

11-19-2015

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Faculty Meeting, Thursday, November 19, 2015

Arts & Sciences Faculty
Rollins College

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_fac



Part of the [Educational Administration and Supervision Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Arts & Sciences Faculty, "Minutes, Arts & Sciences Faculty Meeting, Thursday, November 19, 2015" (2015). *College of Arts and Sciences Faculty Minutes*. Paper 113.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_fac/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 College of Arts and Sciences Faculty Minutes by an authorized administrator of Rollins Scholarship Online. For more information, please contact rwalton@rollins.edu.



ROLLINS

Arts & Sciences Faculty Meeting

November 19, 2015

Agenda

- I. Call to Order
- II. Approval of Minutes from 10/29/15
- III. New Business: Presentation by All-College Executive Council “Plus” (EC+) – Models for Governance Reform (enclosed)
- IV. Committee Reports:
 - a. Academic Affairs
 - b. Finance & Services
 - c. Professional Standards
 - d. Student Life
- V. Adjournment



ROLLINS
Meeting Minutes
November 19, 2015

Present

Aggarwal, Vidhu; Anderson, Mark; Armenia, Amy; Barnes, Melissa; Bernal, Pedro; Boles, William; Boniface, Dexter; Brandon, Wendy; Carnahan, Sharon; Cavanaugh, Jennifer; Chambliss, Julian; Charles, David; Cheng, Martha; Chong, Daniel; Cook, Gloria; Cook, J. Thomas; Cornwell, Grant; Cummings, Denise; D'Amato, Mario; Davidson, Alice; Davison, Joan; Decker, Nancy; Dennis, Kimberly; Diaz-Zambrana, Rosana; Dunn, Stacey; Ewing, Hannah; Fogleson, Richard; Fokidis, H. Bobby; French, Todd; Fuse, Christopher; Gallagher, Erin; Grau, John; Greenberg, Yudit; Griffin, Kevin; Gunter, Michael; Habgood, Laurel; Harper Fiona; Harwell, Jonathan; Homrich, Alicia; Hosburgh, Nathan; Houston, John; Jones, Jill; Kozel, Philip; Kypraios, Harry; Lairson, Thomas; Lines, Lee; Mathews, Jana; Mays, Dorothy; McClure, Amy; Mésavage, R. Matilde; Miller, Robert; Miller, Jonathan; Montgomery, Susan; Moore, Robert; Moore, Thomas; Murdaugh, Anne; Myers, Daniel; Newcomb, Rachel; Nichter, Matthew; Nodine, Emily; Norsworthy, Kathryn; O'Sullivan, Maurice; Ouellette, Thomas; Oxford, Emma; Paladino, Derrick; Park, Ellane; Patrone, James; Pieczynski, Jay; Queen, Jennifer; Reich, Paul; Riley, Cassandra; Roe, Dawn; Ruiz, Maria; Russell, Emily; Ryan, MacKenzie; Sanabria, Samuel; Schoen, Steven; Simmons, Rachel; Sinclair, John; Stephenson, Paul; Strom, Claire; Sutherland, Kathryn; Svitavsky, Bill; Tatari, Eren; Teymuroglu, Zeynep; Tomé, Patricia; Vander Poppen, Robert; Vitray, Richard; Voicu, Anca; Walsh, Susan; Walton, Rachel; Yao, Yusheng; Zhang, Wenxian; Zivot, Eric; Fadool, Margot; Rogers, Don; Wellman, Debra; Cavanaugh, Greg; Castino, Nan

Call to Order

President Dexter Boniface called the meeting to order at 12:33 pm.

Approval of Minutes

The assembled faculty approved the minutes from 10/29/15 by voice vote.

Announcement

Dexter Boniface: Holiday Party is Dec 4 from 5-8pm at the Alford Inn.

New Business: Report from Executive Council Plus of Models for Governance Reform

President Cornwell: This exploration of governance is an instrumental question. It should allow us to deliver on our mission to liberally educate, to create a "leaner" model of service that will enable us to work with students on liberal education. I am an experimentalist; we're not seeking a platonic ideal of governance for all time, but will try something for a limited time that seeks to be better than what we have now. This will be

an iterative process. We will make a change for a period of 3 years, stop talking about it for that period, and then assess it. In three years, we will ask, “can we do better? What should we change? Or is it steady as she goes?”

Today isn't your only touch point; this is simply an initial conversation. EC+ will solicit feedback online and I will convene an All-Faculty meeting on Dec 9. Since an all-faculty meeting likely won't be the best deliberative space, we will use some of that time to break into small, facilitated groups and then report back.

Boniface: I plan to present the document in 2 stages—principles and assumptions, then review all of the models at once. Before that, I would like to make a few prefatory remarks. I want to thank the CPS members of EC+: Don Rogers, Margot Fadool, and Rick Bommelje. They have been deliberative and cooperative. I want to recognize that it must be difficult to embark on this task. The central themes reflected by all of you from our opening retreat were unity and harmony. We now have an opportunity to deliver that. It is our responsibility to demonstrate mutual respect, not just today, but as a body moving forward.

Our guiding principles of reform were established at the outset of our work, before we considered models from other schools.

Guiding Principles of Governance Reform (circulated in advance of the meeting)

The system and structure of shared governance should be organized to **advance our mission** to liberally educate students for global citizenship and responsible leadership, empowering graduates to pursue meaningful lives and productive careers.

The system and structure of shared governance should be as **simple and efficient** as possible to provide for deliberation and decision making around issues and topics central to our mission. Our system of shared governance should seek to optimize the proportion of time faculty can devote to their students, their teaching and their research.

The system and structure of shared governance should be as **transparent** as possible to provide for deliberation and decision making around issues and topics central to our mission. The scope of authority for any committee or office should be clear and explicit.

The system and structure of shared governance should **protect academic freedom** and respect the authority of the disciplines to design and deliver their curriculum and pedagogy according to their best professional judgment while recognizing that all academic programs are accountable to the faculty as a whole.

The system and structure of shared governance should **accord respect to all members of the faculty irrespective of rank or discipline**, and provide mechanisms for the collegial airing of differences and adjudication of conflicts.

Operating Principles (circulated in advance of the meeting)

- Decisions will be in line with the Guiding Principles of Governance Reform.

- None of these models are being specifically advocated by EC+. They are intended to stimulate discussion.
- All existing programs/majors will remain (no current academic programs will be eliminated).
- In all models, Crummer graduate programs operate autonomously as they do now.
- All programs will share common governance committees (curriculum, faculty evaluation, etc).
- Future discussions will focus on details of governance committees, models of staffing committees, and administrative structure.
- These are preliminary models for discussion and revision. A modified document will be circulated for further comment and EC+ will make a recommendation to the President for implementation.

Boniface: We found in contemplating the models, the first order of business was “where do academic units reside?” If we add staffing and administrative structure now, the conversation becomes too complex. We made the decision as EC+ to begin here. There will be later conversations about which committees exist and how will they be staffed. Administrative structure is the prerogative of the President and will be decided at a later date.

Break for questions re: guiding and operating principles. Seeing none, move to presentation of the models (previously circulated). I will offer a brief summary of all six models and ask you to hold questions and comments till the end so as not to privilege any single model.

Schools:

<p>Variation S1 The College of Arts & Sciences (Dean) Division of Expressive Arts Division of Humanities Division of Science and Mathematics Division of Social Sciences Division of Professional Studies</p> <p>College of Business (Dean) —each BAU operates independently Crummer Graduate School of Business (Dean) School of Business (Director)</p> <p>Hamilton Holt School</p>	<p>Variation S2 The College of Arts & Sciences (Dean) Division of Expressive Arts Division of Humanities Division of Science and Mathematics Division of Social Sciences Division of Education & Counseling</p> <p>College of Business (Dean)—each BAU operates independently Crummer Graduate School of Business (Dean) School of Business (Director) Department of Business Department of Health Professions Department of Communication</p> <p>Hamilton Holt School</p>
---	---

Divisions

Variation D1: Modified Status Quo	Variation D2	Variation D3
<p>Arts and Sciences Expressive Arts Humanities Science and Mathematics Social Science Professional Studies</p> <p>College of Professional Studies and the College of Arts and Sciences remain separate entities, but with one governance structure</p>	<p>Expressive Arts (add Communication?) Humanities Science and Mathematics Social Science (add Communication?) Business Counseling, Education, & Health</p>	<p>Expressive Arts Humanities Science and Mathematics Social Science Business Graduate Programs Interdisciplinary Programs Hamilton Holt</p> <p>A “set model” where an individual can populate more than one division according to discipline and teaching responsibilities</p>

Departments

<p>No schools or divisions, except for purposes of general education and considerations of diversity in perspective when staffing committees</p>
--

Boniface: Under the first “Schools” model, even if we reorganize Rollins into Schools and unify a “College of Business,” graduate and undergraduate business would operate separately. Here, we did consider administrative structure and while Crummer Graduate Programs continues to have a dean, undergrad business would have a director, not a dean or even associate dean.

We offered three variations under the Divisions model. The first is the modified status quo, which would keep our existing academic units, but reorganize the governance system to include a single set of committees.

The other variations re-imagine divisions under pedagogical groupings (D2) and a “set” or “stakeholder” model (D3). In these variations, we tried to ask, “Who are the important stakeholders that need to be at the table?” Under D3, individuals could belong to and represent more than one division.

The Departments model has no schools or divisions except for purposes of general education and perspectives in staffing committees.

As we move forward from this point, I’d like to ask us to deliberate on the following question: What do we see as advantages and disadvantages of different models?

Alicia Homrich: I would encourage any thought about formation to not put the Holt school as its own academic unit. It’s an administrative unit. I think it’s time we stop conceiving of it in this way. I think it’s time, for lots of reasons—including taking the time to consider what has worked and what’s been harmful to collegiality—to move toward

healing. I understand why we think of it this way sometimes, but this is a great place to start.

Thomas Moore: I'd like to see us very seriously consider the departmental model. When it comes to unity, I don't see another model that achieves that goal. Let's consider a single dean of the faculty. Then, instead of a model where deans are organized around academic units, we could have associate deans work around areas like faculty development or student academic success.

Socky O'Sullivan: I would like to express my appreciation to the committee for developing these models. I have a few specific questions: 1) Re: S2, the preliminary statement says Crummer is separate, but this implies a connection between Crummer and the other programs. 2) Re: both D1 and D2, it wasn't clear to me what the role of Holt would be. I think it would be a good idea if we could come together as one unit.

Boniface: Holt is left out of the divisions model because it is an administrative unit, not an academic unit. As far as S1 and S2, the premise is that a College of Business would unite these programs, but they would also maintain an independence. They are united as an identity, not a functioning academic unit. The undergraduate programs in the business school would report through the governance committees of The College.

Thomas Lairson: First I would like to congratulate Grant for having the courage to push us toward reassessing some of the things that have happened here in the last several years. (You can imagine there's a but coming.) Although I am at least somewhat assuaged by the notion that the structure is instrumental, it wasn't just the structure that was changed here, it was the very notion of the institution. Some here have tried to move Rollins toward becoming a business university. Is that what we want? My answer is no. I believe all students, whether they major in business or political science, need to be liberally educated. A business program that stands on its own cannot do that. I still adhere to the model that we had in the past through International Business where the business students were liberally educated. I am concerned about a model that separates a business school. We want to embed the business program and the business students in the liberal arts. We need to ask about more than just structure, we need to ask what kind of education we want students to receive. I am troubled by the idea that we're going to ask this question without asking the bigger question, what kind of institution do we want to be? We cannot just consider the structural decisions of the last 5 years; there has been a war over the fate of the institution with one group wanting to go one way and another group wanting to go another way.

Susan Walsh: Variation D2 looked the most appealing to me because it seems simple and efficient. I like the idea of all undergraduates under one unit. I would add from my own perspective in biology, if we could add health professions under business that would be clarifying. I am concerned that the Departments model would give a lot of power to chairs, who rotate.

Boniface: Thank you for these comments, which are exactly what we are seeking. If you like models, but would move things around, that's helpful feedback.

Robert Vander Poppen: I like variation D2 as well for all the reasons Susan articulated. I would suggest that the academic units that are being moved should have the most say in where they go. I strongly oppose the departments model. We currently have weak department chairs; because we rotate the position, we develop a relatively egalitarian

structure within departments. The Departments model could erode that quality and create divisions.

Emily Russell: Point of clarification: The Departments model doesn't have to mean that we would staff committees with department chairs.

Kathryn Norsworthy: I am not sure that the past 5 years was about trying to move the college into being a business university. I saw it as trying to develop new programs that would bring new students and revenue to the College. The President has said that we are a liberal arts college and that in the future, each program will have an opportunity to identify how we map on to the liberal arts. I would like to speak from my experience in the counseling program and how we are embedded in the liberal arts. I don't believe I had ever set foot on a liberal arts campus before I arrived at Rollins. I have been transformed through my experiences here. Our program is grounded in the liberal arts; thus we chose to stay within A&S when the split happened. In order to infuse the liberal arts in all of our programs, I believe it is best to work side by side, to be influenced by one another and to foster an essential, overarching unity. Every department in the college needs to be grounded and infused with the liberal arts.

Jill Jones: thank you, great work. Variation S1 and S2 would make the decision about identity for us; it would create a separate academic program and I believe at that point we need to start giving separate degrees. I like D1. It would at least have us working together on committees. I currently sit on the CPS curriculum committee and I have to acknowledge, based on their size, there's no disinterested person around the table as they make decisions. D1 seems simple, would diversify us and bring us together at the same time. S1 and S2 would have us make decisions that I don't know we want to make. I would also ask, Where is Crummer in S1 and S2? Have they been consulted?

Boniface: Crummer is part of EC+. Henrique Correa is the President of their faculty and was part of the Schools subgroup. I believe he recognizes some possibility of some synergy as long as independence is maintained.

Amy Armenia: What is the distribution of responsibility between divisions and departments?

Boniface: Good question.

Sharon Carnahan: I am a fan of the divisions model, largely D1 and D2. I want to bring up two elephants in the room: salary equity between departments and schools and resource allocation—is that equitably distributed? I also want to acknowledge that we have highly variable department size, and under the new gen ed we have seen that some divisions also have far fewer people than others, and have to teach a disproportionately large number of service courses compared to people in other departments.

Joan Davison: I am pulled to Kathryn's statement, but more as an aspirational one. When CPS was created, it was created because it desired to offer professional studies and not liberal arts. If we move to make us all part of A&S, then I can imagine diverse departmental FEC criteria and perhaps it would be that each department include in its FEC promotion and tenure criteria some measure of how a candidate meets "liberal arts" standards. Second, I agree with Sharon Carnahan's concerns regarding number of faculty members in departments and divisions. Under the divisions model, some divisions might have 20 people, some might have 80, and this potentially would lead to an imbalance of representation. Of course, as we make these assignments into

divisions there should be a sincere disciplinary rigor; these divisions shouldn't be arbitrary. But we must ask, "How is proportional representation achieved across uneven divisions?" Another concern, which goes back to the creation of CPS, will departments be able to identify where they land? I appreciate Robert Vander Poppen's concern that the CPS departments coming into A&S should have autonomy to decide which division they join, but I believe the A&S divisions also should have input. I remember the "divorce meeting" that was held five years ago in this room. It was an ugly divorce. People made comments such as "I feel like a POW liberated from a concentration camp" being allowed to go to CPS. As the SS trooper, I find it hard to move past those comments. People's professional reputations were at stake. It is difficult for the departments coming back, but it is also difficult for the departments they might be coming back to.

Jennifer Cavanaugh: I think it's very important that we talk about the curricular issues in one frame, but we have got to stop positioning ourselves as the people who are out to discipline the others. I sit in meetings where we hear that we're the bad guys, so I know, and I have been so impressed in this meeting today, and by your opening remarks, Dexter. But we are colleagues, we are a small school, and we need to be careful to avoid casting ourselves in this light.

Jana Mathews: I want to acknowledge the danger of making structural decisions based on current culture. I have concerns about D1, where CPS is "professional" and we are what? "Unprofessional"? We all want our students to be successful and get jobs at the end. The fact that we're having a lengthy discussion about how and where to place people in divisions reveals that this is a complex question. I think we should take another look at the Departments model and the ways it can act in the interests of efficiency.

Lee Lines: I agree with Jana and Thom Moore. Such a model would get us back in a mode where we can do the work of educating our students and avoid rehashing the conversations of the last few years, which frankly feel like a distraction. Divisional groupings often feel artificial. Some of us are in departments that are in divisions where we don't really fit. We can organize work at the college to let deans get to bigger questions. It feels like a waste of time and energy to argue about who goes where and why they go there.

Norsworthy: Maybe this is obvious in the department model v the division model, but what function are the divisions serving at this point?

Boniface: Currently, division chairs are invited to the table as counsel to the dean when lines are determined. General education has placed an emphasis on divisions. We do have a somewhat "sleepy" division model.

Rachel Simmons: As a former department chair and division chair, I wasn't really sure what I was supposed to be doing as a division chair. There is no meaningful governance structure attached to divisions. We currently operate under the departments model; we're already doing that, and we're serving our students under the departments model.

Homrich: Isn't it [divisional representation] for governance now?

Boniface: Yes, under the Bylaws our current standing committees have mandatory representation from divisions.

Richard Vitray: As chair of the science division, which is perhaps the only division that functions as such, we have a lot of decisions that need to be made across departments; we meet monthly and consult each other frequently. That being said, we will have to continue that process even under the departmental structure.

Anne Murdaugh: Do we have a sense of what our peers do and how well it works?

Boniface: We have a sense of what they do, but less of a sense of how well it works. As we narrow these models down, we can explore more fully how these options work at other places. As I mentioned earlier, as we discovered through our research, there are only a few ways to organize.

Mario D'Amato: Before I came to the meeting I was in support of D2. Now I think the Departments model looks more interesting. It's a move toward unity; it would help us work out our issues. There are some divisions that do do work, but that will continue even under the Departments model. The second issue that was raised was regarding representation on committees; we could nominally still have divisions, a nominal identification, for the purposes of committee representation. I also want to take an opportunity to read: we always quote the first statement of the mission statement. But the mission also reads: "we are committed to the liberal arts ethos and guided by its values." I stand by that.

Cavanaugh: I like the departmental model as well; one of the things I'd like to see explored is whether we can take some of the interdisciplinary programs attention in D3 and see if that can be maintained in the departments structure.

Jones: It's been said that we're fairly weak in the way we work by divisions and in meetings we work as individuals. But, when you're trying to put people on FEC, it helps to draw from different divisions. We use it relatively weakly, but it's useful.

O'Sullivan: We have not really rethought divisions in the 40 years I've been at Rollins; is this a time to rethink? I assume divisions will always be fairly weak, except in the case of science. Under the Departments model, we have significant size differentials between departments—I want to echo Joan's point: how will we work out representation? Be wary of permanent department heads; we have tended to resist them due to sense of democracy. If we move to department model, will we move toward permanent department heads and leave a relatively few voices at the table.

Erin Gallagher: I've been here less than 2 years and have heard a lot about the division of CPS and A&S. I've asked "what happened?" I have never gotten the same answer, and so I don't believe in the division. I have a very hard time backing D1 in which we are still separate. I have never gotten compelling evidence that this it was a good idea. I also wanted to ask, have our colleagues in CPS gotten this information?

Don Rogers: We occupied this room on Tuesday, looked at the same set of models, and raised some of the same questions. One thing that was different on Tuesday, we all got it at the same time that day, but CPS had the document with a much shorter lead time. As such, their conversation was less substantive than what is happening here, because the discussion largely trended toward asking questions and gaining information. I assume they'll have more to say with additional time.

Boniface: I was there on Tuesday, but I couldn't answer what was on their minds as a whole. These are all major shifts for them; there are major reservations in that group, which are important and can't be denied.

Rick Foglesong: I want to speak to what I see as a structural problem with D1. I like the idea of CPS faculty and A&S faculty serving jointly on committees. The answer to why we have faculty serve on committees is in part because we want to assimilate people into Rollins College. I do have concerns about a single FEC. I am currently serving in third year, and I've both chaired and served on the committee in the past. It will be difficult for FEC to be fair for candidates, to evaluate the work of faculty who come out of a different background and tradition. I'm not talking about a better and a worse CV, I'm talking about different CVs, different approach to work, a different understanding of the scope of a course, and the nature of the work involved. I don't know how to be ecumenical enough to others who come out of such different scholarly traditions.

Paul Stephenson: I've really enjoyed this discussion; I like looking at all these different models. I come from a strong division, but I agree there are pieces that don't always fit correctly. I am comfortable with D2 because it looks familiar, but I also like the idea that we can shift things around. The divisions and departments models do more to shift things around than S1 or S2. I want to echo problems with permanent chairs and advocate that we do not mandate that as part of the model. I am convinced we can find ways to be creative to solve questions of representation. We can come up with an interesting and egalitarian model for how we staff committees.

Carnahan: With respect to "my dear and august fellow FEC member," I could not disagree more. One FEC is central to our liberal arts ethos. Coming to understand what constitutes excellence in art history or biology has been one of my main pieces of learning during my tenure at FEC.

Boniface: As we move forward, the need to provide protections for people who are currently operating under one system and might transition to another is on the EC+ radar screen. I haven't heard a single advocate for S1 or S2, is that because it doesn't have an advocate or because someone hasn't had the opportunity to speak yet?

Murdaugh: I've only had 10 minutes of looking at my phone, but there's precedence for this. Elon does it. Stetson. University of Richmond. I've only known the CPS debacle, every year, every meeting it's been the topic. Since it happened before I arrived, I'm not biased against the Schools model because of history of how CPS was formed. We should explore it simply because other schools do it.

Boniface: Your phone is correct. We looked at a lot of schools before developing these options. Emily is sensitive on this point, but business schools are quite common.

Jonathan Miller: I'm on the Crummer Dean's search this year. I am the only member of the committee outside of the business school and it's a fascinating experience. During this discussion, part of me thought, "I wonder what we're hiring for the dean of Crummer?" A School of Business with graduate and undergraduate programs is a common model, many candidates already come with this kind of experience. On the other hand, I take very seriously this concern that it somehow separates business out from the rest of the school. These things have a self-generating quality. Crummer planning to raise money to build a new school, what are they raising money for? A building to house 500 graduate students or a building to house all the undergraduate business faculty and students.

Craig McAllaster: In terms of process, we will be sending everyone a survey to get pros and cons for each of the models. We want to collect knowledge that we will share with EC+. This is not a voting thing, but a chance to collect feedback.

Chris Fuse: There are many other schools that do schools of business but most of those are universities. I worry that variation S1 and S2 takes us down the road to become a university.

Claire Strom: I'm not advocating for S1 and S1 because I agree with everything that's been said, but why is there not an S3 that embeds the Hamilton Holt school?

Don Rogers: You're seeing 6 different models that we ended up with, but we came up with 11 before this; that treatment of Holt was in 2 of the 11, it just didn't make it to the floor.

Adjournment

Dexter Boniface adjourned the meeting at 1:45.