

11-13-2008

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Executive Committee Meeting, Thursday, November 13, 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, November 13, 2008" (2008). *Executive Committee Minutes*. Paper 72.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ec/72

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
November 13, 2008**

Members Present: Roger Casey, Paul Harris, Marissa Germain, Laurie Joyner, Wendy Brandon, Susan Libby, Lewis Duncan, Lisa Tillman, Don Davison

I. Call to order—Davison called the meeting to order at 12:38 PM.

II. Approval of Minutes from November 4, 2008—approval of minutes was delayed to the next meeting.

III. Old Business

A. Student Affairs mission statement—Davison reminded the Executive Committee of the discussions about revisiting the mission statement for Student Affairs. Davison indicated that he had asked Hater to attend meeting but she needs to be late.

IV. New Business

A. Dean of Student Affairs report to faculty—The Faculty had passed a bylaw revision last year requiring the Dean of Student Affairs to report to the faculty on student affairs issues. Therefore Davison has asked Hater to report at the November 20 faculty meeting.

B. Other new business—Davison discussed the agenda for the November 20 faculty meeting. Hater report would be one item and also perhaps a discussion of recent changes in Student Affairs. He also has three bylaw proposals that need to be considered. Newman also has more revisions to the bylaws. The revisions include a requirement for the President of the Faculty to present a report each year, a bylaw allowing only tenured or official tenure track faculty to serve on a standing committee, and a bylaw allowing online submissions of tenure and promotion materials (see attachment 1). Libby reported that PSC did not feel that the last bylaw change was necessary since the word “submitted” must be understood as disseminated which can be handled in a variety of ways including online submission. Casey suggested that since this is an interpretation of Bylaws that it does not need to be approved as a bylaws change. Levis asked whether the PSC meant that submission could be either physical or online irrespective of the actual method. Libby said that FEC would like all submissions online but PSC has not gone that far yet. Joyner said that because of the number of reviews this year FEC is under tremendous strain, and she recommended trying to get through this semester and then

revisiting it later because of the number of issues involved at this time. Casey saw that there had been a bottleneck each year and it has become even more significant. He agreed with Joyner that now was not the time to make major changes. Davison thought that this could be postponed. Levis suggested that at the very least the Executive Committee could agree that the word “submit” could include online. Then PSC could deal with the other issues in the Spring. Davison asked for a vote of the Executive Committee on this interpretation and it passed. Brandon asked about the interface between FEC and PSC and Executive Committee. Levis said that the original review committee had been set up separately from the governance structure. Casey felt that putting the FEC chair on the Executive Committee might politicize FEC, which could be harmful.

- C. Finance and Services—Tillman expressed concern about the implications of Florida Constitutional Amendment 2 and its potential impact on Rollins. Duncan said that of course if the law forced the college to change benefits the college would have to go along with it, but the Board has passed this policy and has no inclination to repeal it. Tillman expressed concern about a board that generally is seen as conservative. Duncan agreed that many board members were conservative, but they had also just elected an openly gay member to its membership. Tillman reported that Finance and Services wanted to add gender identity and expression to the college’s non-discrimination statement and this proposal probably would go through Human Resources. Duncan wondered if one is not listed on the protected list if that individual was not protected. He expressed concern about not always being aware of the consequences of these expansions of the protected list. Joyner wondered about job advertisement that expressly mentioned sexual orientation. Could an applicant perceive this statement as privileging sexual orientation in the hiring? Tillman replied that it was beyond the federally protected status and so the ad was pointing out that we went beyond the federal list. Some organizations will not post job listing without including a broad range of protections. Casey said he saw it as a job listing and not a policy and also agreed with Tillman that it showed that we went beyond the federally mandated listings. Also it answers questions about domestic partner benefits that many applicants will ask about. Joyner asked if some departments can list or not at their discretion. Duncan said that we need to have a policy but are we articulating an existing policy or a revision of it. Joyner asked if she should asked all departments to include the statement in their advertisements. Duncan felt that the issue should be presented to the faculty to make certain that it is an articulation of current policy. Duncan expressed concern that the longer the list became the more the danger that some might conclude that if they are not on the list that they are not protected. Davison asked about student and faculty representation on the Board. Tillman reported that the committee was in the process of drafting language and she could report to the faculty at the next meeting.

- D. Academic Affairs—Brandon reported that AAC will consider moving to 128 credits from 140 for graduation. Levis asked if we were comparing other institutions that also have four credit-hours classes. Casey said that many ACS schools have similar course credit systems. Joyner was uncomfortable about taking this to the faculty this late in the semester without having a full discussion of the data. Davison felt that AAC should have a colloquium about this at the beginning of December. Duncan said that part of the problem was that some students cannot continue with Bright Futures because they have accumulated so many credit hours through things like choir or service learning. He suggested that some institutions limit the number of credits a student can accumulate through these types of courses. Germain was concerned that if the faculty removed these credit opportunities that would have negative impact on students. It would remove incentives for students to get involved. Duncan suggested that moving toward a portfolio system will address the issue of listing skills and experiences. Joyner said that the six credits earned by peer mentors was an important factor because she would have to have a significant increase in her budget to handle the tasks that they do. Casey hoped that it would be institution wide because of Holt School, which strongly supports the credit reduction. Davison also said that they need to address the question of teaching load. Libby also said that there was strong support among faculty to reduce the teaching load to 3/2. Joyner expressed concerns about the number of faculty release time.
- E. Budget Presentation—Davison raised questions about the budget presentation made to the faculty. He thought that there had been some good questions. For instance, he pointed out Rock's question about aggregating some of the budget lines to see their constitution. Also he pointed to Cohen's notion of A&S operating like Crummer in keeping their profits. Levis reported faculty concern about the fact that A&S seems not to stand very high in the priorities of going from good to great in Duncan's presentation to the faculty. Joyner said that the science faculty who had gone to a conference and came up with ideas that excited them tremendously, are limited in what they can do by the lack of a new science center which was not on the list. Duncan said that the Board of Trustees saw that they could undertake only two hard things at a time. They saw that increasing the composition of the board would increase the number of potential donors and the college needs to have a place for visitors to stay were all they could undertake at this time.

V. Adjournment—the meeting was adjourned at 2:03 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Barry Levis
Secretary

Attachment 1

REVISED 11/04/2008

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO Article III, Section 1 OF THE BYLAWS OF THE COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

**To be inserted immediately before the last full sentence in the present Section 1 of
Article III.**

The Standing Committee chairs shall submit an annual report to the President of the Faculty on or before May 30 of each academic year. The President of the Faculty shall, on or before June 15 of each academic year, forward to the faculty, the Provost, and the Dean of the Faculty a copy of all amendments to these bylaws which have been approved by the faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences in accordance with these bylaws.

Deleted: May 30