

12-4-2008

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Executive Committee Meeting, Thursday, December 4, 2008

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, December 4, 2008" (2008). *Executive Committee Minutes*. Paper 71.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ec/71

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.

**Minutes
Executive Committee
December 4, 2008**

Membership Present: Don Davison, Susan Libby, Marissa Germain, Lewis Duncan, Paul Harris, Laurie Joyner, Mike Gunter, and Wendy Brandon

Guests: Karen Hater, Jim Eck

- I. Call to order—The meeting was called to order at 12:37 PM.
- II. Approval of Minutes from November 4 and November 13, 2008—The approval of these minutes were postponed until the next meeting.
- III. Old Business
 - A. Student Affairs mission statement—Davison wanted to continue the conversation about the recommendation to revisit the mission statement. He proposed that there would be a small group including the two deans, a student representative, a staff member of student affairs, and several faculty including a representative from the Student Life Committee. Germain felt that there should be more than one student on the committee. Hater felt that if that were the case then there would be large call for more staff positions. Levis said that the purpose of this effort was to improve the bridge between academic and student affairs, and it is really the faculty that must undertake to bring that about. Hater said that she had told staff that they would have to trust their representative to present their position. Hater wondered what would happen to the mission statement once it has been developed. There has been a series of mission statements with each new dean. Obviously that should not want that to happen again. How will it be institutionalized? Joyner saw that once it was in place then it should be used to develop cooperation between the two operations so that they are on the same page. Levis recommended that it be approve by the faculty and SGA to institutionalize it. Davison suggested that we not decide at this time. He wondered why the office had changed the mission statement so often. Hater thought that it was the result of the lack of stable leadership. Joyner felt that we could incorporate a requirement that the mission statement could not be changed without the approval of the faculty. Brandon suggested that it be put into the bylaws. Germain wanted to return to the issue of student representation. She observed that there had not been a strong mission statement that held all the offices together. Gunter asked just how many missions statements there were. Davison stated that many units of the college have there own

mission statement that is subordinate to the main mission statement. Libby wondered if there would be a search for a permanent head of counseling center. Hater stated that no decision had been made yet. Duncan said that in order to control costs the college was looking at what services would be continued that are not part of the core commitment of the college. Germain argued that it is comforting to students to have these services available. The Executive Committee recommended that Katie Sunderland represent the Student Life Committee on the Task Force. Brandon suggested Eric Smaw. Levis suggested Bill Bowles and Thom Moore, Libby recommended Kim Dennis. Gunter suggested Eileen Gregory if someone decided not to do it. The slate was approved and Davison will contact them to see if they were willing to serve.

IV. New Business

- A. Executive Committee Appointment to Faculty Salary Council—The committee consists of the four division heads including Libby, Cohen, Kypraios, and Klemann. Davison recommended Brandon because of her past experience while the others had not been involved in the process last summer. Brandon said that she was willing to serve and the Executive Committee approved.
- B. Cornell Distinguished Faculty awards—Davison said that he had no business for the meeting so that Duncan will present the awards as the only business.
- C. Academic Affairs—Graduation hours. Brandon thought it would be good time to begin the discussion of the topic of reducing hours for graduation. Davison suggested that at the faculty meeting there would be a brief presentation and then he could invite faculty input. Gunter wondered what the proposal was about. Brandon said that it was about reducing teaching loads as well as Duncan's concern about scholarship moneys. Gunter felt that it was just the result of inflated course credits and that students actually don't take enough courses. Duncan said that the college would have to reduce the number of courses that carry credit. He pointed out the problem of Bright Futures. Gunter said that high quality institutions required about the same number of courses for graduation as Rollins does. Levis wondered if the old system of courses rather than credit hours would work better. Duncan observed that some of brightest students have suffered because of lose of scholarships. Joyner argued that it had to do with increasing academic quality and that some of the experiences we give credit for outside of regular courses would be incorporated into regular courses. Gunter felt that the problem of Bright Futures was a good argument for reducing graduation hours and also the possibility of reduced

the faculty teaching load, but if that diminishes the number of courses that a student takes then that represents a serious problem. The best scholar students take five courses per semester. Germain said that under the current system she has not been able to take classes outside the requirements for her major and minor. Brandon said that AAC will collect all of this information and over the winter break put together this information to develop a final proposal. Davison thought that after the awards that the meeting would be turned into a committee of the whole for the discussion. Brandon also said that they were looking at the Holt curriculum.

- D. Finance and Services—recommendation for representation on Board (see attachment 1)—Gunter said that the proposal would be presented to the faculty in January and the SGA was currently considering their own proposal. Duncan said that the board would reject the current proposal especially since it does not indicate that the faculty representatives would be non-voting. That he thought the faculty should want the board to invite faculty and student participation in discussions rather than representation. Gunter said that the data suggests that most of the schools that faculty are attending regularly and that that was especially true of committee participation (see attachment 2). Joyner said that Loyola she had been designed a faculty advisor and not representative. Duncan thought that faculty serving on a committee was a reasonable request. Joyner wondered if the committees were the real working locus of the trustees. Could faculty then just have observer status expect in executive sessions. Duncan felt that might fly. Duncan said that participation was what the faculty really wanted. Duncan said that students and faculty have been invited to curriculum committee. Davison said that what the faculty wanted was that they be invited regularly and not in an ad hoc manner. Duncan said that the danger was that if faculty participates in board business that trustees might want to be more involved in faculty business including what books were used in classes. Gunter said that the problem with trustee is that they really do not understand the difficulties of teaching. Duncan said that the board did not have discussions about classroom activities but about hiring practices and strategic decisions about future plans for the college. Davison felt that the board has an impact on the faculty; a good example was the strategic planning as well as budget and planning groups and the sustainable business model. These are key issues that will drive the future direction of the institution and that there should be value in having faculty insight. Duncan gave the example of the increase in the endowment but it is not the board's job to determine how that money is spent. Germain thought that suggestions from the board might be useful. Libby said that the members of the board and faculty were on such different plains that it is not useful.

- E. Professional Standards—Bylaw recommendation (see attachment 3)—
Libby presented a bylaw change that would disallow promotion to Associate Professor before tenure. Davison had interpreted that it would not include requirement to have been at Rollins for a minimum period of time before tenure. Libby said that for the sake of brevity the revision directs to another section that does outline the time served requirements. Duncan wondered about some individuals who are hired in at the Associate level but without tenure. Brandon said that it was an attempt to stop the practice of promoting individuals after a few years without review by FEC. Duncan wondered about individuals working at a national science laboratory. Brandon said that was negotiated in the original faculty contract. Davison recommended that the proposal should go back to committee for further consideration because he did not see it quite ready to go to the faculty.
- F. Other new business—Davison wondered about the progress of Classical Studies and asked Brandon to make a report. Brandon said that Rubarth had made an update to AAC, and she will forward it to the Executive Committee.
- G. Duncan wanted to discuss about the poster concerned about censorship. He is considering removing the poster but he had no intention of censoring the speech. He was asking for advice from the Executive Committee. Davison felt the photograph is sensational although a talk on evolution would not be. Brandon thought that it might be. But we don't want to stifle inquiry, she argued. Libby argued very strongly about removing the image. The consensus was not to remove the posters but to use it as a teachable moment

V. Adjournment—The meeting was adjourned at 2:35 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Barry Levis
Secretary

Attachment 1

Proposed Faculty Resolution on Board of Trustees Submitted by Finance & Service Committee

To enhance efficiency and communication, and in keeping with precedent established by both peer and aspirant institutions, we 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 each standing committee of the Board.

Attachment 2

See separate document listed after the minutes.

Attachment 3

Proposed By-Law change

[Delete](#)

[Replace with](#)

Article VIII, B,

Promotion to Associate Professor. [Persons holding the rank of Assistant Professor may be awarded promotion to the rank of Associate Professor after a minimum of six years of full-time teaching in a senior institution at the Assistant Professor level, of which at least four years have been at this institution.](#)

[Persons holding the rank of Assistant Professor are promoted to the rank of Associate Professor upon the award of tenure. \(See eligibility for tenure, Section D\).](#)