

9-13-2007

## Minutes, Arts & Sciences Executive Committee Meeting, Thursday, September 13, 2007

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, September 13, 2007" (2007). *Executive Committee Minutes*. Paper 91.  
[http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as\\_ec/91](http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ec/91)

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).

**Minutes**  
**Executive Committee of the Arts and Sciences Faculty**  
**September 13, 2007**

Members present: Lewis Duncan, Laurie Joyner, Paul Harris, Roger Casey, Don Davison, Barry Levis, Wendy Brandon, Rick Vitray, Stephanie Schuldt, Thom Moore (representing AAC)

- I. Approval of Executive Committee Minutes– The minutes from September 6, 2007 meeting were approved with corrections.
  
- II. Old Business
  1. Academic Affairs Committee
    - a) Curriculum Review – Moore representing AAC presented the committee’s proposal for the Curriculum Revision Steering Committee (See Appendix I). Duncan expressed his concern about the lack of staff representation on the committee especially those involved in student leadership and community engagement. Moore stated that AAC felt very strongly that the steering committee should consist of faculty only. Brandon suggested that committees normally had staff representation. Moore said that not all committees do; he thought that it does not make sense for staff membership, since the faculty have control of curriculum. The trustees have specifically given responsibility to faculty. Duncan argued that engaged learning called for staff involvement from those areas. It was a significant issue for members of the staff. Moore argued that because curriculum was a faculty responsibility the direction should remain exclusively with the faculty. The committee would certainly involve staff to a significant extent. Duncan said that it was a serious issue with student affairs staff. Brandon asserted that staff members have an important perspective to add to the process. Davison said that he did not understand how the faculty would abrogate control by including a professional staff member. Moore said that AAC felt it was an important symbolic move to the faculty. Harris expressed concern about the lack of experience of some of those recommended by AAC. Moore stated that AAC felt very strongly the committee should consist of junior faculty. Harris thought that was a very negative signal to senior faculty who are already concerned about the raise structure last year. They might feel even more ignored. He felt that the composition of the steering committee did not tap into our brain trust at all. Moore reminded the committee that elections were held last spring for divisional representation on the steering committee. AAC also determined select representatives for the steering committee to

provide some balance. They feared that older faculty might dominate the process. Davison argued for the need for the most open process possible so that one group would not dominate and everyone on the faculty would feel included. Joyner said that the AAC felt very strongly about not allowing senior faculty to dominate. They spent the entire meeting debating staff inclusion and committee composition of younger faculty. Moore said that with the current composition of AAC this recommendation was the best compromise because AAC was deeply divided. Duncan feared that this compromise was the course of least resistance rather than being high minded. Joyner said that the AAC discussion was highly principled. Harris argued that perception is everything and the process would suffer because the rest of the faculty might see the steering committee as not representative. Davison then asked each member of Executive Committee to articulate their views of the AAC proposal. Afterwards he said Executive Committee has three options seeing that there seemed to be little support for the AAC proposal: we could endorse the AAC proposal, we could ask for a new proposal from AAC, or we could write our own proposal to present to the faculty. Another possibility would be to take the AAC proposal without Executive Committee endorsement to faculty at the next meeting. Casey asked if the Executive Committee agreed with the charge to the steering committee regardless of its make up. He was concerned that deadlines set by AAC were too ambitious. Joyner suggested that the election process of divisional representatives was a major flaw because some of those elected had not been consulted and did not want to serve. She suggested that the Executive Committee could accept the charge but then revisit the composition because of these concerns. Davison agreed that the Executive Committee should approve the creation of the steering committee and endorse the change with minor modifications including making certain that the Executive Committee was kept fully informed of the committee's activities, some alteration of dates, and endorse the election at large of members to the committee. Casey expressed concern about the election of at large members. The committee needs individuals who have full knowledge of the pedagogy, curricular philosophy, and the political process for seeing through this enterprise. Joyner suggested that the Executive Committee not send the proposal back to AAC if we have so many concerns about it. Levis expressed concern about alienating AAC. Davison said he did not want to micromanage the process since that would be impossible. Moore saw that AAC had to revisit the issue of election of divisional representatives. Duncan wondered if AAC would listen to Executive Committee recommendations about staff person. Moore felt that because the committee was so deeply divided he could not say for sure. The Executive Committee voted to reject the Proposal from AAC. Davison moved a sense of the Executive Committee that the

AAC should address the question of the Steering committee again, making some minor changes to the charge, addressing the issue of divisional elections and establishing a more purposeful way of electing faculty to the steering committee who possess a strong liberal arts background and political acumen, and establishing weekly meetings, Harris seconded and the motion passed unanimously. By a vote of five to two, the Executive Committee also endorsed a sense of the Executive Committee that there should be a non-voting staff voice on the steering committee.

2. Strategic Marketing Initiative—Davison asked Duncan to present a progress report to the faculty. Duncan said that Greg Marshall should attend that meeting with faculty.
3. Executive Committee interpretation of whether faxes/emails/absentee ballots, etc., should be counted as official votes for business and/or nominations at A & S meetings.

### III. Committee Reports

1. Finance and Service – Vitray stated that the committee’s top agenda item will be faculty salaries.
2. Professional Standards – Brandon said the committee was considering a parental leave policy. She wondered about the relation between PSC and what Marvin Newman was doing with bylaw review. Davison did not see Newman’s work being other than housekeeping. All recommendations should go through PSC. Casey asked if Newman would review both the Bylaws and the Faculty Handbook. Joyner said she had serious concerns about the Bylaws. Davison said he thought that Newman would be looking for minor inconsistencies in the Bylaws and that Joyner should send major problems directly to PSC.
3. Student Life – Harris said that Student Life would begin discussions about the relationship between co-curricular change and curriculum revision.

- IV. Adjournment – Harris moved to adjourn and Vitray seconded. The meeting adjourned at 1:50 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Barry Levis, Secretary

## Appendix I

**TO:** EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE  
**FROM:** ACADEMIC AFFAIRS COMMITTEE  
**SUBJECT:** CURRICULUM STEERING COMMITTEE  
**DATE:** SEPTEMBER 13, 2007  
**CC:** AAC MEMBERS

---

The Academic Affairs Committee proposes to create a steering committee charged with overseeing the revision of the curriculum at Rollins College. This group will hereafter be referred to as the Curriculum Steering Committee.

Committee members will serve for at least one year but not more than two years. The committee will be composed of eight faculty members from the following groups:

1 from the Humanities Division

1 from the Expressive Arts Division

1 from the Division of Science and Mathematics

1 from the Division of Social Sciences

2 faculty members appointed by the Academic Affairs Committee

2 faculty members elected by the faculty at large

- At least two of the members will be selected from the summer work groups.
- The Student Government Association will be given the opportunity to endorse one faculty member that will stand for election as one of the two faculty voted on at-large.

The Academic Affairs Committee proposes the following members of the faculty be appointed to the Curriculum Steering Committee:

Martha Cheng

Rachel Simmons

Mark Anderson

Paul Harris

Rosana Diaz-Zambrana

Fiona Harper

Two faculty members elected at-large

### **Charge to the Task Force**

1. Elect a committee chairperson.
2. Create an intentional process that will include senior faculty, especially those holding endowed chairs.
3. Read and review the findings of the summer work groups and 4C.
4. Conduct transparent, open, biweekly meetings with an agenda published in advance.
  - a. Part of each meeting will be devoted to Steering Committee discussion.
  - b. Part of each meeting will be open for comments from the college community.
  - c. Some meetings will function as colloquy on specific issues.
  - d. Staff members and students will frequently be invited to present or discuss issues in their areas of expertise.
5. By October 31, 2007, present to the Academic Affairs Committee a rank-ordered list of priorities for revision of the curriculum and begin the process of developing a new curriculum.
6. Develop two or more concrete proposals to bring before the faculty for a vote in March 2008.
7. Report monthly to AAC via the Curriculum Steering Committee chairperson.