

2-3-2005

## Minutes, Arts & Sciences Executive Committee Meeting, Thursday, February 3, 2005

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 3, 2005" (2005). *Executive Committee Minutes*. Paper 113.  
[http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as\\_ec/113](http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ec/113)

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 of the Meeting**  
**Executive Committee of the Arts and Sciences**  
**February 3, 2005**

**Members attending:** P. Lancaster, R. Casey, Y. Greenberg, S. Lackman, N. Decker, D. Griffin, P. Bernal, S. Klemann. Guest: R. Carson

**I. Call to Order:** Yehudit Greenberg called the meeting to order at 12:33.

**II. Approval of Minutes:** The minutes of the meetings of January 20 were approved as presented.

**III.** Greenberg reminded Committee Chairs that if a change is to be made that will affect another committee, to make sure to consult with the affected committee.

**IV.** Greenberg asked to revive conversation about having a Faculty representation on the Board of Trustees. One issue of debate is how the faculty member would be chosen, and would that faculty member have a certain “agenda.” Greenberg will follow through because she feels it is important that a member of the faculty be involved on the Board. Klemann pointed out the conversation has to take place first with Dr. Duncan. There is also a question whether the trustees would agree. Is it necessary having a faculty member on the board? Greenberg will discuss the option with Dr. Duncan.

**V. Dates for Meetings** discussed: Executive Meeting on March 22 cancelled, March 9 at 8 a.m. substituted, in the Warden Dining Room.

**VI. Honor Code** (Bernal): Bernal presented a list of talking points; the draft document had been e-mailed to the committee members earlier. This is a modified honor code, where there are a variety of sanctions to be considered. On the mandatory requirement clause, the code has to be consistent with itself so that it can be implemented procedurally. Students must sign the pledge in order to matriculate at Rollins College. The reason for signing the pledge on every assignment is to keep the Honor Code prominent. Students are encouraged to self-report and to try to get others to do so. In this culture it may be difficult for students to report each other, but there is evidence, from other institutions, that the culture may change. Members of the committee suggested that if the student does not sign, the faculty may refuse to accept the assignment. The document, as currently written, clearly states that refusal to sign must be explained to the faculty member. There is a question of writing the honor code itself, or just signing one’s name. The current document says that the student will have to handwrite the pledge in every assignment. The signing ritual reinforces the code. Members of the Executive Committee were concerned about the burden on the students on the judicial committee, but the evidence indicates there are few cases that would have to be adjudicated. Only cases where the student refuses to admit guilt or self-report will have to go to the Council. Is one ultimate result of this Code the hope that students will be able to take exams without being proctored? The proposal was brought to the Executive Committee in advance of going to the Faculty. Bernal believes the Code must be approved, tabled, or voted down by May so it can be implemented by the beginning of the next academic year. One member was concerned about the Council’s ability

to set penalties and perhaps micro-manage the professor's grading in the course; should the student fail the class, no matter how "big" or important the assignment is?

The committee has begun to develop a social honor code that parallels the academic honor code. The committee will present the two documents separately. The social honor code is the rules of the college written in the language of the academic honor code. If the Committee is ready, the Academic Honor Code proposal will go before the faculty in March.

**VII. Academic Affairs (Klemann):** Klemann asked for the Executive Committee to delay the Foreign Language proposal. Klemann then presented Bob Carson to discuss the Task Force on Health and Wellness. The report under discussion was distributed ahead of the meeting. The Task Force had been asked to develop the program with resources currently available on campus. Research was done for comparison with other colleges, etc. The Task Force, in deliberating and studying, realized they could not create something with current resources. The Task Force considered using a Health and Wellness 2<sup>nd</sup> semester RCC-type course that would keep the cohort together. The plan would require two extra full-time lecturers. The Task Force is searching for a grant to be able to implement the proposal over three years; if the proposal goes well, there will be a request for permanent funding from the College. The faculty used during the trial period would not be tenure-track, and would probably be younger; the model for faculty is that used by the English Department with lecturers. The current course may look like the current Health and Wellness course, but the fine details are yet to come. The current course may not be the best model.

The issue was tabled due to time limitations. The meeting was adjourned at 2:03 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan Cohn Lackman, Ph.D., M.B.A.  
Vice-President, Secretary