duncan argued that they were especially important to intramurals. Harris observed that so many of the faculty had no real experience with Greek organizations that it was an important factor in the survey. Germain felt that *The Sandspur* and RTV need to focus more on the accomplishments of Greek organizations. Hater wanted to know where she could turn for assistance. Davison suggested that Student Life while Joyner suggested the staff advisory board.

- B. Internationalization Report—Casey reported that Edge headed a committee that has produced a report on college internationalization efforts. He said that there still needs to be a structural document that encompasses the entire college so that we can work across units

VI. Adjournment—The meeting was adjourned at 2:03 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Barry Levis  
Secretary

## **Attachment 1**

### **Finance and Services Resolution:**

*To enhance efficiency and communication, and in keeping with precedent established by both peer and aspirant institutions, the Arts & Sciences Faculty propose the addition of two members of full time teaching Faculty to the Board of Trustees as well as at least one faculty representative on relevant standing committees of the Board.*

## **Attachment 2**

### **Student Life Committee Results from the Survey on Faculty Involvement in the Co-Curriculum Spring 2008**

#### **Purpose & Method:**

In the 2007-2008 academic year, the Student Life Committee, joining forces with Cara Meixner from the Office of Student Involvement and Leadership, discussed faculty involvement in the co-curriculum specifically with regards to serving as advisors to student organizations. Statistics indicate that an organization's advisor is more likely to be a member of the staff (especially student affairs staff) than a faculty member, especially if that organization is a fraternity or sorority. In an effort to determine the perception of the current and ideal levels of involvement in student organizations several focus groups of students, faculty, and staff were held. From these focus groups a survey was created and sent to all full-time faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences via the Web. The survey asked several demographic questions and open-ended questions on what motivates/discourages faculty from organization advising, potential incentives to participate, and the role of these organizations in the curriculum. We were especially interested in differences between Greek and non-Greek organizations.

#### **Results & Analysis:**

*Demographics:* The 58 responses to the survey created a response rate of approximately 30% of those asked to complete it. The break down of 60% tenured, 28% tenure-track, and 10% non-tenure track indicates that our sample is representative of the general faculty population (1 person did not indicate rank). Of the respondents, 38% were currently advising a non-Greek student organization, 66% had advised in the past and 24% had been asked to advised and refused. There was less participation in advising Greek organizations. Only 5% were currently advising a fraternity or sorority, 17% had advised in the past, and 17% had been asked and refused. This seems to indicate that it is

not the case that faculty are refusing to advise Greek organizations at a greater rate, but that we are being asked to advise these organizations less often.

*Motivation:* When asked what motivates faculty to advise student organizations, the faculty perception was that faculty that choose to advise (1) are seeking to help and connect with students, (2) had an existing relationship with the student who asked them to advise, and (3) see it as a way to serve the college. These responses were prevalent regardless of the type of organization. Faculty responses also indicated a perception that an interest in the organization's mission itself motivated faculty if the organization was non-Greek, while past membership was considered a motivating factor in advising Greek organizations.

*Reluctance:* When asked what might make faculty reluctant to serve as an advisor, lack of time and lack of recognition as service during the tenure and promotion process were the two most prevalent answers regardless of organization type. For non-Greek organizations, lack of interest was also a potential reason to not serve. A different pattern emerged for reluctance in advising fraternities and sororities. Faculty mentioned the negative perception of Greek life on campus and a lack of desire to place themselves in precarious legal/ethical situations. Additionally, faculty mentioned the stigma from other faculty associated with advising such an organization. This stigma seems to be real given the number of sarcastic comments about wanting to relive one's youth that appeared under what might motivate someone to advise such an organization.

*Incentives:* Faculty were asked to think about what kinds of things might increase their willingness to advise student organizations. Recognition as service to the college during the tenure and promotion process was the most prevalent answer followed by monetary and time incentives (like course release). Improving the negative reputations (with regards to drinking and partying) was often mentioned specifically for Greek organizations. Several respondents did not believe that any type of incentive was appropriate for advising student organizations.

*Curriculum connections:* Given the current discussion of curriculum reform on campus, faculty were asked about ideas on how to integrate the co-curricular activities of student organizations into the Rollins curriculum. The most overwhelming response, especially for Greek organizations, was that there should not be a connection. For the individuals who did want to see connections, they were different for Greek and non-Greek organizations. The recommendation for non-Greek organizations was to strengthen their connections to specific classes and departments. Recommendations for Greek organizations included highlighting or increasing their service to the campus and community at large.

**Followup:**

LEFT BLANK FOR SLC TO DECIDE WHAT'S NEXT

## FACULTY INVOLVEMENT IN THE CO-CURRICULUM SURVEY

This year Student Life Committee is examining potential connections between the curriculum and the co-curriculum. To facilitate these connections, faculty must have some level of involvement in student organizations. This survey is intended to assess faculty opinions about student organizations and solicit ideas about linking the curriculum more closely to the co-curriculum. You will be asked a set of questions first about fraternities and sororities, and then about “non-Greek” student organizations.

This survey has been reviewed and approved by the Rollins College Institutional Review Board (IRB). Your responses to this questionnaire are voluntary and anonymous. When you click on the submit button at the bottom of the survey, your responses will be e-mailed to Paul Harris (Chair of Student Life Committee) without any identifying information attached.

A summary report from this survey will be sent to the entire faculty when the research is complete.

If you have any questions, contact Paul Harris [pharris@rollins.edu](mailto:pharris@rollins.edu) or extension 6316.

### **The following questions concern fraternities or sororities:**

1. Do you currently advise a fraternity or a sorority?     Yes     No

**If Yes,** approximately how many hours per semester does your role as advisor require?

2. Have you advised a fraternity or sorority at Rollins in the past?     Yes     No

**If Yes,** approximately how many years combined have you spent advising these organizations?

3. Have you ever declined a request to advise a fraternity or sorority?     Yes     No

4. In your opinion, what motivates faculty members to advise fraternities or sororities?

5. In your opinion, what factors make faculty members reluctant to advise fraternities or sororities?

6. Can you think of anything (e.g., practices, policies, procedures, incentives) that might increase faculty willingness to advise fraternities or sororities?

7. Do you have any ideas about how the co-curricular practices of fraternities and sororities could be better integrated into the curriculum at Rollins?

### **The following questions concern “non-Greek” student organizations (i.e., organizations that are not fraternities or sororities):**

8. Do you currently advise a non-Greek student organization?     Yes     No

**If Yes,** approximately how many hours per semester does your role as advisor require?

9. Have you advised non-Greek student organizations at Rollins in the past?  Yes  No

**If Yes**, approximately how many years combined have you spent advising these organizations?

10. Have you ever declined a request to advise a non-Greek student organization?  Yes  No

11. In your opinion, what motivates faculty members to advise non-Greek student organizations?

12. In your opinion, what factors make faculty members reluctant to advise non-Greek student organizations?

13. Can you think of anything (e.g., practices, policies, procedures, incentives) that might increase faculty willingness to advise non-Greek student organizations?

14. Do you have any ideas about how the co-curricular practices of non-Greek student organizations could be better integrated into the curriculum at Rollins?

**Information about you:**

15. Gender?  Female  Male

16. Tenure status?      1 Tenured  
                                 2 Working Towards Tenure (Tenure Track)  
                                 3 Non-Tenure Track Position

17. Rank?   1 Instructor   2 Assistant Professor   3 Associate Professor   4 Professor

**Thank you for completing our survey.  
Please click the submit button to send your responses to us.  
Your responses will be anonymous when we receive them.**